



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 045 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, May 13, 1996

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

The House of Commons Debates are also available on the
Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, May 13, 1996

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE BOARD

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Immigration and Refugee Board should be dismantled and its functions subsumed into the Department of Citizenship and Immigration where refugee claims would be heard and decided by well trained and accountable immigration officers.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address private member's Motion No. 120 which calls for the dismantling of the Immigration and Refugee Board. I will refer to the board as the IRB from here on in.

This motion is in response to more than two years of inaction on the part of the department of immigration and its political management by the current government. For more than two years the former minister and his replacement have skirted issues and generally avoided questions, all the while refusing to take responsibility for the inadequacies which exist within the immigration portfolio.

Under the current Liberal regime the government has brought forward legislation which has juggled the status quo and made minuscule changes. However, it has not addressed the legitimate concerns of Canadians who want the system fixed.

It must be hard for old style politicians to see past the trough of political patronage and grasp the concept of populous opinion. Since the time of Confederation the political machine in Canada has been rife with corruption and the harbour of patronage. The latest Liberal instalment is yet another chapter in the patronage book. Many initiatives are undertaken to accommodate campaign contributors, regardless of the cost to public funds or public safety.

The government is out of touch with the average Canadian, so I will take this opportunity to inform it of how rank and file Canadians view the shortcomings of the current immigration system.

Canadians are a remarkable people. Their selfless commitment to helping those less fortunate has gained the admiration of the world. Canadians want to provide a safe refuge for those who, through no fault of their own, are in legitimate danger of persecution. This is our home and we are happy to share it with those in need.

However, this responsibility has its limits. No one likes to be taken advantage of and that is exactly what is occurring today. Some of those who have come to our land seeking asylum are fugitives, war criminals or people who have not been straightforward in disclosing their situation or their past. The current system does not allow for thorough scrutiny, resulting in heightened risk to Canadians.

This situation did not arrive overnight. There has been a long stream of inept decision making which has brought our humanitarian efforts to the disastrous state which exists today. Contrary to routine embellishment by ministers of immigration, past and present, there is plenty that can be done to rectify the situation. It involves some creativity, hard work and may upset some of those who have been getting fat off overburdened taxpayers. These criteria alone would cause the minister to run away in fear, yet we with a Reform backbone are willing to make the changes in the interest of Canadians.

Let us look at the function and makeup of the IRB. The IRB was created in response to the Supreme Court of Canada's 1985 ruling in the case of *Singh v. the Minister of Employment and Immigration*. The supreme court, under the direction of Chief Justice Bertha Wilson, had ruled in *Singh* that all refugee claimants were to be granted all hearings in accordance with standards of fundamental justice and that the prior practice violated those standards. The board was also empowered to hear the appeals of those who had been ordered removed from Canada.

The decision was predicated on the theory that the IRB would be a determining body able to sort out those seeking asylum under the United Nations definition of a conventional refugee from those simply seeking entrance to Canada. From this point on the trouble starts.

Private Members' Business

Let me start by addressing the makeup of the board. The IRB, which is comprised of over 235 amply remunerated appointees, is both larger and better paid than is appropriate. The body incurs an operating cost of over \$80 million a year, not including the cost to legal aid and social services which result from their decisions.

By dismantling the IRB and subsuming its function into the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, the system would become more accountable, more cost effective, more ethical and would fulfil our humanitarian obligations.

Like all other appointed quasi-judicial bodies, the IRB is autonomous in its decision making practices. As the minister of immigration is so fond of saying, it is at arm's length to the government.

• (1110)

Unfortunately it was not an acceptable form of recall. This process could take as long as five years and fall outside the mandate of an elected government. Those making decisions on behalf of Canadians should be directly accountable for their actions. Without the direction of the House of Commons, the IRB is pursuing its own mandate regardless of the wants and needs of Canadians.

Many of those who land in Canada as refugees should have been considered immigrants, others should have been denied entry altogether. As Canadians we have an obligation to accommodate only those who qualify as convention refugees under the definition outlined by the United Nations.

The United Nations definition of a convention refugee is one who, because of a membership in a particular political or social group, religion, race or nationality, cannot return to his or her own country for fear of serious persecution. The UN estimates that in 1993 there were over 20 million displaced persons in the world. Of these only 60,000 remain genuine refugees. 1994-95 reflects the same kind of statistics.

The UN reports that 25,000 of the 60,000 who were in need of immediate resettlement were settled worldwide. Canada accepted 25,000 refugees in 1993. Therefore either Canada settled every single refugee in the world or the formula for determining the status is flawed. I believe it to be the latter.

A clear definition has been laid down by the UN. Unfortunately the IRB interpretation of that definition has created considerable uncertainty regarding the determination of refugee status. The average acceptance rate for industrialized countries has traditionally hovered around 14 per cent. Canada's acceptance rate is presently hovering between 70 per cent and 90 per cent. Clearly the definition of refugee has undergone radical expansion in Canada.

Some may argue the merits of having such a high approval rate. However, the ramifications of these practices is far reaching and not as noble as one may think. I will address this issue later in my speech.

The IRB has redefined its mandate and practices outside that of its inception and that of any other practice exercised by signatories of the UN convention.

There must be a clear formula for refugee determination and it must be followed in all cases. Unless a nation has proven itself to be a systematic violator of the terms of the UN treaty, then that nation should be considered a safe third country for the purposes of refugee determination.

Currently the majority of cases heard by the IRB involve inland claimants, those people who enter Canada and seek refugee status. Many of these people have paid their way to Canada and only seek refugee status because of Canada's liberal practices. Canada operates under the legal fiction that there are no safe third countries. As such, virtually all migrants regardless of their previous country of residence, are granted refugee hearings on request. I can point to the United States, England, Germany and even Israel, that according to Canada, are refugee producing nations.

I believe it is entirely appropriate and does not contravene the decision to deny claimants refugee hearings who come from safe third countries. This is in accordance with the UN definition. This opinion is shared by Canadians but not by the Immigration and Refugee Board.

The practices of the IRB have caused two streams of immigration into Canada; those who qualify as immigrants and those who slip through as refugees. There are two losers in this scenario: the legitimate refugee who is not granted access to Canada and the taxpayer who is forced to support huge bills which result from appeals, legal aid and social assistance. Claimants that do not have a legitimate claim to seek asylum in Canada carry a huge price tag.

The average cost to the taxpayer per claimant in terms of legal aid, court time and social assistance is between \$30,000 and \$60,000, multiplied by 25,000 refugee claimants accepted annually, the bill is well over \$1 billion. This amount comes close to matching the total budget of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees. With that budget the UNHRC manages to care for, resettle and repatriate five million displaced persons a year.

• (1115)

In other words, Canada spends the same amount of money on a few thousand cases as the UN does on five million. There is definitely a problem. The primary goal of Canada's refugee system is to provide humanitarian relief. Therefore, a reduced emphasis on

inland processing is needed in order to focus a greater reliance on overseas selection.

Overseas claimants are confined to refugee camps surrounded by barbed wire and armed soldiers. These people have been denied the most basic of human needs, yet their plight is forsaken by those who abuse the Canadian refugee system.

In addition to the humanitarian gains inherent in this approach, costs to the taxpayer would be substantially reduced. Contrary to the exorbitant costs attributed to inland claimants, the cost of resettling overseas claimants averages between \$2,500 to \$3,000 per claim. This is fair, it is ethical and it is what the IRB was established to do, help those most in need.

We may ask ourselves why dismantle the IRB, why not just change its mandate? I do not believe it is that simple. The IRB is a hotbed for political patronage appointments. Merit is not always a factor or a motive. The IRB is unresponsive to the interests of Canadians and has become a representative of special interests from the immigration industry perpetuating a system which drains public moneys for its own gain; the more the merrier as long as the taxpayer is paying. This is accomplished by broadening the definition of refugees beyond either what the people of Canada or the United Nations for that matter have ever proposed.

In many instances IRB members have been confused between the terms of persecution and prosecution by allowing fugitives, terrorists, outlaws and political dissidents into Canada under the guise of refugees. Some of these undesirables are believed to be channelled through Canadian social assistance funds back to the political regimes which perpetuate violence, genocide and drugs, not the element which tugs at the heart strings of generous Canadians. I believe Canadians have been duped into believing otherwise.

Under current guidelines refugee hearings conducted by the IRB are to be non-confrontational. In other words, board members and staff must take pains to avoid engaging in questioning, introducing evidence or employing a tone that would suggest to the claimant the onus of providing proof of legitimacy lies with them.

It is a privilege to be granted access to the best country in the world. There needs to be a system of determining refugees which is thorough, efficient, cost effective and fair. The IRB is not, hence the fact that it must be dismantled.

The House may ask what will serve in its place. I am glad that question was asked because no responsible piece of legislation should be presented unless it is well researched and includes a plan of implementation. I assure the House this motion includes both.

I am proposing the IRB be entirely dismantled and replaced by a body of well trained immigration officers who have the ability individually to determine refugee claims. These officers would

Private Members' Business

receive intensive training in refugee acceptance guidelines. This measure would establish government policies and procedures which would need to be followed in each and every case.

The performance of these officers would be scrutinized and regularly reviewed by departmental officials under the jurisdiction of the deputy minister of immigration and citizenship, thereby implementing the element of accountability which has been absent from the present model.

Some may argue replacing the IRB with a body of trained immigration officials directly accountable to the deputy minister will lead to political intervention in the determination process. There could be a valid argument here. However, Reform proposes that members of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees monitor refugee acceptance guidelines in Canada and act as a check and balance on the process.

Our mandate to accept and resettle convention refugees is obligatory as signatories of the treaty. The UNHCR would be able to inform the minister and Canadians of questionable trends in refugee processing.

• (1120)

This intervention would end the pandering of the immigration industry interest which is so prevalent thus far. Immigration officers would be empowered to investigate and question the legitimacy of all claimants in the interest of Canadians. The decision of verifying and accepting a claim would be rendered by individual hearing officers rather than by an IRB member, a patronage appointment.

This method of intervention would ensure full disclosure of information, including that which is incriminating. Why should we provide asylum to those who have committed crimes in other lands? I know the Liberals prefer to see that, as they have often expressed, but unfortunately most Canadians do not agree with that. There are far too many needy claimants in the world to take risks on those with chequered pasts.

By empowering our immigration officials with fact finding abilities there is a greater chance of weeding out those who are not deserving of asylum in Canada.

The IRB is ineffective in determining refugee claimants as described in the UN definition of a convention refugee. The IRB has a history of catering to the immigration industry, lining the pockets of immigration lawyers, advocacy groups and organizations with hard earned taxpayer dollars.

The IRB has broadened the Canadian definition of a refugee to the point that anyone entering Canada has a nine out of ten shot at refugee status. Of all who reach Canada, only 1 per cent are ever deported. This is a joke that undermines the immigration and refugee system in the eyes of Canadians.

Private Members' Business

The IRB has repeatedly cost the Canadian taxpayer, the board itself, \$80 million a year. That is a disgusting display of partisan patronage which must stop now.

One would think the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration would embrace a plan such as this. It would restore integrity and accountability to a portfolio which is severely lacking. It would demonstrate to the Canadian public that she cares about the situation and responsible with their hard earned tax dollars. It would portray her as a minister concerned with the safety of Canadians, dedicated to Canada's humanitarian obligations.

There is only one problem. She would have to fire all her friends and those of the previous minister, which I do not think would happen. That is a serious obstacle for this minister and the entire Liberal Party. The only jobs, jobs, jobs they care about are patronage jobs.

We on this side of the House see things a whole lot differently. We want to take the immigration system and make it effective, accountable and ethical. We want governments to implement programs which serve Canadians without the added expense of patronage jobs. We want the refugee determination process to be conducted by well trained, non-partisan immigration officials. This is not a Christmas wish list. This is the bare minimum which is to be expected from a responsible government.

Our plan would result in the number of persons accepted as convention refugees through the inland process being sharply reduced.

I am bringing forward a motion which is in the best interest of Canadians by implementing a more effective system of refugee determination without the pomp and circumstance of bloated patronage appointments and the pandering to special interest demands.

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak to Motion No. 120 by the hon. member for Calgary Northeast advocating the elimination of the Immigration and Refugee Board.

Let us examine that which is to be destroyed by this motion. The IRB, an independent administration tribunal, was to identify those who need our protection as convention refugees.

In 1989 the IRB was established so that refugee claimants would have the right to a hearing in order to explain their claim personally. This resulted following a supreme court decision which indicated the claimants had a right to an oral hearing when questions of credibility were at stake. As well, the IRB was formed in order to respond to charges that the former system was not impartial. A return to the former system would only lead to the same criticism and legal challenges which plagued it.

• (1125)

The IRB is comprised of three divisions. The refugee division of the IRB deals exclusively with claims to convention refugee status. Before the division comes into the picture, a senior immigration officer of Citizenship and Immigration Canada determines whether a claimant is eligible to claim convention refugee status. If eligible, claimants are referred to the IRB for determination. Claims are usually heard by a two member panel, although in a number of situations decisions can be made by a single member.

The IRB also plays the key role in adjudicating all immigration inquiries. This is handled by the adjudication division of the IRB which is mandated to conduct immigration inquiries and detention reviews. Inquiries are held at the request of department officials to determine whether persons are to be admitted to or removed from Canada.

The appeal division of the IRB is in charge of handling appeals by Canadians citizens or permanent resident sponsors in cases where the department officials have rejected an application for permanent residence made by a close family member.

It also handles appeals for removal orders issued by the board's adjudication division or department officials against permanent residents, visa holders or convention refugee claimants who have been convicted of a serious crime in Canada, who have made a material misrepresentation on their application for permanent residence, or who have not complied with the terms and conditions of their landings.

As well, the appeal division handles appeals by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration against decisions of the board's adjudication division. The minister may reject or admit the subject of an immigration inquiry.

As everyone can see from this description, the IRB performs an extremely important and complex function. Transferring the IRB's function to the department would not be a small feat. It would be expensive and would not add anything positive. Most important, it would seriously compromise the impartiality of the refugee determination process.

We must do everything possible to avoid a perception that refugee determining officers are seen as simply doing the will of the government of the day. Impartiality is imperative. The independence of the IRB ensures the principles of our charter of rights and freedoms are preserved.

Our charter provides that everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person, and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

Refugee status determination requires particular skills and expertise. It requires personnel who have knowledge and understand-

ing of the refugee experience. Departmental officials could be trained to do the job of IRB members, but we must keep in mind current members were selected because they already had many of the qualities necessary for the job.

As such, there would in essence be no sense in moving these positions to the department. Moreover, regardless of whether the IRB were dismantled, the qualities required of refugee decision makers would not change one bit. The bottom line is that transferring the functions of the IRB to the department would mean significant and unnecessary expenditures and would also compromise the impartial nature of the refugee determination process which the IRB performs so effectively. This latter point is crucial. It is the reason I must reject the hon. member's motion.

• (1130)

It is important to be aware that the previous Minister of Citizenship and Immigration recently introduced changes to the IRB. This includes downsizing the IRB from 175 members to 112 for a cost saving of \$6 million. Also, an independent panel will be set up to choose new IRB members and reappoint current ones. The selection process prior to this change was previously the responsibility of the minister.

This is evidence that the IRB is continually reacting to a changing environment and is evolving. The need to evolve however does not imply that we should dispose of the entire system. If there is a problem, we fix it. We make changes. We do not mindlessly destroy what is already created and in place.

To destroy and dismantle will not solve anything. It will not accomplish a thing. This government has worked hard ever since its inception to make sure that Canada's refugee determination system is fair, to be certain that it is affordable and that it is also sustainable. The changes that have already been made to the IRB are a clear example of this. We have an excellent refugee program that will only continue to improve.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Motion M-120 tabled by the hon. member for Calgary Northeast, who wants the Immigration and Refugee Board or IRB to be dismantled.

This motion has already been debated on December 14. The hon. member wants IRB functions to be subsumed under the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

He put forward several reasons to justify his motion, and I agree with some of them because they are quite valid. He wants to end patronage, partisan appointments and the renewal of commissioners' mandate. He wants to end political patronage, the tradition of rewarding election campaign friends and supporters by appointing

Private Members' Business

them to highly paid, prestigious positions, like that of IRB commissioner.

However, I totally disagree with the hon. member's opinion that the board should be dismantled. Although I recognize that there are indeed some operational problems, I think the IRB is a valuable organization that must be preserved.

The IRB was created in 1989 following a 1985 Supreme Court ruling on the Singh case. The ruling stipulated that refugees and asylum seekers too are protected by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and entitled to a hearing in accordance with the standards of fundamental justice.

The Supreme Court ruled that the charter of rights and freedoms must be respected in the refugee determination and admission process.

This process must also take place before an impartial organization, an independent tribunal, as is the case with the IRB.

The IRB is the largest independent quasi-judicial tribunal in Canada. It was established by Parliament to rule on refugee claims and immigration appeals.

• (1135)

Since 1993, it is also responsible for the arbitration function as it relates to immigration inquiries and the review of the grounds for detention. The IRB administers a budget of approximately \$77 million per year and, as of May 1, had 178 board members, whose wages range from \$73,400 to \$142,400. These are well-paid jobs, board members earning \$90,000 a year on average.

There is a serious problem, which has been raised by the hon. member for Calgary Northeast, with appointment and reappointment of members. The Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration periodically reviews some of these appointments, and we have noticed that many are politically motivated. Sometimes, those selected lack the necessary expertise. Never having worked with immigrant or refugee serving organizations, they do not always have the skills required to carry out their duties.

The board has heard the testimonies of two former board members, who condemned the incompetence of some board members. There is even one board member who was disbarred as a lawyer only to be later appointed to the board by this Liberal government.

The government told us it wanted to improve the board member selection process. An advisory committee, the Gordon Fairweather committee, after the name of its chairman, was established. This is some obscure committee, whose operations we know nothing about. For instance, we do not know on what basis the board members are selected, whether or not interviews are conducted and if appraisals are taken into account. The role played by the IRB in

Private Members' Business

appointing and reappointing members when their terms of office expire is not known.

The official opposition, and the hon. member for Bourassa in particular, have asked that the chairman of this committee appear before the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration along with an IRB representative to explain to us what procedure is used to select and appoint board members. Unfortunately, our request was denied by the Liberal majority on the committee.

We Bloc members oppose Motion M-120, even though we agree with some of the points raised by the hon. member for Calgary Northeast. We do not think that the solution is to dismantle the IRB, but to bring about major changes to this paralegal body. Transferring the IRB's functions to public servants is not the solution, because the minister and the government display partisanship when appointing the deputy minister or senior officials to whom these public servants are accountable.

In the past, when public servants were responsible for the refugee status determination process, the decision was sometimes made in secret. There was no obligation to hear those who were seeking asylum. This is why the Supreme Court ruled that a paralegal body was required to make decisions on such requests.

Moreover, I cannot agree with a motion from a party that has shown no interest in the cause of refugees. This motion only seeks to force Canada to drastically reduce the number of refugees currently allowed into the country. The Reform Party has shown a great deal of hostility towards immigrants and refugees, while also recently making discriminatory comments towards homosexuals and blacks. It also displays some animosity towards women and minorities. Therefore, we cannot support this motion.

• (1140)

There are problems with the IRB. One of the most important ones is, in our opinion, the fact that it takes much too long to hear claims, particularly in the case of an appeal. The IRB must improve its productivity, and its members must make better and more consistent decisions.

There are many problems in the IRB office in Montreal. Last week, a board member was arrested, and charged with making death threats to an IRB hearing officer. He was charged with intercepting private conversations, having a restricted weapon in his possession, harassing and of making harassing phone calls. These are serious charges. As things stand, the board member has not been suspended, even if his case is already before a court.

Incidents such as these do undermine the credibility of the IRB. This is why I am asking the minister and the chair of the IRB to

react and to suspend this board member until a final decision has been reached in this case.

I would like to point out another problem with the IRB. I was told that the IRB wants to privatize its documentation, information and research service. This is an important service that provides board members with the information they need about the asylum seeker and his or her home country. I have even heard that a Liberal member is involved in these efforts to privatize the documentation service of the IRB. I do not think that would be a good idea. I think we should reassure the employees who are afraid of losing their jobs.

The situation worldwide is alarming: the number of refugees is still on the rise. According to the High Commissioner for Refugees, there are 27 million refugees, and 80 p. 100 of them are women and children. Today's newspapers reported a very serious problem in Liberia, an African country thousands of refugees are trying to flee. I would like Canada to provide them with humanitarian assistance and to welcome a number of these refugees here.

Let me say in conclusion that we will vote against this motion.

[English]

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak on behalf of my colleague's private member's motion to get rid of the Immigration and Refugee Board. I support him 100 per cent.

I have heard from former members as well as those who are presently sitting on the IRB. They are very concerned about the attitude, the prevailing culture as they call it, within the Immigration and Refugee Board. There are individuals who feel that the prevailing attitude or culture of the board is very biased, one sided and certainly is not balanced. They are very concerned because they see this attitude as being one of supporting the advocacy groups and the refugees over and above any consideration for Canada and for the safety of Canadian society. This concerns me.

The board is a quasi-judicial body which operates at arm's length from the government. There does not seem to be any accountability. I appreciate that somebody has to be there to be concerned about the refugee and immigration applicants who appear before the board, however I feel there are other options. There are other options and opportunities within the Canadian system for their concerns to be addressed. My colleague has given his concept of what he thinks the alternatives can be.

• (1145)

I would suggest that having a government department with individuals who have the knowledge and training to deal with this

is probably the preferable way of dealing with it because they are accountable. If it can be shown they are not doing their job or that there is bias or a lack of consideration for any of the different parties, they can be held accountable and they can be removed from their job.

The members of the IRB are not treated in the same way. They are removed from any accountability. When they make decisions that are not in Canada's best interests, nothing really can be done. Making people accountable for their decisions is a very important consideration.

Another reason departmental representatives are in a better position or should be allowed that jurisdiction is that decisions would be done in a timely manner. It is not fair for any applicant to have to wait four or five years to know whether or not they are going to be allowed to stay in their country of choice. It is not fair to the Canadian public nor to the applicants themselves to be held in the situation of not knowing where they belong.

I have talked to many applicants who have gone through a very long and drawn out process to try to get some kind of determination. It is very difficult for them when they have established roots in a new home in Canada to be told four or five years later that they cannot stay.

I am concerned with what is happening to the Immigration and Refugee Board in that its decisions are also bringing disrepute to Canada's whole immigration system. I can cite a number of cases of where its decisions have been contrary to public opinion and the opinion of immigration officers. There are decisions where the immigration officers have appealed the IRB decision because they felt so strongly about it. A number of them have happened within the last year or two.

One that strikes me as being totally uncalled for is a decision for Jhadoo to remain in our country. Jhadoo has a fairly lengthy criminal history and ended up once again committing a serious crime. He beat to death with a baseball bat a mother of six children. He did it for money. The IRB determined that he could be rehabilitated even though he had a long criminal history and he had murdered a mother of six children. He was put out on parole. The decision was made that while he was on parole he could remain in Canada on the condition that he not associate with other criminals. When the IRB decision came down his parole had already been revoked and he was in jail associating with criminals. This did not seem to concern the IRB.

There is another case of an applicant who had been ordered deported, whose deportation order had been stayed by the IRB and then had been appealed and overturned. Although that individual had a charge of manslaughter, a charge for a sexual offence against a 13 year old, and charges of aggravated assault, he was allowed to

stay in Canada. As a result there is one woman who is dead and a 13 year old girl who was shot and badly wounded before he committed suicide. There is a price to pay for decisions such as these.

When somebody thinks that the department officials have not given a good decision or that their deportation order is unjustified, there are the courts of the land to deal with those cases. There is nothing that denies them the ability to appear before the courts in those cases.

• (1150)

We have made it so easy for individuals to stretch the process, to stretch the courtesy and the kindness of our country to the point where our acceptance rate is high on 75 per cent. Although as a country we are compassionate and we want to open our doors, it is a question of making sure that those most in need, the genuine refugees who are in camps and do not have the means to relocate in another country, are the people we look after, not those individuals who have the financial resources to reach the North American continent and to make their claim from here.

Some comments have been brought to my attention from the Rwandan community here in Canada, the Tamil community here in Canada, the Hong Kong community here in Canada, and the Sikh community here in Canada. They are concerned about the decisions which are being made by the IRB. They are concerned about the representation in the IRB hearings which they see as very one sided and very biased. They ask: "How is it possible that this is happening? We are the victims. We are being victimized in Canada by the people the IRB is allowing to come in. Why is somebody not protecting us in Canada from that which we left in our home countries?" I cannot answer them because I do not know why we are allowing that to happen.

The situation we find ourselves in was brought to my attention by somebody within the community. This person is concerned that in 1994 there were 68 Chileans who made claims to the board in Montreal. In February 1995 Canada removed the visitor's visa regulation for Chileans. In 1995 Montreal had 1,483 applicants for refugee status. That is a jump from 68 claimants to 1,483 claimants in one year.

One has to ask why this happens. Is it for legitimate reasons or is it because Canada has a reputation for having such a weak, soft system that it makes it easy for people to take advantage of us? In the interests of Canadians, in the interests of the integrity of our immigration system it is very important that Canada start looking at organizations and boards like the IRB to determine whether they have been successful in maintaining the status and the stature of Canada in the international community. If they have not, then this country should be looking for other alternatives. I would suggest that now is not soon enough.

Private Members' Business

Ms. Maria Minna (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to characterize a system as being biased against the safety of Canadians is not only not fair, but it is not just.

Over 50 years this country has opened its doors to thousands and thousands of refugees. This is something I am sure everyone is proud of. There are individuals in this House right now who know firsthand the hardships and perils refugee claimants have to face, the persecution, the sorrow and the fear.

For the rest of us it may sometimes be difficult to understand or comprehend the refugee experience. People in Canada do not have to worry about soldiers coming to their doors in the middle of the night to take them or their families away. We do not have to worry about being tortured or killed for our political beliefs. We do not have to worry about suddenly losing our homes and possessions because of war. We must never forget that many others do.

There are places in the world where speaking one's mind can get one thrown into a cell without a trial or a sentence, or worse. We live in a time when terms like ethnic cleansing and genocide have become part of the daily vernacular. I am proud to say that in Canada we have chosen to confront these issues head on. It has long been recognized both here and abroad that Canadians care and we take our responsibilities as good citizens of the world very seriously.

• (1155)

That is why we accept the international obligations we took on when we signed the 1951 Geneva convention relating to the status of refugees and the 1967 protocol. By signing those agreements we promised to protect those in need, to open our arms and hearts to victims of oppression and misery.

A key element of the strategy to deal with refugees was the creation of the Immigration and Refugee Board in 1989. The IRB, on behalf of Canadians, reflects our commitment to promote a peaceful and humanitarian response to global issues of conflict, mass migration and human rights. The board's goals and challenges have remained constant: to identify those in need of Canada's protection and to adjudicate fairly and efficiently all immigration appeals, inquiries and detention reviews.

There have been times when the IRB has met all of these goals and challenges. However, we have had problems. There have been times when the IRB's judgment has been questioned. There have been times when the integrity of the system has been placed in doubt. However this does not mean we should scrap the whole thing. This type of haphazard tearing down is inefficient and uncalled for. Characterizing the system by using a few criminal sensationalistic cases is irresponsible.

In 1985 the supreme court ruled that refugee claimants are entitled to a hearing on the merits of their claim in accordance with the charter right to fundamental justice. In the Singh case the court pointed out that fundamental justice required that the claimants had a right to an oral hearing before the decision maker where questions of credibility were at stake. The opportunity to be heard is only one element of fundamental justice. The decision maker must also be unbiased and impartial. There is a requirement not only for justice to be done but for justice to be seen to be done.

We have a board of professionals who are well trained to deal with the intricacies and complexities of refugee cases. Refugee status determination has been described as one of the most difficult forms of adjudication. It is emotionally demanding and requires a commitment to justice and fairness. Board members are chosen because they have the qualities deemed necessary to carry out this important and often heart rending work. They bring with them different perspectives and knowledge of the international community.

The board's record of success far outweighs the few instances of problems. Last year alone the board heard over 20,000 claims. Unfortunately when dealing with that many people inevitably a few people may slip through the cracks. A criminal few have cast some serious aspersions on a good system. That is why the government recently took action to protect the integrity of our system. I am talking about the passage of Bill C-44 which hon. members opposite know well.

Bill C-44 is an enforcement tool which is tough on serious criminals who would abuse our nation's goodwill and hospitality. It stops serious dangerous criminals from claiming refugee status simply to delay their removal from Canada. It also allows our government to stop a refugee hearing after the hearing has begun if it suddenly receives new information about a claimant's criminal dealings.

Before the passage of Bill C-44, we would not stop the process once it started. Likewise, Bill C-44 takes away the right of serious criminals to appeal removal orders to the immigration appeal division of the IRB. The withdrawal of appeal rights will only occur in the most serious cases involving real danger to the public.

We have done a great deal to address the concerns that hon. members across the way are talking about. Perhaps it should be noted right now that improvements to the board are not always legislated in the House. In order to maintain its relevance and efficiency, the board continually assesses its performance and examines ways to improve. The IRB has willingly undertaken an ongoing process of critical self-examination of policies, practices and procedures.

In recent years the board itself has concentrated on developing and identifying best practices. Another example of this positive development was the introduction of guidelines in examining

claims from women refugees fearing gender related persecution. Canada was the first country in the world to undertake such an initiative. This reinforces our image as a world leader in upholding the rights of women.

It is a system which is continually evolving and developing. It is a system which builds on its successes and learns from its mistakes. Countries such as the U.S., which has been admonished by the UN a number of times for its lack of sensitivity and understanding in its dealings with refugees, are not the kinds of countries I would like to compare Canada with.

We have a system in place which is at arm's length from the government, is professional and is doing a good job. We need to improve it, but scrapping it is like sticking our heads in the sand.

The Deputy Speaker: Perhaps we could call it 12.03 p.m. rather than having someone speak for three minutes.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

The House resumed from May 10, 1996 consideration of Bill C-12, an act respecting employment insurance in Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 75

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 63.

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 76

That Bill C-12, in Clause 63, be amended by

(a) replacing line 19, on page 60, with the following:

“63.(1) Subject to subsection (2), the Commission may, with the approv-”; and

(b) adding the following after line 34 on page 60:

“(2) Where the government of a province notifies the Commission in writing that it wishes to enter into an agreement to provide for the annual payment by the Commission of contributions equivalent to all costs and expenses relating to the employment benefits and support measures that are to be made each year by the Commission in the province, the Commission shall enter into such an agreement forthwith.”

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are getting near the end of this stage which unfortunately, just as all other stages of consideration of this bill, has been cut short by the government. First of all, this bill did not follow the normal

Government Orders

procedure since it was referred to committee before second reading, where the official opposition usually has the opportunity to talk about the principles of a bill. And now, at report stage in the House, the government has once again decided to limit debate.

I think the government does not want to give us the opportunity to tell the truth about this reform in the House of Commons because it is afraid that, if people learn the truth, there will be even more pressure on the government.

After all these demonstrations in areas where there had not been any in a long time, we had further proof of the people's dissatisfaction in the 40,000 cards Quebecers sent to the Leader of the Official Opposition so he could give them to the Minister of Human Resources Development, who was not there to receive them. But the cards are there.

If people are so much opposed to this bill, it is because it changes dramatically the conditions of the unemployment insurance program, which is the only protection available to ordinary people, to those who are not rich, to those who do not have lifetime job security, and that includes a lot of people.

The only people who will be less affected by this bill are those who already have a steady job, who already work 35 hours a week or more. But even these people will be affected by the level of maximum benefits and by the reduction of the benefit period to 45 weeks. Even they will be affected, because their sons, wives, friends, and people from their areas will be affected, because economically, as well as socially, this bill is a bad bill.

I would say it is a bad bill for Canada as well. And you might look at me and consider it ironic, coming from a member of the Bloc Quebecois. Yes, Mr. Speaker, but on this issue, as on so many others, the official opposition has fulfilled its function because, when we are here, we are defending not just Quebec's interests in this Parliament, but also the interests of Quebecers, which are just as affected as Canadians in Atlantic Canada or anywhere else in Canada by this UI reform.

• (1205)

This reform has an impact on the economy and on Canada. Why? Because since the beginning, UI was, in my view, a form of transfer from the richer regions, those where work is the most plentiful, to the poorer regions, where it is harder to find a decent-paying job.

But the purpose of this bill, and it is there for anyone who reads the documents put out by the department, is to reduce equalization payments. People in the regions quite rightly protested. They were being targeted. But they are not the only ones targeted, far from it.

In addition to tightening up eligibility requirements, as was mentioned, in addition to reducing benefits, in addition to slashing the level of benefits for those without stable jobs, this bill has the

Government Orders

detestable feature of increasing the arbitrary and discretionary power of the commission, which has dwindled to a shadow of its former self, because, to all intents and purposes, the department takes over what used to be the commission's role. Employees are now employees of the department. So, there is more arbitrary power, and definitely more punitive measures.

As proof, I offer the amendments presented by the government, because it was the only one able to present any, on all the provisions involving expenditures and revenues. These amendments solve very few problems for very few people and, in themselves, will not offset the department's intended cuts. Those cuts will be replaced with additional sanctions.

It is important to note that there is a very low level of unemployment insurance fraud, based on what we know about the incidence of fraud in various public programs. It is important to point out that, of the nearly \$14 billion paid out in benefits, cases involving fraud accounted for \$94 million this past year, or far less than 1 per cent. The number of individuals found guilty of fraud is also far lower than that figure.

I have heard from so many lawyers working with people who have been having horrendous problems with UI. Moreover, numerous rulings by both the umpire and the federal appeal court have repeatedly shown that people are very much at a disadvantage when it comes to unemployment insurance. If they do win their case, all that they obtain as a judgment is that the commission will review its decision, so many people do not even protest, because they cannot afford to.

• (1210)

Something we fear will happen, and it will if the government continues along this path, is that there will be more work done under the table, more arrangements between employers and employees to get around this legislation.

The government still has time, there is no urgency. The purpose of our proposed amendment is to encourage the government to take the necessary time for proper consultations aimed at true reform. There is no rush to precipitate regions into very high unemployment levels, no rush to hurl those with no security except unemployment insurance into far greater poverty.

[*English*]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of the employment insurance legislation before the House.

The bill is key to our government's commitment to the reform of the social security system. As Secretary of State for the Status of Women and as a B.C. MP, I am pleased to say fairness and inclusiveness are hallmarks of the bill. It retools the outdated Unemployment Insurance Act of 1971 for our times.

In the 1990s structural unemployment created a new problem that the old UI system had not been designed to address. Through no fault of their own, workers were being laid off and found it difficult to get permanent work. There are many reasons for this, not the least of which is the advent of a new era of technological and information based industries.

The end result was that UI, which was meant to assist workers through temporary short term job displacement, was ill equipped to respond to the frequent recurrent, and in some cases permanent, job loss characteristic of structural unemployment.

The only way to deal with structural unemployment, as the rest of the industrial world is beginning to find out, is to become relevant to the new industrial reality. To do this means retraining and providing workers with the tools and skills for the new world of work. Canadians want to work, to be independent economically and to provide the infrastructure for Canada's competitiveness in the global economy.

This bill creates a new and modern employment insurance system for Canadians who agree we need to realign our social programs and who want these changes made with fairness and with flexibility, with a human face.

Canadians have had a direct hand in shaping this reform and the result is an insurance plan that focuses on employment, training and entrepreneurship, not unemployment. This new system will help more Canadians prepare for, find and keep work in the new economy, and goes so far as to create jobs.

One of the most significant features of this reform is that while 96 per cent of current UI recipients will still be eligible, 500,000 new claimants will be able to receive benefits, a majority of whom are women and youth.

The new bill also recognizes the regional diversity of the country. For the first time, fewer hours will be required to qualify in high unemployment areas such as northern B.C. and the maritimes. The bill recognizes for the first time the inherent differences in the work patterns of men and women and seeks to remedy them.

The evolution of women's aspiration for equality has created a different dynamic in the workforce. Today women make up 45 per cent of the paid workforce.

[*Translation*]

Women have become such a force in the labour market in the past 25 years that addressing issues of interest to women means addressing the numerous characteristics of the new economy, issues such as nontraditional work, conflicts between job and family responsibilities, and various models for entering the work force.

Women tend to work fewer hours than men and to earn less. They are more likely to be in nontraditional jobs.

[*English*]

The new EI recognizes the different realities of women and men because it is the first major federal initiative designed with the benefit of formal gender analysis. I point out how this has been reflected in Bill C-12.

One of the major strengths of this legislation is the move from weeks of work to hours of work as the basis of the plan. In today's fluid job market the week is no longer the best measure of labour force participation. The hour is a more accurate measure of work effort since it will acknowledge the efforts of all part time workers who put in under 15 hours of work a week, often doing so in more than one job, and who were not allowed to participate in the benefits other workers enjoyed. Now premiums are paid from the first hour worked. Every hour counts toward a claim.

For the first time women may be able to qualify for maternity, parental and other special benefits they were previously ineligible for. Almost 70 per cent of part time workers are women. This change means 500,000 more Canadians will have their work insured for the first time. Concerns have been raised that if women in this position cannot get more hours of work they will lose their claim to maternity or parental benefits.

• (1215)

Gender based analysis showed that at most 2 per cent of current maternity claimants would need to work longer to qualify for these special benefits but that they will get them. Also, now that every hour counts, employers will have less reason to limit the hours of their part time workers as they did in the past. Many Canadians who hold down multiple jobs will be eligible for EI for the very first time.

Another group of workers who will benefit under the new system are seasonal workers, 38 per cent of whom comprise the B.C. workforce. These people working in logging, mining, fisheries, tourism and construction. They often have a gap in the off season which breaks up their continuous weeks of work criteria. Now, not only will they carry over for up to a 26 week gap, but the hour system will increase their eligibility by recognizing the intensity of their work over the on season.

Bill C-12 will help low income Canadians. Some 350,000 Canadians with family incomes of less than \$26,000 a year will be eligible for the family income supplement. Two-thirds of these are women who will receive a top up for up to 13 per cent of their benefit. They will be able to keep a foot in the job market door by supplementing their benefits by \$50 or 25 per cent of their weekly benefits, whichever is higher.

Government Orders

About 1.3 million low income Canadians will now have their EI premiums refunded, including almost 700,000 women and about 300,000 youth.

The new EI plan is a pro-employment plan where benefits will be balanced by five active employment initiatives designed to help unemployed Canadians find their place in the labour force. Wage subsidies will give employers an incentive to hire people in targeted groups who face barriers to employment. Many of these beneficiaries will be women and youth.

An innovative new benefit, targeted earning supplements, will top up the income of eligible claimants who take a low earning job.

Self-employment assistance has already helped more than 34,000 Canadians to start their own businesses. This is especially exciting for women who now make up one in every three entrepreneurs. Skills, loans and grants support individual initiative and commitment.

Access to these benefits has been broadened to include more Canadians. Anyone who received insurance benefits in the previous three years and anyone who has claimed maternity, parental or adoptive benefits in the past five years, will now be included.

[*Translation*]

This new system is both economically and socially responsible. It is proactive and balanced.

[*English*]

It will bridge the difficult transition in a world that is moving out of one industrial era into another, where the status quo no longer works, where a plan designed to meet the needs of a boom generation has become irrelevant.

Change is always difficult at best. How to change in ways that moves us forward competitively into the new world reality is what the EI bill proposes. It reinforces the value of work and our belief as Canadians that we can create prosperity and security in the new millennium. I urge the House to pass this bill and to help Canada accept the challenges and benefits that the 21st century offers.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to intervene once again on Bill C-12. I do not understand how the secretary of state can boast that this is a bill for women. I do not believe it for a minute.

I do not know whether the secretary of state heard or read the same news as us, but it is a fact that no more than two weeks ago a press conference was held here by a number of women's groups. They included NAC, the Fédération des femmes du Québec and a number of other groups that criticized this bill, because it is bad for women.

Government Orders

Why is it bad for women? Because it will penalize part time women workers, and not only women but young people. The secretary of state for the status of women said that 77 per cent of women worked in part time jobs. How is it she is alone in saying so—because she represents the Liberal government, which supports the bill—when women are criticizing this bill, which will penalize part time workers?

• (1220)

The government is boasting that UI benefits are counted and paid as of the first hour worked, but these women, who work less than 15 hours, will not qualify, as we know very well. A lot of women work part time and less than 15 hours a week. What is going to happen? These women will not qualify for unemployment insurance benefits.

I am not the only one saying so, and my colleagues in the Bloc are not the only ones saying so. Women's groups in Canada and in Quebec, and not just Quebec, are saying so. It is not simply for partisan reasons we are speaking to this issue, a lot of people outside the Bloc have criticized it.

I do not know whether the secretary of state watched the news on the weekend, but as late as yesterday, on Mother's Day, a press conference was held in Montreal where unions and Françoise David, representing the Fédération des femmes du Québec, criticized this bill on behalf of women because it is no good.

I very much regretted the absence of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women. It could have taken the government to task and could have expressed its opinion on this unfortunate bill, which hurts women. The government deplores poverty among women, but what is it doing with this bill? It is going to increase poverty among women, because women will not be able to qualify.

Also, the secretary of state is boasting that it will be a good piece of legislation for women, and that pregnant women will be entitled to more UI benefits. I wonder how the government intends to help women when, in the case of pregnant women, they will need 716 hours of work to qualify for UI benefits.

A number of people will be affected by this bill, especially seasonal workers. I assume women too have seasonal jobs. For instance, women in the tourism sector, or fisheries; this is seasonal work. Will these women be penalized because they do not hold full time jobs, either by choice or because they have children at home and cannot work full time? Yes, they are going to be penalized.

I will say it again, I do not understand why this government is insisting on passing this bill, which will be bad for women. It should go back to the drawing board and review this bill.

When the Liberals were in the opposition, they criticized certain aspects of this legislation, they criticized the Conservative Party.

They said it was on the wrong track, and was going to penalize people. Everything we are saying now was said then by the Liberals. Why? Because they were in the opposition.

Now they are in power and they do not have the courage to go ahead with what they criticized in the past. Today, I am criticizing them for it. I am criticizing the lack of realism on the part of this government with regard to unemployment.

We all know that times are tough in terms of employment. People are without a job through no choice of their own. This weekend, we learned in the news that hotels Le Méridien and Auberge des Gouverneurs are facing financial difficulties. What does that mean? It means the employees of those hotels will soon be unemployed. This is disturbing.

The unemployment insurance fund is going very well; there is a \$5 billion surplus in the fund. Five billion dollars! Instead of helping these people make it between two jobs, they are reducing the number of benefit weeks and making criteria more exacting.

The secretary of state for status of women said earlier that the employment insurance program, which is no longer called the unemployment insurance program, will not necessarily deal with unemployment, but instead will give grants so that people can receive training and return to work.

This is another case of duplication and overlapping, and I regret this way they have of interfering in areas already under Quebec's jurisdiction. Instead of sending the money and budgets necessary for the implementation of a real employment policy in Quebec, instead of helping workers and facilitating their training, they keep \$5 billion and adopt a piecemeal approach to solve the unemployment problem which is still prevailing in Quebec and in Canada.

• (1225)

Several groups testified before us and are shocked to see the government's lack of compassion for the precarious circumstances of some people who find themselves on unemployment insurance through no fault of their own. So, it is no longer an unemployment insurance.

As I was saying recently in a speech, it is no longer an insurance that makes sure people will have a minimum of money to provide for their needs when they lose their job. If 77 per cent of women work in part time jobs, they will be doubly penalized by this bill.

They will be penalized because they will no longer have a job and they know very well that these are very precarious jobs. There is no continuity in part time employment. They will have a hard time finding another job. This will mean these women, men and young people will go on welfare. You know, going on welfare is a vicious circle. What does it mean for these people? It means moving further away from the possibility of finding another job.

Government Orders

When the government was in opposition, it was against discriminatory measures targeting the unemployed. It should reconsider because it will have to pay the price.

As we have seen, the people of Quebec and of Canada are against this bill that does not provide unemployment insurance in case of job loss. The government will penalize people over the number of benefit weeks and will raise the criteria, so that the unemployed will no longer receive the assistance they expect.

Yet, these people have paid their premiums. I too am paying premiums and I hope I will not have to rely on the UI system some day. But these people have paid so that other people, perhaps even themselves, can receive UI benefits some day. It is not by penalizing them, by increasing the hours of work required that the government will solve the problem.

Moreover, they take the money from the pockets of people who will never qualify for unemployment insurance because they did not accumulate the 700 to 910 hours of work per year required to be eligible for UI benefits.

Meanwhile, as I said before, the government is keeping \$5 billion in its own pockets. But that is not all. It is only for this year. What will happen with next year's surpluses? This government is responsible for social cohesion. Only the future will reveal the impact of today's unemployment, and the government will be responsible.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 76. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Shall we call it 12.30?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage and second reading of the bill now before the House.

Mr. Boudria: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that all remaining motions be deemed to have been proposed to the House, recorded divisions on the motions be deemed to have been requested and deferred. If we get that consent, Mr. Speaker can then propose to ask for a recorded division.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 81

That Bill C-12, in Clause 67, be amended by replacing line 32, on page 62, with the following:

"67.(1) Subject to section 70, a person, other than a full-time student within the meaning of the Income Tax Act,".

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 80

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 67.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 93

That Bill C-12, in Clause 78, be amended by replacing lines 4 and 5 on page 67 with the following:

“78. The total amount that may be paid out by the Commission under section 61 and paragraph 63(a) and charged”.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 92

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 78.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 112

That Bill C-12, in Clause 96, be amended by replacing line 32, on page 81, with the following:

“refund to the person, together with interest at the prescribed rate on these amounts calculated from the day they were paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the aggregate of all”.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 113

That Bill C-12, in Clause 96, be amended by replacing lines 45 to 48, on page 81, and lines 1 and 2, on page 82 with the following:

“\$2,000—(IE-P)+I

where

P is the aggregate of all deducted amounts mentioned in subsection (4);

IE is the person's insurable earnings in the year; and

I is the interest at the prescribed rate on the deducted amounts calculated from the day they were paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.”

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, NDP) moved:

Government Orders

Motion No. 111

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 96.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 128

That Bill C-12 be amended by adding after line 29, on page 96, the following new Clause:

“110.1 The Commission shall, no later than thirty days before a pilot project is tested, cause a notice to be published in the Canada Gazette that contains the following:

- (a) a statement that the Commission is preparing to test a pilot project;
- (b) the nature and objectives of the pilot project;
- (c) a description of the operation of the pilot project;
- (d) a statement of how long the pilot project will last and when testing will commence;
- (e) a statement that a detailed description of the pilot project may be obtained free of charge, on request by any person, from the Commission at the address set out in the notice; and
- (f) an invitation to all interested persons to make representations before the Commission respecting the pilot project and the time period for doing so.”

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 188

That Bill C-12 be amended by adding after line 25, on page 131, the following new Clause:

“Standardization during transitional period

167.1 (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Commission shall, during the period between January 5, 1997 and January 5, 2002, with the approval of the Governor in Council, make regulations that, in its opinion, are required for the purpose of

(a) gradually eliminating the concept of regional rates of unemployment during this period and dealing with any resulting legal consequences, so that, by January 5, 2002, a claimant, provided that the claimant otherwise qualifies for unemployment benefits under this Act, may qualify for unemployment benefits without regard to a regional rate of unemployment; and

(b) adjusting, during this period, the number of weeks of insurable employment or the number of hours of insurable employment required for a claimant to qualify for unemployment benefits, so that, by January 5, 2002,

(i) the number of hours of insurable employment required to qualify for unemployment benefits will be the same throughout Canada, and

(ii) the standardized qualifying period in paragraph (b)(i) shall apply without reference to a regional rate of unemployment;

(2) The Governor in Council shall, by order,

(a) after consultation with the Commission, amend any provision in this Act that is inconsistent with the objectives and transitional duties referred to in subsection (1); and

(b) no later than January 5, 2002,

(i) establish a standard qualifying period that is valid throughout Canada, based on the number of hours of insurable employment during a qualifying period and calculated without reference to a regional rate of unemployment; and

(ii) amend any provision in this Act that is inconsistent with the standard qualifying period referred to in subparagraph (i).”

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 192

That Bill C-12, in Clause 169, be amended by replacing lines 11 to 21, on page 132, with the following:

“(2) The Minister shall lay a copy of the report of the Auditor General of the accounts and financial transactions of the Commission relating to employment insurance and of the state of the Employment Insurance Account before each House of Parliament on the first sitting day on which that House is sitting after the day the Minister receives the report.”

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark’s Crossing, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 191

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 169.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 215

That Bill C-12 in Clause 190, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 3 and 4 on page 141 with the following:

“(e) sections 14 to 17;”

(b) by replacing line 13 on page 141 with the following:

“(1) paragraph 108(1)(h);

(1.1) subsection 153.1(3); and”

(c) by replacing lines 31 to 34 on page 141 with the following:

“(5) The provisions enacted by section 6 of Schedule II continue to apply in place of sections 14, 16 and 17 of this Act to claimants”.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark’s Crossing, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 214

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 190.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 219

That Bill C-12 be amended by adding after line 22 on page 153, the following new Clause:

“17.1 The following applies in place of subsection 153.1(3):

(3) The scheme established by the regulations may not provide special benefits to persons who

(a) have less than 20 weeks of insurable employment in their qualifying period; or

(b) are subject to an increase under section 7.1 in the number of hours of insurable employment required to qualify for benefits.”

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 216

That Bill C-12 be amended in —T clause 6 of Schedule II

(a) by replacing line 26 on page 148 with the following:

“section 14:”;

(b) by replacing line 30 on page 148 with the following:

“(a) 55% of the claimant’s average weekly insurable”;

(c) by replacing line 1 on page 149 with the following:

“(i) 60% of the claimant’s average weekly insur-”;

(d) by replacing lines 7 and 8 on page 149 with the following:

“average weekly insurable earnings and \$225, if the claimant’s average weekly insurable earnings”;

(e) by replacing lines 11 to 13 on page 149 with the following:

(2) The average weekly insurable earnings of a major attachment claimant are the insurable earnings in the last 20 weeks of insurable employment in their qualifying period divided by 20.

(3) The average weekly insurable earnings of a minor attachment claimant are the insurable earnings in their qualifying period divided by the larger of the following divisors:

Government Orders

(a) the divisor that equals the number of weeks on insurable employment in their qualifying period, and

(b) the divisor determined in accordance with the following table by reference to the applicable regional rate of unemployment:

TABLE

Regional Rate of Unemployment	Divisor
not more than 8%	20
more than 8% but not more than 9%	19
more than 9% but not more than 10%	18
more than 10% but not more than 11%	17
more than 11% but not more than 12%	16
more than 12% but not more than 13%	15
more than 13%	14

(4) The Commission may, with the approval”;

(f) by replacing lines 21 and 22 on page 149 with the following:

“qualifying period for a period, whether on a weekly basis or otherwise, for calculating and estab-”.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 217

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting clause 7 of Schedule II.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 218

That Bill C-12 be amended in clause 10 of Schedule II

(a) by replacing lines 29 to 39 on page 150 with the following:

“10. (1) The following applies in place of paragraph 30(1)(a):

(a) the claimant has, since losing or leaving the employment, been employed in insurable employment for the number of weeks required by section 7 to qualify for benefits; or

(2) The following applies in place of subsections 30(6) and (7):

(6) Where a claimant who has lost or left an employment as described in subsection (1) makes an initial claim for benefits, the following weeks of insurable employment may not be used for the purposes of subsection 7(2) or (3):

(a) weeks of insurable employment from that or any other employment before the day on which that employment was lost or left; and

(b) weeks of insurable employment in any employment that the claimant subsequently loses or leaves, as described in subsection (1).”

(b) by striking out lines 2 to 5 on page 151 and substituting the following:

“any employment that a claimant loses or leaves as described in subsection (1) may be used for the purposes”.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: A recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*English*]

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 4.

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 6.

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 7.

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 8.

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 9.

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 10.

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 11.

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 13.

Motion No. 26

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 16.

Motion No. 27

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 17.

Motion No. 28

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 18.

Motion No. 29

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 19.

Motion No. 30

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 20.

Motion No. 31

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 21.

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 22.

Motion No. 33

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 23.

Motion No. 34

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 24.

Motion No. 37

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 26.

Motion No. 38

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 27.

Motion No. 39

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 28.

Motion No. 40

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 29.

Motion No. 41

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 30.

Motion No. 42

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 31.

Motion No. 43

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 32.

Government Orders

Motion No. 44

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 33.

Motion No. 45

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 34.

Motion No. 46

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 35.

Motion No. 47

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 36.

Motion No. 48

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 37.

Motion No. 49

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 38.

Motion No. 50

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 39.

Motion No. 51

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 40.

Motion No. 52

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 41.

Motion No. 53

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 42.

Motion No. 54

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 43.

Motion No. 55

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 44.

Motion No. 56

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 45.

Motion No. 57

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 46.

Motion No. 58

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 47.

Motion No. 59

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 48.

Motion No. 60

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 49.

Motion No. 61

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 50.

Motion No. 62

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 51.

Motion No. 63

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 52.

Motion No. 64

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 53.

Motion No. 65

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 54.

Motion No. 66

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 55.

Motion No. 67

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 56.

Motion No. 68

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 57.

Motion No. 69

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 58.

Motion No. 70

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 59.

Motion No. 71

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 60.

Motion No. 74

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 62.

Motion No. 77

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 64.

Motion No. 78

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 65.

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 66.

Motion No. 82

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 68.

Motion No. 83

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 69.

Motion No. 84

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 70.

Motion No. 85

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 71.

Motion No. 86

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 72.

Motion No. 87

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 73.

Motion No. 88

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 74.

Motion No. 89

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 75.

Motion No. 90

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 76.

Motion No. 91

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 77.

Motion No. 94

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 79.

Motion No. 95

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 80.

Motion No. 96

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 81.

Government Orders

Motion No. 97

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 82.

Motion No. 98

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 83.

Motion No. 99

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 84.

Motion No. 100

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 85.

Motion No. 101

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 86.

Motion No. 102

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 87.

Motion No. 103

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 88.

Motion No. 104

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 89.

Motion No. 105

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 90.

Motion No. 106

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 91.

Motion No. 107

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 92.

Motion No. 108

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 93.

Motion No. 109

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 94.

Motion No. 110

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 95.

Motion No. 114

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 97.

Motion No. 115

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 98.

Motion No. 116

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 99.

Motion No. 117

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 100.

Motion No. 118

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 101.

Motion No. 119

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 102.

Motion No. 120

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 103.

Motion No. 121

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 104.

Motion No. 122

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 105.

Motion No. 123

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 106.

Motion No. 124

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 107.

Motion No. 125

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 108.

Motion No. 126

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 109.

Motion No. 127

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 110.

Motion No. 129

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 111.

Motion No. 130

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 112.

Motion No. 131

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 113.

Motion No. 132

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 114.

Motion No. 133

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 115.

Motion No. 134

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 116.

Motion No. 135

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 117.

Motion No. 136

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 118.

Motion No. 137

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 119.

Motion No. 138

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 120.

Motion No. 139

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 121.

Motion No. 140

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 122.

Motion No. 141

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 123.

Motion No. 142

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 124.

Motion No. 143

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 125.

Motion No. 144

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 126.

Motion No. 145

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 127.

Government Orders

Motion No. 146

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 128.

Motion No. 147

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 129.

Motion No. 148

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 130.

Motion No. 149

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 131.

Motion No. 150

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 132.

Motion No. 151

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 133.

Motion No. 152

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 134.

Motion No. 153

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 135.

Motion No. 154

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 136.

Motion No. 155

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 137.

Motion No. 156

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 138.

Motion No. 157

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 139.

Motion No. 158

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 140.

Motion No. 159

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 141.

Motion No. 160

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 142.

Motion No. 161

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 143.

Motion No. 162

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 144.

Motion No. 163

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 145.

Motion No. 164

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 146.

Motion No. 165

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 147.

Motion No. 166

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 148.

Motion No. 167

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 149.

Motion No. 168

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 150.

Motion No. 169

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 151.

Motion No. 170

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 152.

Motion No. 172

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 153.

Motion No. 174

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 154.

Motion No. 175

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 155.

Motion No. 176

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 156.

Motion No. 177

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 157.

Motion No. 178

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 158.

Motion No. 179

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 159.

Motion No. 180

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 160.

Motion No. 181

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 161.

Motion No. 182

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 162.

Motion No. 183

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 163.

Motion No. 184

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 164.

Motion No. 185

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 165.

Motion No. 186

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 166.

Motion No. 187

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 167.

Motion No. 190

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 168.

Motion No. 193

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 170.

Motion No. 194

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 171.

Motion No. 195

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 172.

Motion No. 196

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 173.

Government Orders

Motion No. 197

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 174.

Motion No. 198

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 175.

Motion No. 199

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 176.

Motion No. 202

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 178.

Motion No. 203

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 179.

Motion No. 204

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 180.

Motion No. 205

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 181.

Motion No. 206

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 182.

Motion No. 207

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 183.

Motion No. 208

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 184.

Motion No. 209

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 185.

Motion No. 210

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 186.

Motion No. 211

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 187.

Motion No. 212

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 188.

Motion No. 213

That Bill C-12 be amended by deleting Clause 189.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 9. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 11. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 12. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 13. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 14. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 15. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 16. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 19. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 26. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 27. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 28. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 29. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 30. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 31. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 32. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 33. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 34. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 37. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 38. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 39. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 40. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 41. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 42. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 43. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 44. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 45. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 46. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 47. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 48. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 49. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 50. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 51. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 52. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 53. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 54. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 55. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 56. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 57. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 58. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 59. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 60. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 61. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 62. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 63. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 64. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 65. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Government Orders

The next question is on Motion No. 66. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 67. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 68. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 69. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 70. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 71. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 74. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 77. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 78. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 79. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 82. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 83. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 84. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 85. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 86. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 87. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 88. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 89. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 90. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 91. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 94. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 95. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 96. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 97. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 98. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 99. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 100. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 101. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 102. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 103. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 104. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 105. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 106. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 107. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 108. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 109. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 110. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 114. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 115. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 116. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 117. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 118. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 119. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 120. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 121. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 122. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 123. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 124. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 125. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 126. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 127. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 129. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 130. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 131. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 132. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 133. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 134. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 135. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 136. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 137. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 138. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 139. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 140. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 141. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 142. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 143. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 144. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 145. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 146. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 147. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 148. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 149. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 150. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 151. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 152. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 153. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 154. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 155. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 156. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 157. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 158. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 159. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 160. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 161. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 162. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 163. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 164. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 165. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 166. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 167. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 168. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 169. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 170. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 172. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 174. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 175. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 176. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 177. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 178. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 179. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 180. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 181. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 182. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 183. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 184. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 185. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 186. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 187. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 190. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 193. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 194. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 195. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 196. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 197. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 198. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 199. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 202. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 203. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 204. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 205. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 206. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 207. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 208. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 209. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 210. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 211. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 212. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 213. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

We will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C-12.

Call in the members.

• (1250)

[*Translation*]

And the division bells having rung:

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1.

A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 3. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 1 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motion No. 2. If motion No. 1 is negatived, Motion No. 2 will be voted on.

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

(*Division No. 77*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Asselin	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bridgman
Brien	Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Cummins
Duceppe	Epp
Fillion	Forseth
Frazer	Gagnon (Québec)

Godin
Guimond
Hanrahan
Hayes
Jacob
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Loubier
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Speaker
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne—53

Gouk
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Marchand
Meredith
Morrison
Penson
Ramsay
Sauvageau
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Barnes
Bélaïr	Bélanger
Bertrand	Blondin-Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden	Byrne
Campbell	Catterall
Chamberlain	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Cowling	Culbert
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dingwall
Dromisky	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
English	Finlay
Fiis	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gerrard	Godfrey
Grose	Guarnieri
Harper (Churchill)	Harvard
Hubbard	Jackson
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Payne	Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Proud
Reed	Regan
Ringuette-Maltais	Robichaud
Rock	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Simmons	Speller
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Thalheimer	Torsney
Valeri	Vanclicief
Verran	Whelan
Wood	Young
Zed —103	

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Assadourian	Bakopanos
Bergeron	Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brushett
Calder	Cannis
Caron	Chan
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Deshaies
Dumas	Fewchuk
Graham	Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Guay	Hopkins
Jordan	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
Ménard	Mitchell
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	Paré
Patry	Pettigrew
Pillitteri	Pomerleau
Serré	Sheridan
St-Laurent	St. Denis
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Ur

• (1255)

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 lost. Therefore I declare Motion No. 3 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you were to seek it you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of report stage Motion No. 1 to the motion now before the House, as well as report stage Motions Nos. 4, 5, and 8.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 77.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I therefore declare Motions No. 2, 4, 5 and 8 negatived.

The next question is on Motion No. 6.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find unanimous consent for all members who voted on the previous motion, with the exception of the Minister of National Defence, to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

Mr. Laurin: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois members will vote nay on this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote no, unless other members wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Mr. Speaker, I vote yes on this motion.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I wish to be recorded as voting in favour of this motion.

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

(*Division No. 78*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Barnes
Bélair	Bélanger
Bertrand	Blondin-Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden	Byrne
Campbell	Catterall
Chamberlain	Clancy
Cohen	Cowling
Culbert	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Dromisky
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	English
Finlay	Flis
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gerrard
Godfrey	Grose
Guarnieri	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hubbard
Jackson	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Payne
Peters	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud	Reed
Regan	Ringuette-Maltais
Robichaud	Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Simmons
Speller	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Thalheimer
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Whelan	Wood
Young	Zed —104

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Asselin	Bachand
Bélisle	Bellehumeur

Government Orders

Benoit
Bridgman
Canuel
Cummins
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Gouk
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Marchand
Meredith
Morrison
Penson
Ramsay
Sauvageau
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

Bernier (Gaspé)
Brien
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Duceppe
Fillion
Frazer
Godin
Guimond
Hanrahan
Hayes
Jacob
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Loubier
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Speaker
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne—52

Mr. Laurin: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois members will vote yea on this motion, with the addition of the hon. member for Roberval who has joined us.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will be voting no on this motion.

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Mr. Speaker, I will be voting yes on this motion.

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

(*Division No. 79*)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Assadourian
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder
Caron
Crête
Daviault
Debien
Dumas
Graham
Guay
Jordan
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Ménard
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
Patry
Pillitteri
Serré
St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rosemont)

Bakopanos
Bernier (Beauce)
Brushett
Cannis
Chan
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Deshaies
Fewchuk
Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Hopkins
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
Mitchell
Paré
Pettigrew
Pomerleau
Sheridan
St. Denis
Ur

• (1300)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 6 carried.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of the vote just taken on Motion No. 6 to report stage Motions Nos. 201, 21, 23, 25, 173, 93, 219, 216, 217 and 218.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find unanimous consent for all members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand
Bellehumeur
Brien
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Fillion
Gauthier
Guimond
Lalonde
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Marchand
Nunez
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne—31

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bélisle
Bernier (Gaspé)
Canuel
Duceppe
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Jacob
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Loubier
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allmand
Arseneault
Barnes
Bélangier
Bertrand
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Byrne
Catterall
Clancy
Cowling
Cullen
DeVillers
Dingwall
Duhamel
Eggleton
Epp
Fiis
Frazer
Gaffney
Gerrard
Gouk
Guamieri
Hanrahan
Harris
Hayes
Hubbard
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
Malhi

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anderson
Assad
Bélair
Benoit
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Bridgman
Bryden
Campbell
Chamberlain
Cohen
Culbert
Cummins
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Easter
English
Finlay
Forseth
Fry
Gagliano
Godfrey
Grose
Hanger
Harper (Churchill)
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jackson
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney

Government Orders

Manley	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Morrison	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Payne
Penson	Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Ringuette-Maltais
Robichaud	Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Simmons
Speaker	Speller
Stewart (Brant)	Strahl
Stinson	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Strahl
Thalheimer	Telegdi
Torsney	Thompson
Vanclief	Valeri
Whelan	Verran
Young	Wood
	Zed—126

PAIRED MEMBERS

Assadourian	Bakopanos
Bergeron	Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brushett
Calder	Cannis
Caron	Chan
Crête	Dalphon-DuGiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Deshaies
Dumas	Fewchuk
Graham	Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Guay	Hopkins
Jordan	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
Ménard	Mitchell
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	Paré
Patry	Pettigrew
Pillitteri	Pomerleau
Serré	Sheridan
St-Laurent	St. Denis
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Ur

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 defeated.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote just taken to Motions Nos. 10A, 10, 17, 20, 72, 75, 80, 111, 191 and 9.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 79.*]

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I want to record my vote in favour of Motions Nos. 9 and 17.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare motions Nos. 10A, 10, 17, 20, 72, 75, 80, 111, 191 and 9 lost.

(Motions Nos. 10A, 10, 20, 72, 80, 111, 191 negated.)

• (1305)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 18. A negative vote on Motion No. 18 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 17.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find unanimous consent for all members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

Mr. Laurin: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois members will also vote nay on this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will be voting yes on this motion.

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 18, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 80*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Bridgman
Cummins	Epp
Forseth	Frazer
Gouk	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harris
Hayes	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Penson
Ramsay	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson —23	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Asselin	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Barnes
Bélair	Bélanger
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden	Byrne
Campbell	Canuel
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Clancy
Cohen	Cowling
Culbert	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fillion
Finlay	Flis
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier	Gerrard

Government Orders

(Division No. 81)

Godfrey	Godin
Grose	Guarnieri
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hubbard
Jackson	Jacob
Keys	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Landry
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McWhinney
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Payne
Peters	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Proud
Reed	Regan
Ringuelette-Maltais	Robichaud
Rocheleau	Rock
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Simmons	Speller
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Thalheimer	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Verran
Whelan	Wood
Young	Zed—134

PAIRED MEMBERS

Assadourian	Bakopanos
Bergeron	Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brushett
Calder	Cannis
Caron	Chan
Crête	Dalphondu-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Deshaies
Dumas	Fewchuk
Graham	Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Guay	Hopkins
Jordan	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	McClellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
Ménard	Mitchell
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	Paré
Patry	Pettigrew
Pillitteri	Pomerleau
Serré	Sheridan
St-Laurent	St. Denis
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Ur

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 18 defeated.

(The House divided on Motion No. 17, which was negated on the following division:)

YEAS

Members

Allmand	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bachand
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)	Brien
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Duceppe	Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier
Godin	Guimond
Jacob	Lalonde
Landry	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Loubier	Marchand
Mercier	Nunez
Picard (Drummond)	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Venne—32

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Barnes
Bélaire	Bélangier
Benoit	Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Bridgman	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden	Byrne
Campbell	Catterall
Chamberlain	Clancy
Cohen	Cowling
Culbert	Cullen
Cummins	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dingwall
Dromisky	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
English	Epp
Finlay	Flis
Forseth	Frazier
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gerrard
Godfrey	Gouk
Grose	Guarnieri
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Churchill)	Harris
Harvard	Hayes
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hubbard
Jackson	Keys
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McWhinney
Meredith	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Payne	Penson
Peters	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud	Ramsay
Reed	Regan
Ringuelette-Maltais	Robichaud
Rock	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Simmons	Speaker

Government Orders

Speller
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson
Valeri
Verran
Wood
Zed—125

Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Thalheimer
Torsney
Vanclief
Whelan
Young

Bryden
Campbell
Chamberlain
Cohen
Culbert
Cummins
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Easter
English
Finlay
Forseth
Fry
Gagliano
Godfrey
Grose
Hanger
Harper (Churchill)
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jackson
Kirby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
Meredith
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Payne
Peters
Proud
Reed
Ringuette-Maltais
Rock
Simmons
Speller
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson
Valeri
Verran
Wood
Zed—127

Byrne
Catterall
Clancy
Cowling
Cullen
DeVillers
Dingwall
Duhamel
Eggleton
Epp
Flis
Frazer
Gaffney
Gerrard
Gouk
Guarnieri
Hanrahan
Harris
Hayes
Hubbard
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison
Murray
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Ramsay
Regan
Robichaud
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Speaker
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Thalheimer
Torsney
Vanclief
Whelan
Young

PAIRED MEMBERS

Assadourian
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder
Caron
Crête
Davialt
Debien
Dumas
Graham
Guay
Jordan
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Ménard
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
Patry
Pillitteri
Serré
St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rosemont)

Bakopanos
Bernier (Beauce)
Brushett
Cannis
Chan
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoie
Deshaies
Fewchuk
Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Hopkins
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
Mitchell
Paré
Pettigrew
Pomerleau
Sheridan
St. Denis
Ur

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 36. A negative vote on Motion No. 36 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 35.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find unanimous consent that all members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laurin: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois members will vote nay on this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will be voting yes on this motion.

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): I will be too, Mr. Speaker.

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

(Division No. 82)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bélair
Benoit
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Bridgman

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anderson
Assad
Barnes
Bélanger
Bertrand
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)

Asselin
Bélisle
Bernier (Gaspé)
Canuel
Duceppe
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Jacob
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Loubier
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

NAYS

Members

Bachand
Bellehumeur
Brien
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Fillion
Gauthier
Guimond
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Marchand
Nunez
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne—30

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Assadourian	Bakopanos
Bergeron	Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brushett
Calder	Cannis
Caron	Chan
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Deshaies
Dumas	Fewchuk
Graham	Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Guay	Hopkins
Jordan	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
Ménard	Mitchell
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	Paré
Patry	Pettigrew
Pillitteri	Pomerleau
Serré	Sheridan
St-Laurent	St. Denis
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Ur

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 36 and 35 adopted.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the same vote to Motion No. 171, and for the benefit of my colleague, that is listed as item (u) on our informal list, and Motions Nos. 112 and 128.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Mr. Speaker, I would be in favour of those three motions.

(The House divided on Motion No. 171, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 83)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Bridgman
Cummins	Epp
Forseth	Frazer
Gouk	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harris
Hayes	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Penson
Ramsay	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson —23	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Asselin	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Barnes
Bélair	Bélangier
Bélisle	Bellehumeur

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden	Byrne
Campbell	Canuel
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Clancy
Cohen	Cowling
Culbert	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fillion
Finlay	Flis
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier	Gerrard
Godfrey	Godin
Grose	Guarnieri
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hubbard
Jackson	Jacob
Keys	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Landry
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McWhinney
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Payne
Peters	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Proud
Reed	Regan
Ringuette-Maltais	Robichaud
Rocheleau	Rock
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Simmons	Speller
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Thalheimer	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Verran
Whelan	Wood
Young	Zed—134

PAIRED MEMBERS

Assadourian	Bakopanos
Bergeron	Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brushett
Calder	Cannis
Caron	Chan
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Deshaies
Dumas	Fewchuk
Graham	Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Guay	Hopkins

Government Orders

Jordan
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Ménard
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
Patry
Pillitteri
Serré
St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rosemont)

Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
Mitchell
Paré
Pettigrew
Pomerleau
Sheridan
St. Denis
Ur

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 171, 112 and 128 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 73. A negative vote on Motion No. 73 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 72.

• (1310)

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if we could just return to Motion No. 36, I am seeking to apply it to other motions. In fact, I withdraw that. There is seemingly no other application. I am just considering whether Motion No. 215 is identical. I believe, Mr. Speaker, you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote on Motion No. 36 to Motion No. 215 which is the first item on the last page of our informal list.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 82.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 215 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 73.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe the House would give its unanimous consent that those members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion currently before the House, with Liberal members voting no on the motion.

Mr. Laurin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote no on this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will be voting yes, unless someone wants to vote otherwise.

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Mr. Speaker, I will be voting no.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 83.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 73 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 189.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of Motion No. 73 to the motion now before the House, as well as Motion No. 76 which is the first one on the next sheet of our informal list.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Karygiannis: Mr. Speaker, I want my vote to reflect that of my party.

(The House divided on Motion No. 189, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 84*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Cummins
Forseth
Gouk
Hanrahan
Hayes
Meredith
Morrison
Ramsay
Stinson
Thompson —23

Ablonczy
Bridgman
Epp
Frazer
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Speaker
Strahl

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Arseneault
Asselin
Bachand
Bélair
Bélisle
Bernier (Gaspé)
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brien
Bryden
Campbell
Catterall
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen
Culbert
DeVillers
Dingwall
Duceppe
Easter
English
Finlay
Fry
Gagliano
Gauthier
Godfrey
Grose
Guimond
Harvard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lee
Loney
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Marchand
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna

Alcock
Anderson
Assad
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Barnes
Bélanger
Bellehumeur
Bertrand
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Byrne
Canuel
Chamberlain
Clancy
Cowling
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fillion
Flis
Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)
Gerrard
Godin
Guarnieri
Harper (Churchill)
Hubbard
Jacob
Keyes
Knutson
Lalonde
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
Mercier
Milliken
Murphy

Government Orders

Murray
Nunez
O'Reilly
Paradis
Payne
Picard (Drummond)
Proud
Regan
Robichaud
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Speller
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Vanclief
Verran
Wood
Zed—135

Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Ringuette-Maltais
Rocheleau
Sauvageau
Simmons
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Valeri
Venne
Whelan
Young

PAIRED MEMBERS

Assadourian
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder
Caron
Crête
Daviault
Debien
Dumas
Graham
Guay
Jordan
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Ménard
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
Patry
Pillitteri
Serré
St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rosemont)

Bakopanos
Bernier (Beauce)
Brushett
Cannis
Chan
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Deshaies
Fewchuk
Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Hopkins
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
Mitchell
Paré
Pettigrew
Pomerleau
Sheridan
St. Denis
Ur

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 189 and 76 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 81.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to further apply what I have just requested to Motions Nos. 81, 188 and 192 as well.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 84.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 81, 188 and 192 defeated.

• (1315)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in at report stage.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, on concurrence at report stage and second reading, I believe you would find unanimous consent that members who have just been recorded as having voted on the previous motion be now recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea. We would like to add the presence of the minister of Indian affairs who will be recorded along with other Liberal members on this motion.

I use this opportunity to thank my colleagues, the whips of other respective parties, for their kind assistance in accelerating this process in allowing Parliament to function even better.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be recorded as voting in favour of this motion. Also, in listening to the different votes I must have missed something because I wanted to vote in favour of Motions Nos. 12, 15, 27, 68 and 94.

The Deputy Speaker: Can we by unanimous consent permit the member to vote as he has indicated?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laurin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote no on the last two motions.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, members of the Reform Party will be voting no on this last motion.

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Mr. Speaker, I will be voting no as well.

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

(*Division No. 85*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assad
Belair
Bertrand
Bodnar
Boudria
Bryden
Campbell
Chamberlain
Cohen
Culbert
DeVillers
Dingwall
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fry
Gagliano

Alcock
Arseneault
Barnes
Belanger
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Byrne
Catterall
Clancy
Cowling
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Easter
English
Flis
Gaffney
Gerrard

Government Orders

Godfrey	Grose	Crête	Dalmond-Guiral
Guarnieri	Harper (Churchill)	Daviault	de Savoye
Harvard	Hubbard	Debien	Deshaies
Irwin	Jackson	Dumas	Fewchuk
Karygiannis	Keyes	Graham	Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Kirkby	Knutson	Guay	Hopkins
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka	Jordan	Leblanc (Longueuil)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee	Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln	Loney	Leroux (Shefford)	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
MacAulay	MacDonald	Ménard	Mitchell
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	Paré
Maloney	Manley	Patry	Pettigrew
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Pillitteri	Pomerleau
Massé	McCormick	Serré	Sheridan
McGuire	McWhinney	St-Laurent	St. Denis
Mifflin	Milliken	Tremblay (Rosemont)	Ur
Minna	Murphy		
Murray	Nault		
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Reilly		
Pagtakhan	Paradis		
Parrish	Payne		
Peters	Pickard (Essex—Kent)		
Proud	Reed		
Regan	Ringuette-Maltais		
Robichaud	Rock		
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Simmons		
Speller	Stewart (Brant)		
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo		
Telegdi	Thalheimer		
Torsney	Valeri		
Vanclief	Verran		
Whelan	Wood		
Young	Zed —104		

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill concurred in and read the second time.)

* * *

AGREEMENT ON INTERNAL TRADE IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The House resumed from April 22 consideration of the motion that Bill C-19, an act to implement the agreement on internal trade, be read the third time and passed.

• (1320)

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak at third reading of Bill C-19, an act regarding the implementation of the agreement on internal trade.

In my address today I will describe to the House the impact of trade barriers on the economy and what effect these barriers have on real Canadians and their families. I will critique the agreement, its merits, its shortcomings, and I will conclude by pointing out how this agreement must be changed in order to be of real benefit to Canadians.

Interprovincial trade barriers cost Canadians jobs and money. Studies produced by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Fraser Institute, the C.D. Howe Institute and others estimate interprovincial trade barriers cost Canadian businesses between \$6 billion and \$10 billion a year.

According to information published by the Fraser Institute in its book *Provincial Trade Wars: Why the Blockade Must End*, if Canadian firms were enabled to operate freely across the country, average Canadian household incomes would rise by as much \$3,500 a year. While conservative estimates place this figure lower, the point still remains these barriers cost Canadians jobs and money.

Removing barriers to internal trade is an issue which is so important to me and the leader of the Reform Party that we have created a new critic area to address this important issue. We will fight for Canadians so they can have their jobs and we will fight for Canadian business so they can deduct their business with the least government and systemic interference possible. This issue is second only to debt reduction in terms of issues which must be

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Allmand	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bachand
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bridgman	Brien
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins	Duceppe
Epp	Fillion
Forseth	Frazer
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier
Godin	Gouk
Guimond	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harris
Hayes	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob	Lalonde
Landry	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Loubier	Marchand
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Nunez	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Ramsay
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne—55	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Assadourian	Bakopanos
Bergeron	Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brushett
Calder	Cannis
Caron	Chan

dealt with to get Canadians back to work and to stop the 20 years of fall in workers' take home pay.

What is the magnitude of the internal trade barriers in Canada? The Canadian Manufacturers' Association estimates there are at least 500 trade barriers currently between provinces. It is not known exactly how much larger our internal trade market would be if goods and services could flow freely back and forth across the country, but clearly Canadian business would regain a portion of those markets currently lost to foreign countries and foreign companies.

I have not found a serious estimate of the number of jobs for Canadians this would translate into, but it would be tens of thousands, most likely hundreds of thousands.

A comparison of Canadian international trade and interprovincial trade in goods and services shows international trade to be about \$160 billion per year and interprovincial trade about \$146 billion a year. This comparison illustrates our interprovincial trade is only about \$14 billion less than our total international trade.

Why then does the Prime Minister and his government not put the time and effort into this trade problem they do into international trade? Travelling the world may see more glamorous but does it produce jobs? Removing barriers to internal trade certainly will. According to Stephen Van Houten, president of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, provincial trade barriers have resulted in lost sales, lost investments and lost jobs.

How do these barriers stagnate growth and limit job creation? One might think these measures are intended to ensure growth and prosperity within a province. That is the intent, but the opposite is what happens. While these artificial perimeters protect the microcosm from outside competition, they are shifting the growth of domestic industry and establishing protective markets which lead to higher consumer costs. According to the Consumers Association of Canada, some provinces pay up to 10 per cent more for local products because of internal trade barriers.

Catherine Swift, president of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, describes the current trade in goods and services: "A totally uncompetitive situation which means consumers pay more or pay through the nose. People are forced to pay what bloated utilities like Ontario Hydro choose to charge rather than what is the best price in the domestic market".

• (1325)

I believe I have established that interprovincial trade barriers are costing Canadians jobs and money. What do the Liberals have to say about this issue? The answer is quite a bit. The problem is that so far talk has led to little action. The Liberal government has

Government Orders

repeatedly recognized that barriers to internal trade cost Canadians jobs and money, but it has not done anything substantial to rectify the problem.

The government made promises in the red book on this issue, promises in both throne speeches on the issue, and recognized the harm of internal trade barriers in the finance committee's prebudget consultation report, but to date little has been done.

I remind the Liberal government of some of its own words in relation to internal trade. Page 22 of the infamous red book, the book of broken promises, states: "A Liberal government will be committed to the elimination of interprovincial trade barriers within Canada and will address this issue urgently".

Neville Nankivell writes in his *Financial Post* article on February 18: "The legislation on freer domestic trade was supposed to have high priority for the Liberal government's economic policy. It had cleared the committee stage and was backed with some amendments, but passage was sidetracked in December by the need to push through the Prime Minister's controversial unity package".

It is obvious the government is more concerned with perpetuating Quebec appeasement than it is about improving economic conditions for all Canadians, including Quebecers, Quebecers who are looking for jobs.

In the throne speech of 1994 the Liberals promised to reduce overlap and duplication between provinces and the federal government and to work with the provinces to eliminate internal trade barriers.

Before the federal government brought down the budget this year, the finance committee urged the government to take action on interprovincial trade barriers in its prebudget consultation report. The committee report described the current interprovincial trade situation in Canada as very much balkanized.

The report went on to state that in some cases it easier to do businesses in other provinces by going through a U.S. corporation that can use the provisions of the North American Free Trade Agreement than by doing business directly.

Within the same report the committee urged government to continue to seek further action with provinces on reducing interprovincial trade barriers: "Trade within Canada must be placed on an equal footing with Canada-U.S. trade in terms of the free flow of goods and services. We can no longer afford the extravagance of favouring foreign competition over trade among Canadians and discriminating against fellow Canadians".

It is shameful that our governments, both federal and provincial, have forced Canadian companies to fight an uphill battle against

Government Orders

their foreign counterparts. We should be ensuring more than just an equal footing with the United States and other countries.

If barriers to interprovincial trade were eliminated we would be doing more than placing Canadian companies on an equal footing internationally. We would be giving them the competitive advantage they want and deserve. Unfortunately neither the federal nor the provincial governments seem prepared to work with Canadians to reduce trade barriers.

The agreement on internal trade is the product of executive decision making. Twelve cabinet ministers from the respective provinces and territories along with the federal Minister of Industry hammered out a deal they could all live with, but what about business?

The Canada West Foundation released a paper in June, 1994 entitled "Internal Trade and Economic Co-operation: Down to the Wire on an Internal Trade Agreement". This paper addresses provincial interests and attitudes prior to the agreement negotiations.

• (1330)

Before the agreement was put in place, the Saskatchewan government stated: "Despite certain irritants, most interprovincial trade moves freely now. Canada's economic union works well for the most part. Our real economic problems in Canada do not come from the current structure of our internal market".

This statement clearly contradicts the concerns of independent Saskatchewan business which was surveyed by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business and published in its June 1994 paper entitled "Barriers to Growth".

In Saskatchewan, 93 per cent of respondents were in favour of the removal of trade barriers. Of the respondents who were affected by trade barriers, over 60 per cent were affected negatively, the key problem areas being provincial regulations and federal subsidies. Both resulted in higher costs and restricted growth. How can the business community feel assured that its interests are being addressed when there is such a lack of understanding by provincial governments?

What should the government do to bring down the barriers to trade and rectify the situation that Canadians currently face? It could start by acknowledging that previous Liberal and Conservative governments had an obligation to all Canadians under the British North America Act to ensure that trade barriers were never established in the first place.

The British North America Act, 1867 clearly states under section 121 that all articles of growth, produce or manufacture of any one of the provinces shall, from and after the union be admitted free into each of the provinces. Section 91(2) states that the legislative authority of Parliament extends to the regulation of trade and

commerce. The people of Canada have paid a serious price for government inaction and the abdication of responsibility in this area.

I will take some time now to speak about certain parts of the internal agreement on trade that this bill implements. The agreement on internal trade is designed in principle to break down barriers in order to establish internal free trade. In an attempt to be all things to all provinces, impediments to this objective have been erected. One such impediment is article 404 regarding legitimate objectives.

A legitimate objective is an exemption from the agreement regarding (a) public security and safety; (b), public order; (c) protection of human, animal or plant life or health; (d) protection of the environment; (e) consumer protection; (f) protection of health, safety and well-being of workers; and (g) affirmative action programs for disadvantaged groups.

What does it mean? It means that any province can use the above stated criteria as a means of establishing the protection of its domestic sectors from competition where it can be demonstrated that (a) the purpose of the measure is to achieve a legitimate objective; (b) the measure does not operate to impair unduly access to persons, goods, services or investment of a party that meet the legitimate objectives; (c) the measure is not more trade restrictive than necessary to achieve that legitimate objective; and (d) the measure does not create a disguised reduction on trade.

When that is put together and one thinks about the legitimate objectives that are allowed, one can clearly see that provincial governments can protect pretty well whatever they want under this legislation. For all intents and purposes, these provisions can be used in nearly every sector involved in interprovincial trade. How is this going to break down barriers? The answer is that it will not.

It reminds me of the Ukrainian matrioska dolls. Every time one is opened, there is another one. It is a very frustrating process getting to the prize.

At a recent round table discussion hosted by the Certified General Accountants of Canada, I asked senior government officials involved in this agreement if they could identify a trade barrier that could not be considered a legitimate objective. They were unable to identify a clear example of a trade barrier that could not be at least considered as a legitimate objective. This spells out to me that there are very few instances where establishing a legitimate objective exemption is not possible.

• (1335)

It is obvious from the ample access to exemptions that disputes between parties are bound to arise. Included in each sector is a series of procedures intended to resolve disputes between the parties, except in the following sectors: energy, agriculture and the "MASH" sector, which is made up of municipalities, academic

Government Orders

institutions, schools and hospitals. These areas of exclusion are another story for another time.

When a dispute arises, the parties are to enter into consultations in order to attempt to rectify the problem. If that is not successful, then the parties apply for a request for consultations between governments. At this level any party who has a vested interest in the outcome of the consultations is able to participate.

If that procedure is unsuccessful, then the issue is brought to the committee. That body is comprised of ministers from the 13 signing governments that were responsible for drawing up this agreement. If the procedure is unsuccessful, then the parties may submit a written request for a panel of experts to preside over their dispute. The panel is comprised of five individuals chosen from a roster of 65 experts: that is, five appointed panellists from each government body. From this roster each party shall select two panellists who shall, in turn, elect the chair.

Will this dispute settlement mechanism work? We do not know. According to Stephen Van Houten, president of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the agreement on internal trade is highly bureaucratic. There is no binding enforcement measure. There is little chance of a successful outcome for aggrieved businesses. There are no awards for damages. There is no right of action without the consent of the attorney general. Decisions to withhold consent need to be explained or reviewed. In short, there is no effective dispute settlement mechanism.

The dispute settlement mechanism consists of two avenues of recourse: a government to government resolution process and the individual to government process. The second process is a positive addition which needs to be enhanced in order to heighten the access of individuals to the panel.

Currently individuals are required to be represented by their respective party. This constitutes either a provincial government or the federal government, depending on the jurisdiction in question. The individual must be able to convince that government to take up the cause for them. It seems to me that most Canadians do not feel comfortable in relying on a government bureaucracy to go to bat for them.

To summarize the dispute settlement mechanism, the emphasis of this form of settlement is on consultation and mediation between governments. If this consultation fails, the disputing parties are to resort to an ad hoc panel of appointed experts. There is no binding enforcement of the process through the awarding of damages, an injunction or some other form of penalty. The mechanism does, however, provide for private parties to launch a complaint against governments and for public consumption of panel proceedings.

The decisions of these panels are not binding. They serve as recommendations. The only means of enforcement available under the agreement is through public humiliation and public pressure. If the party refuses to comply with the panel recommendation their non-compliance is made public by the internal trade secretariat. This remains on the committee agenda for the period of one year. If at the end of that year the party has yet to comply, retaliatory action may be pursued.

Will this dispute settlement mechanism process work? I say that we should give it a chance. We should give it a try. However, it seems highly unlikely because retaliation will often cost less than the actions in question.

For the reasons I have addressed today and for the many others which I do not have time to address, I cannot support Bill C-19. The bill implements the agreement on internal trade which is flawed and incomplete. The government says it will fix the legislation in the future. The lack of action is costing Canadians now. The government often preaches that it is interested in Canadians having jobs, yet it refuses to act quickly to fix a problem which can be fixed if the proper commitment is there.

• (1340)

This agreement does not fulfil the need. It serves as an ideal or a goal which may some day be attained. The energy, the MASH, and agriculture sectors of the agreement have yet to be dealt with at all. The list of provincial exemptions is growing by leaps and bounds. The 13 governments need to get together again to construct an agreement which eliminates unreasonable protections for each of the governments' special interests.

I have described to the House the important role internal trade plays in the lives of Canadians. I have described a few of the shortcomings of this agreement: its lack of enforceability, credibility and accessibility. I have explained how to bring about change to make the agreement effective and accountable.

The agreement falls short of its objective. We have been encouraged to support the bill as a step in the right direction. We have been promised that the best is yet to come. This may be true. For the sake of Canadian jobs and business, I hope that it is. Unfortunately, the Liberal government has fallen short on its promises before. The fact that it has missed numerous deadlines set out in this agreement speaks for itself.

I want internal trade barriers removed. Canadian business wants internal trade barriers removed. Canadians looking for jobs want these barriers removed. This government and provincial governments say that they want internal trade barriers removed. Therefore, I say to the Liberal government: Do it and do it now.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues today in speaking to Bill C-19, an act to implement the agreement on internal trade in Canada.

I am proud to participate in this debate, as this is a very important legislation, however arid and technical it may be. The bill affirms the principle, with which we agree, that internal trade should be liberalized as much as possible and that any kind of tariff barrier that exists should be removed as much as possible.

I must say that it was about time that Canada, as a political and economical entity, and that Canadians come to an agreement because it was becoming increasingly obvious that Canada was getting along better with its neighbours than with its own provinces. Canada successfully negotiated a free trade agreement with the U.S. and, later, NAFTA, while it was having a great deal of trouble coming to an agreement on interprovincial tariff barriers.

We agree with the principle of the bill. Especially since, as you probably recall, there was a huge irritant in that clause 9 used to give the federal government enormous powers that it had more or less assumed. Without consulting anybody, at a meeting held in western Canada, the federal government announced its intention to make all legitimate efforts to persuade a province whose attitude is deemed less co-operative than that of another.

At the time, under clause 9, the government had given itself sweeping, excessive, disproportionate powers. As you probably recall, this prompted the then premier of Quebec, Jacques Parizeau, to describe this clause in particular and the bill as a whole, since it all hinged on clause 9, as “trade war measures taken by Canada against Quebec’s government in particular”.

• (1345)

Mr. Paillé, the then Quebec Minister of Industry, Commerce and Technology, made the appropriate representations to his federal counterpart, asking him to exercise moderation and see to it that clause 9 and federal powers in this area be cut down to reasonable proportions instead of being so ridiculously excessive. If I am not mistaken, that is how the Quebec minister described the attitude of the federal government, which was taking advantage of the situation to increase its powers.

As for us, we condemned as strongly as possible, both in the industry committee—of which I was then vice-chairman—and here in this House, the federal government’s tendency to give itself inordinate powers. I do not want to brag but we succeeded at the time in talking some sense into the government and making it understand that the extent and ambiguous nature of the powers it

was giving itself did not meet a real need and were out of line with what Canadians then expected in this matter.

We now have a clause 9 in which federal powers are more restricted, more reasonable, and in which all the parties, including the Quebec government, agree that an arbitrator is indeed needed in this area, thus giving the federal government some legitimate, consistent powers.

Even if we agree with the bill in its present form, there are still two provisions that we are deploring but which have been maintained despite the representations made and the amendments put forward by the official opposition.

The first of the two provisions we deplore is, again, clause 9, which provides that “pursuant to Article 1710 of the Agreement, the Governor in Council—that is to say, the cabinet—may, by order” and so on. This means that, in any tense situation or dispute between any two parties in Canada, the cabinet gives itself the right to settle the matter by issuing a direct order without going through the House. On the sly.

We would have liked—we even moved an amendment to this end, but it was unfortunately rejected by the government—the representatives of the 10 provinces and 2 territories in Canada that signed the agreement who sit in the House of Commons to be able to participate in the debate, either on behalf of the defendant or on behalf of the plaintiff, to publicly present the arguments of each party in the public interest and for historical purposes so that, at the end of the day, there is a debate before the federal government can come down with a sledgehammer or with sanctions, as it is now entitled to do.

We would have liked a debate to be held so that the elected representatives of the two parties involved—let us imagine, for example, that there is a dispute between Alberta and British Columbia—who sit in the House of Commons at the same time can participate in the debate and perhaps have some influence or ultimately put forward proposals. The dispute could then be settled in the best way possible and not by order, not on the sly, not in an arbitrary manner, as suggested by the current formula favoured by the government in this very important matter.

• (1350)

It must be understood that we are talking about a recourse against an injuring party. Traditionally, there has been a manpower mobility problem here, at the Quebec-Ottawa border, since workers from one side of the river could not work on the other side, and vice versa. These are sensitive issues.

The more discussions there are, the greater the chances of finding the most appropriate solution. Resorting to orders in council and acting on the sly or arbitrarily will certainly not improve the chances of finding the fairest possible solution.

We generally support the bill, but we are also disappointed with clause 19, the wording of which is very expeditious. It reads as follows:

19. Part III of the Motor Vehicle Transport Act, 1987 is repealed.

This may be a short sentence, but it has enormous consequences for a group of Quebec workers who made a lot of representations. These workers appeared before the industry committee to give their point of view. They also contacted the offices of the transport and industry ministers. Unfortunately, their efforts were in vain. I am referring to Quebec's bulk hauling truckers.

After a long struggle, they managed to get a law finally passed in Quebec to regulate bulk transport. The province did a good job and things have been going smoothly in that industry for many years now. This is quite an improvement given the heated confrontations that took place before, including in the streets of Quebec City at one time, to develop public awareness regarding the issue of bulk transportation.

With the repeal of Part III of the Motor Vehicle Transport Act of 1987, there will now be two jurisdictions in the same sector of economic activity. Currently, bulk transport permits are issued by the Government of Quebec and conditions are quite strict. This is why things are now quiet in that sector.

Part III of the Motor Vehicle Transport Act, 1987 being repealed, Quebec will now have another type of permit coming out of the woodwork. In other words, some people will have a federal bulk hauling permit without being subject to Quebec regulations.

What is worrying some people, and justifiably so, is that there will be two types of shipper, with two types of permit, federal or Quebec. For your information, the Quebec permit is subject to very stringent regulations, and it has been eminently satisfactory to everyone since its inauguration several years ago. It suits truckers because it has restored tranquility, whereas from now on there can be people who are federally licensed and not subject to Quebec regulations. There is a huge risk of anarchy, because truckers subject to the Quebec regulations will be competing with others who are not.

• (1355)

We have, however—the trucking companies even more than ourselves—tried to make the government, the industry and transport ministers, see reason on this. The Minister of Health was not involved in this debate unfortunately. He would no doubt have understood the situation, judging by the openmindedness we have seen in him.

Unfortunately, we had to settle for dealing with the industry minister, the same one as today, as well as with the former Minister of Transport. These negotiations were fruitless and the bulk haulers

will now have to live with this legislation, which—and we are only too pleased to repeat this again and again—will jeopardize the peace there has been until now in this sector.

There is a risk of anarchy, because there will be two types of operator: the ones subject to the unstructured and unregulated federal law and the ones with a permit from the Government of Quebec and covered by Quebec regulations, which to date have proven their worth. It most unfortunate once again that the government was not more open to representations from the official opposition on this.

We support this bill, because we sovereignists feel it confirms the existence of and acknowledges the need for good economic relations and the future need for a partnership between the economic entities of Quebec and Canada, after sovereignty is achieved.

The ties are so close, on this continent, between the economies of Quebec and Canada that it would make no sense not to equip ourselves to recognize the importance of these ties, first, and to make our economies competitive with the foreign economies we trade with and the strong economies challenging us, second.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I will continue later on. I will try to show the superficiality of this coast to coast agreement. It does not take long once you have to consider the interest of this entire economic territory for you to run out of breath and it leads to policies like the one just proposed by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans on the fee structure of coast guard services. With this policy, there is no hesitation dividing Canada into three and setting fees arbitrarily without basis or consultation of the parties involved.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

SMILE

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the SMILE program in my riding of Annapolis Valley—Hants. SMILE stands for Sensory Motor Instructive Leadership Experience.

Through this program 165 school aged children with special needs are paired with close to 200 student volunteers from Acadia University. The goal of the program is to enhance individual self-esteem by helping to improve the physical skills of the participants. The positive effects of improved self-esteem spill over in all aspects of their lives.

The SMILE program has been operating for 14 years and through tremendous efforts of both volunteers and participants everyone comes away with a positive experience.

S. O. 31

I ask all members of the House to join with me in recognizing all those individuals who have made this program such a success.

* * *

INTEREST ACT

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Real Estate Association in consultation with the Canadian Bankers Association and the Consumers Association of Canada proposed fair and equitable amendments to the Interest Act for both mortgage borrowers and mortgage lenders.

• (1400)

They say the act must be amended to: first, provide for mortgage prepayment, adopting a uniform prepayment penalty that consumers understand; second, define the interest rate differential formula based on the remaining term as the best method to achieve fairness; third, retain the three months penalty currently included in the National Housing Act; fourth, standardize the formula and right to prepayment with user friendly terminology to let people understand what they are signing; and finally, require lenders to reveal true mortgage borrowing costs to ensure the consumer clearly understands the terms and conditions.

Government should listen to consumers and representatives from the Canadian Real Estate Association who are in Ottawa this week to urge for measures to strengthen consumer rights by amending the Interest Act.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mrs. Jean Payne (St. John's West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to congratulate Mr. Fred Woodman on his recent appointment as chair of the Fisheries Resource Conservation Council.

Mr. Woodman has been involved in the fisheries for over 40 years. He has held numerous important positions such as chairman of the Fisheries Council of Canada; chairman of the Fisheries Association of Newfoundland and Labrador; and chairman of Newfoundland Resources Ltd. He has been an active member of the FRCC since May 1993.

The FRCC will give immediate priority to the development of a groundfish conservation strategy and the development of a criteria for the reopening of the fisheries on a sustainable basis. Mr. Woodman's leadership skills and solid background in fisheries and conservation will be a guiding force for the council in his upcoming term.

HAMILTON-SHAWINIGAN SESQUICENTENNIAL

Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, 1996 marks the 150th birthday of my hometown, Hamilton, Ontario.

Today in honour of Hamilton's sesquicentennial, His Worship Robert M. Morrow, mayor of the great city of Hamilton, and son honneur Lise Landry, mayor of the right honourable Prime Minister's hometown of Shawinigan, Quebec, announced the official launch of the Hamilton-Shawinigan sesquicentennial weekend initiative.

From June 29 to July 1, 150 families from Shawinigan will be invited to stay and visit with families in Hamilton, to renew and strengthen the cultural and social bonds between my hometown and its first twinned city, Shawinigan. The event will foster understanding, communication and mutual respect on a grassroots personal level between the proud Canadians living in Hamilton and Shawinigan.

It is my hope that this display of good natured Canadian fellowship will inspire similar projects throughout our great country.

It is with great pride and enthusiasm that I say long live Hamilton and vive Shawinigan.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIR SAFETY

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we were sad to learn over the weekend of the crash of a DC-9 in the swampy Florida Everglades.

When it went down on Saturday, the plane was on a flight between Miami and Atlanta. Our worst fears have now been realized. None of the 104 passengers and five crew members has been found.

This air tragedy was one of the most deadly on the North American continent in over 20 years. This unfortunate event reminds us of the importance of improving and tightening air transportation safety measures.

The members of the official opposition today wish to join Quebecers and Canadians in offering their sincerest condolences to the family and friends of the victims.

* * *

[*English*]

TAXATION

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we now know that as many as 20 per cent of international transactions involving Canadian companies involve the use of offshore tax havens. This means that as much as \$60

billion in one year flows between Canadian companies and foreign affiliates without being reported to Revenue Canada. And banks we are told are among the worst offenders. Imagine, corporate tax evaders and banks which dodge the law.

What is most disappointing about this story though is not the tax dodgers employed by the corporate elite. After all, we have been talking about that issue for years. What is most disappointing is that the government has known for years about this problem—the report was compiled in 1991—yet it has mustered little more than a lame response.

Canadians are tired of paying more taxes, receiving fewer services, watching the banks and big resource companies have their best times ever while paying lower taxes or even dodging them altogether.

It is time the government acted on behalf of those Canadians who pay taxes and pay the freight. It is time the government closed the loopholes on its wealthy corporate friends, just as New Democrats have been saying for some time now.

* * *

[Translation]

FRANCOPHONES OUTSIDE QUEBEC

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a francophone from outside Quebec, I would like to express the disappointment and anxiety I felt when I heard the comments made by a former Franco-Ontarian, who is now the hon. member for Québec-Est.

• (1405)

Strange how all of a sudden the Bloc Québécois seems concerned about francophones outside Quebec. It recognizes us only as an excuse to criticize the government.

Franco-Manitobans have fought long and hard for the right to speak and live in French. We now have our own school board, the largest French-language university and community college in western Canada, a newspaper, radio and television stations, theatre and music in French, and much more.

I applaud the tenacity and dedication of all francophone communities outside Quebec, which are doing all they can to survive and being quite successful despite the pessimistic and destructive attitudes of a few.

S. O. 31

[English]

MINING

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, at the start of National Mining Week today I am sounding alarm bells about the future of Canadian mining.

Last week the head of the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada said: “Canada is losing market share of exploration capital at an alarming rate”. As a prospector myself, I can assure the House that unless we fix our mining regulatory mess today, Canada will not have the new mines it needs tomorrow.

We must understand that we have had 15 years of declining mineral reserves from 1980 to 1994. The recent slight increase in investments results almost entirely from only two discoveries: diamonds in the Northwest Territories and nickel in Labrador.

Canada has the geology. We have reliable land tenure. But we do not have a simple, clear and timely system of government regulation. This government must deliver now on its promise of regulatory reform for mining or say goodbye to thousands of future Canadian jobs.

* * *

[Translation]

LOUIS RIEL

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the less than flattering statue of Louis Riel in front of the Manitoba legislature was replaced yesterday by one that befits this great man and his role in the history of Quebec and Canada.

Now that the father of Manitoba has been so honoured, the Bloc Québécois hopes the next step, an even more important step that this House should take, will be to unanimously agree to quash the guilty verdict against Louis Riel.

This would show that John A. MacDonald’s mentality no longer prevails. In 1896, he told Quebec’s Lieutenant-Governor, Rodrigue Masson, and I quote:

[English]

“He shall hang, even though every dog in Quebec barks in his favour”.

[Translation]

In other words: “He shall hang, even though all dogs in Quebec bark in his favour”.

S. O. 31

[English]

TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify recent statements I made on temporary employment.

Lately I have talked with the heads of several very fine temporary service firms. I wish to salute these fine honest firms, many of which are proud members of the Federation of Temporary Help Services.

Over the years this industry has developed a strong code of ethics and standards, to the point where today's legitimate operators display a high degree of professionalism. For instance, no portion of a temporary worker's wage is held by recognized temporary service firms which pay fair hourly wages, offer full statutory benefits and often provide job specific training.

As well, reputable temporary service firms do not charge a sign up fee to employers.

* * *

BEDFORD JUNIOR HIGH BAND

Mr. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a fine group of young students who form the school band at Bedford Junior High. They have just returned from a fantastically successful trip to Orlando, Florida where they took part in the All American Music Festival.

This band was the only junior high band at the festival. It was selected the most outstanding concert band, the most outstanding jazz band and the most outstanding ensemble for the jazz band trumpet section. They were the youngest musicians at the festival.

I hope all members will join me in congratulating Mr. Gary Adams, their teacher, and all these fine young musicians for their tremendous success and hard work.

* * *

SENATOR JACK MARSHALL

Mr. Gerry Byrne (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to pay tribute to Senator Jack Marshall, a former parliamentarian of this House who was recently inducted into the distinguished Order of Canada.

The Order of Canada recognizes Canadians from a variety of fields and backgrounds and pays tribute to their outstanding service and dedication to our country.

Senator Jack Marshall worked tirelessly as the MP for Humber—St. Georges—White Bay from 1968 to 1978. He then served Canada in the other place for 17 years.

● (1410)

The motto of the order means "they desire a better country".

There is no question that Senator Marshall was dedicated to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and to the people of Canada. Senator Marshall was and continues to be a powerful advocate for Canadian veterans rights. Today he continues to volunteer his service to Canadians from within the Parliament offices. Such is the calibre and the dedication of this man.

Today it is appropriate for us as parliamentarians to recognize the dedication of this great Canadian and his award of the Order of Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REFORM

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government has once again been asked to withdraw his reform proposal, this time by representatives of the coalition against the unemployment insurance reform.

Representatives of the CEQ, the CSN, the FTQ and the Fédération des femmes du Québec have made one last-ditch attempt at changing the government's mind. They asked the Bloc Québécois to table more than 40,000 postcards addressed to the Minister of Human Resources Development in protest.

Indifference and rashness typify the attitude of every single government member. Do they not realize that young people, women, immigrants and regions struggling with high unemployment, just to name a few, will be hard hit by their reform?

Arrogance and disrespect have a price and there will indeed be a very high price to pay when the people will finally get a chance to rebuke this government for not listening, because enough is enough, after all.

* * *

[English]

THE SENATE

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Alberta is the only province with a law requiring the election of senators. It has every right to ask the Prime Minister to respect its opinion.

The Senate today is a functioning part of the parliamentary law making process in Canada. The outdated anachronism of Senate porky patronage appointments is unconscionable and must end because senators today, while not elected, are making key decisions on everything from human rights legislation to the Bank Act.

Last Thursday the Prime Minister said: "I will name a senator who I will choose and who will represent my party in the House of Commons". He also said: "At a time when the senators are all Tories and the House of Commons is building legislation to be

passed, I will use my privilege and exercise my duty to name a senator who will respect the will of the House of Commons”.

The Prime Minister clearly shows his aggressive arrogance on this issue when he indicates his belief that the Senate is not for Canadians but is his tool to give the Liberal Party supporters patronage appointments.

The Speaker: Colleagues, in these statements we give every latitude to members, but I would caution all members to not reflect on the other place in a derogatory fashion.

* * *

[Translation]

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since this is national mines week, it is important to stress the economic, cultural and social contribution of this industry for several regions of Canada.

For example, the mining sector shaped the development of several Quebec regions, particularly in the north, where I lived for a number of years. To this day, the mining industry remains a major economic development tool. Year in year out, mining shipments total between \$2.5 and \$3 billion. The mining industry is also a major employer, including in rural areas.

To be sure, the challenge for this sector is to turn to high technology and thus contribute—

The Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time is up.

* * *

PUBLISHING INDUSTRY

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to mention the opening, today, of the Institut des communications graphiques du Québec, in Montreal.

Through its \$3 million financial contribution, the Government of Canada concretely shows its interest in technological development and innovation, particularly in Quebec’s publishing industry.

This initiative will allow the industry to be at the forefront of new technologies, thanks to the possibilities provided by multimedia and the information highway, which have become indispensable tools for the development of a modern society.

Oral Questions

• (1415)

[English]

EDUCATION

Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in the House today to recognize the fantastic work that is being done in the education of our young people.

Mr. Leo Carteri received the Prime Minister’s award for teaching excellence in science a few weeks ago. Recently I was able to visit his school and attend a ceremony honouring him, his fellow teachers and of course the students.

Mr. Carteri’s students rarely go home from the Canada-wide Science Fair without at least one prize. Mr. Carteri believes that competitions like these not only widen the students’ academic horizons but also expose them to the corporate world through business scholarships.

Canada’s youth is this government’s priority. I know members of the House will join with me as I commend Mr. Carteri in helping to encourage and enrich our young people.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

REFERENDUMS

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is no minister present and the Prime Minister is not here, how are we supposed to have a question period in this House?

The Speaker: My dear colleague, we do not generally make reference to hon. members’ presence or absence.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister and concerns the federal government’s plan to prevent Quebecers from having a democratic say in their future.

My question is, therefore, for the Prime Minister, or one of the other referendizers, although I see none of them around either. So I will ask somebody to answer for them because Quebecers are waiting for a government answer.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Gauthier: I trust that they will heed what the Prime Minister wrote in his book entitled *In the Lion’s Den*. In it, the Prime Minister of Canada wrote that if they lost, they would respect Quebecers’ wish and accept separation. That is what the Prime Minister of Canada wrote.

My question then—

Oral Questions

Ms. Fry: Get to the question.

An hon. member: Question.

Mrs. Picard: They do not like to hear that, do they?

Mr. Gauthier: No, they do not like to hear that, Mr. Speaker, the—

The Speaker: I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to please get to his question.

Mr. Gauthier: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Having stated he would respect Quebecers' wishes and accept separation, could the Prime Minister or somebody else on his behalf explain whether, having jumped into bed with Guy Bertrand to deny Quebecers' right to decide their own future, he is not now denying what he himself wrote not that long ago?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, we do recognize the right of the people of Quebec to express themselves democratically in a referendum. We deeply respect that right. But the Quebec attorney general has said something more. In the Bertrand case, the Quebec attorney general said that the Constitution and the courts had nothing to do with the process of Quebec's achieving independence.

• (1420)

We believe in the rule of law in Canada. As the attorney general of Canada, it is my responsibility to take part in the Bertrand case, not in order to back Mr. Bertrand, but in order to respond to the position taken by the attorney general of Quebec against the rule of law in Canada.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government's action must be interpreted as a challenge to Quebecers' right to decide their future themselves. The government is trying to subordinate this right of Quebecers to a decision by the courts.

Does the Prime Minister realize that, with this action and by trying to join forces with Guy Bertrand, not only is he launching a direct attack on sovereignist Quebecers, that is obvious, he is attacking all of Quebec including his former partners on the no side in the latest referendum?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, those who know our position know this is not true. As I said, we recognize the right of the people of Quebec to express themselves in a referendum. It is another matter entirely, however, when the attorney general of Quebec says the Constitution may be nullified by popular vote. It is not true, and I

cannot, as attorney general of Canada, stand on the sidelines in the light of the position of the attorney general of Quebec.

So, we decided to get involved in the matter, not to support Mr. Bertrand, but to support the rule of law. We have had the opportunity since last August to become involved in Mr. Bertrand's case and we decided not to. It is not our intention to support Mr. Bertrand; we are there only to support the rule of law and the Constitution of Canada for all Canadians, including Quebecers.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice is knocking himself into a cocked hat in an effort to prove he is not supporting Guy Bertrand, but everyone in Quebec knows, everyone in Canada knows, that the federal government is joining forces with Guy Bertrand to please the rest of Canada.

Since he is so good at explanations, perhaps he would explain why the Prime Minister told Quebecers, before the latest referendum, that a yes would mean an irreversible outcome, when he had planned at that point a legal challenge to the right of Quebecers to decide their future? Perhaps he could explain.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, you have to look at the facts. The facts are that we did not get involved in Mr. Bertrand's case to support Mr. Bertrand. We have had the opportunity to become involved since last August.

It was only once the attorney general of Quebec said, a few weeks ago, that the Constitution did not apply to Quebec's move to independence that we decided it was necessary to become involved on behalf of Canadians and the rule of law.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition can say what he said today, but it is not right. The facts are clear. We decided to take part in this matter only in response to the position taken by the attorney general of Quebec.

• (1425)

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at the time of the last referendum campaign, the Prime Minister told Quebecers, so that they would vote no, that their decision was irreversible and that he would respect their decision. Now, six months later, he is launching his government into a court challenge to deny Quebecers the right to decide on their future democratically.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Does the Prime Minister admit that the strategy he has adopted is one of confrontation, the sole purpose of which is to provoke the people of Quebec?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the federal government recognizes clearly that referendums are a

Oral Questions

means for the public to express its opinion, and there is no doubt that democratic means such as referendums are open to Quebec, as they are open to Canada.

It is also clear that the Constitution of a country is not and cannot be amended through a referendum in just one part of a country, and that constitutional law and the internal law of a country are the laws that govern popular decisions and that allow constitutions to be changed. In this case, the Constitution and internal law indicate what means we may take to change the Constitution.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would remind the minister that Quebec never signed the 1982 Constitution and its amending formula.

Can the Prime Minister offer any justification for his constitutional about-face other than that he has now decided to implement Plan B, a hard line approach with Quebec?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our goal has always been to reconcile Quebecers of all stripes with the rest of Canada, and to pass legislation and implement policies that will allow us to improve the well being of Quebecers and Canadians alike.

As a Quebecer, I must say that it is clear—

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata): We will show you the Verdun tape, we have it.

Mr. Massé: I see that the Bloc Québécois is reduced to negative slurs. Unfortunately, I must point out that when they say we are getting into bed with Mr. Bertrand, they are insulting one of their own former colleagues who saw clearly that PQ doctrine did not correspond to the needs of Quebecers. This is what makes us federalists, and Mr. Bertrand very clearly realized that the Bloc Québécois's goals and policies run counter to the interests of Quebecers.

* * *

[*English*]

THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. It relates to the government's decision to intervene in the Bertrand case.

I think it is important that the minister has recognized the importance of defending the rule of law, without which the democratic process has no meaning.

To clarify fully the government's position, is it the position of the Government of Canada that any change to the constitutional status of a province would have to be done legally and would require under the amending formula the consent of all provinces?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is our position that any change in the make-up of the country would have to be done legally. As to the precise mechanics or dynamics, that is a matter of discussion even among academic and constitutional experts. I do not think it is possible to be categorical in saying exactly what protocol is required.

However, it is terribly important to emphasize, as is implicit in the hon. member's question, that democracy and the exercise of democratic freedoms go hand in hand with the rule of law. It is possible to exercise democratic freedoms only when the rule of law is firmly in place.

• (1430)

No one should think that mere adherence to the rule of law means change cannot take place. Change can happen effectively in a stable and orderly way only when the rule of law prevails, which is the approach we have taken to this issue.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, that was a question I first asked the government on October 17, 1994. The government declined at the time to answer it, saying it was strictly hypothetical. It is good we are now answering it but I wish the government had more precise answers to the specifics on this issue.

My supplementary question is also from that date. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra has written that the federal government today retains its full constitutional options to allow or not to allow a referendum vote, to control the content wording of any referendum question, to control the actual timing of any vote and to launch its own pre-emptive nationwide referendum legally superseding any Quebec vote.

Do these statements reflect the position or the constitutional thinking of the Government of Canada?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if I understand the hon. member's question, it is the right of any provincial government to test the popular will of the population by putting a question in a consultation process through a referendum.

I think what is brought into sharp focus by the position taken by the attorney general of Quebec in the Bertrand litigation is the effect of such a consultative vote. It was implicitly said by the Quebec attorney general in the Bertrand litigation that should such a referendum, if it results in a positive vote, can supplant or replace the Constitution and the rule of law so that they have no application to the consequences.

To that we take direct and substantial opposition. We have involved ourselves in the litigation for the purpose of responding to that position as expressed by the attorney general of Quebec.

Oral Questions

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Once again, Mr. Speaker, we support the intervention in this case, but I think it is fair to point out that we expect it would be done and will be done in a broader policy framework on all of these questions.

[Translation]

On a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, the fear in Quebec is that the federal government would use the rule of law to deny the political and democratic will.

Will the minister confirm unequivocally that the political will of Quebecers, as expressed legally and democratically, will be respected and that the federal government will negotiate in good faith?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government respects any wishes clearly expressed by the people.

It is also obvious that two referendums were held on the issue of Quebec's separation. Each time, the people of Quebec clearly indicated they did not want to separate.

If the idea is to get a definitive answer, I cannot help but wonder why the no vote does not constitute a definitive answer. Why does the Bloc Québécois not accept the will very clearly expressed by Quebecers? They should stop fostering political uncertainty in Quebec, promoting unemployment across the province and causing problems to all Quebecers on something on which they have expressed their will twice already, both times voting no.

* * *

REFERENDUMS

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board talks about reconciling Quebecers and Canadians, but he should be concerned about reconciling federalists. Indeed, Daniel Johnson, the leader of the no side in Quebec, does not agree with the federal government. He recognizes the right of the people of Quebec to determine their own future. The federal government must be really desperate to make an ally of Guy Bertrand.

● (1435)

I want to ask the President of the Treasury Board, who said that the people of Quebec—those are the words he used—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Duceppe: You can bet the Prime Minister will have another version tomorrow.

He said: “You have to right to express yourselves, you have the right to say what you want to be, you have the right to say that Quebec must become a sovereign country, but you must first ask

for the permission of the rest of Canada”. Is this what he is saying? I remind him that when Newfoundland joined the Confederation, it never asked Quebecers whether they agreed or not with that decision.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a people of Quebec like there is an Abenaki people, a Cree people and an Inuit people. I hope Quebecers will not deny the existence of the Abenaki or Inuit people.

The will of the public must clearly be subject to the laws of a national assembly and to a constitution. When there is a constitution in a country, the first democratic duty of citizens is to comply with the law that dictates the major policies in their country. This is what I am asking the Bloc Québécois to do.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the minister that the first province to recognize the aboriginal nations was Quebec, on March 20, 1885, well before Ottawa.

The minister can try all he likes to justify himself, but the government's argument does not wash. This minister is part of a government that has lost the trust not just of Canadians, but also of Quebecers, because of its performance with the GST, its bizarre attitude with the army and its minister, its broken promises on discrimination, and the hopeless state of constitutional affairs.

Let the minister admit that the sole purpose of this strategy is to revamp the government's image in English Canada, because it needs it and, as usual, to do so under the leadership of the Prime Minister. This is a man who is accustomed to renewing his image at Quebec's expense, as he has done throughout his political career.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, clearly, the Bloc Québécois thinks that insults are their best argument today. In fact, it is their best argument, because if they are saying that they have recognized the peoples living in Quebec, such as the native peoples, then why do the native peoples not have the right, through a referendum as they are saying, to become sovereign themselves?

We can see only too well that their arguments make no sense and that it is therefore necessary to have a law setting out citizens' rights and the manner in which they may be expressed.

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the results of a recent plebiscite in Alberta demonstrate that grain farmers want to have the choice to market their grain outside the Canadian Wheat Board.

Oral Questions

In response, Alberta's minister of agriculture has presented the idea of buying grain from farmers for \$1 per load in Alberta and selling it to farmers for \$1 per load in the United States. This proposal is meant to get around the roadblock thrown in the way by the Canadian Wheat Board. This would in effect allow farmers the choice they voted for in the Alberta plebiscite.

Will the minister of agriculture move quickly and allow Alberta farmers the choice they demanded in the plebiscite?

Mr. Jerry Pickard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question.

The export of Canadian grain still remains a federal legislative responsibility. It is not proper for a province to take on unilaterally a decision which would affect grain farmers right across the prairies, which would affect their livelihood.

Over the last several weeks the panel we have set up looking at the grain question has had opportunity listen to the concerns of every province, including Alberta, and to the problems of all the producers. It is coming out with a report in June.

We will look at the report. We are certainly concerned about the whole issue of grain across the country.

• (1440)

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, you have to wonder if anybody on that side of the House has a clue as to what is going on in western Canada. Study, study, study and still no answer.

Alberta farmers have already spoken on this issue. The minister's refusal to act is costing farmers about \$2 a bushel at a time when they desperately need money to plant their crops. Why will this minister not act for a change? Farmers need the money now.

Mr. Jerry Pickard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that the minister has acted. He put together a panel to study the grain issues in this country and he is making certain that every voice is heard. He is making certain that this grain panel has the opportunity to report back to the government before action is taken.

It is proper when a panel or a group is put in place to give it time for its consultations and to listen to its recommendations.

* * *

[Translation]

REFERENDUMS

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

On October 24 in the Verdun auditorium, the Prime Minister stated that he agreed with the Quebec people's desire for change. He went on to say, and I quote: "I supported that position in the past, I support it today, and I will support it in the future, whatever the circumstance".

How can the Prime Minister reconcile his smooth talk on the eve of the referendum with his current attempt to deprive the Quebec people of their fundamental right to decide their own future?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, it is not a matter of depriving the Quebec people of their fundamental right to decide their own future.

What is essential in this desire for change is that governments, whether it is the Government of Canada or the provincial governments, put in place policies that are more in line with the needs and expectations of their people.

If you look at our government's throne speech, you will see that we indicated our intention to effect the changes needed either in the economic union or in the social union to better meet the needs of Canadians. That is what a good government does and that is what we did in the past and will continue to do in the future.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if the past is any indication of the future, what awaits Quebecers in the future is an unemployment rate even higher than today.

Will the Prime Minister admit that the reason for his about-face is his fear of losing the next referendum? Now that they know they almost lost it, they are really afraid of losing the next one.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, what is at issue in this case is which government policies will help Canadians, including Quebecers, better deal with the problems of tomorrow. That is what people are afraid of. Yes, the matter of the referendum does increase uncertainty in Quebec, reduce investment and aggravate unemployment, and that is what people are afraid of.

As those who conduct door-to-door polls in the Montreal ridings realize, people know that the option advocated by the Bloc Québécois and the Parti Québécois reduces the number of jobs, reduces investment in Quebec, reduces their income, and that is what they are afraid of. What they want is good government and not the uncertainty of a referendum.

Oral Questions

[English]

FISHERIES

Mr. John Cummins (Delta, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is in deep water over his west coast revitalization plan. Why will he not come clean over the issue of allocation?

He knows if land claims go the way of the Nisga'a deal, then 50 per cent of the fish catch will go to native only fisheries. Will the minister admit that the real reason for his buy back plan, which will destroy the lives of thousands of fishermen, is not to reduce the number of fish caught, but to transfer the rights to catch fish from one group of fishermen to another?

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I notice that today the hon. member is saying 50 per cent. Last week it was 25 per cent. I am not sure what the number will be tomorrow.

I remind the hon. member and the House that the purpose of the plan to revitalize the Pacific salmon is essentially to give fishermen a choice. The choice is to exit the fishery, to stay in the fishery and continue to fish in one area or to expand investment in the fishery by buying licences from those who exit the fishery and essentially give the salmon a better chance.

• (1445)

It is a plan that was developed in consultation with fishermen. It is a plan that has a lot of support in British Columbia and it is a plan that will work.

Mr. John Cummins (Delta, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is the minister who cannot get his numbers right. His rhetoric leads me to believe that he is in cahoots with B.C. Premier Clark on this issue.

The premier is prepared to give away one-half of the catch. The minister is prepared to reduce the fleet by one-half. The ratio of boats to fish will not change.

Will the minister come clean and admit that the real agenda of the government is to transfer the right to catch fish from one group to another?

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the hon. member is under the impression that Mr. Clark is helping me with this plan.

I am delighted to move forward. If Mr. Clark is happy to help me with support in one area, fish habitat, because protecting fish habitat against damage caused by logging, mining, highway construction and urban development are certainly areas where I could do with some help.

I thank the hon. member for raising the subject. I look forward to any help that Premier Clark can give me on this plan.

[Translation]

REFERENDUMS

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister, wherever he may be, wherever he may be hiding.

The Speaker: The question please, dear colleague.

Mrs. Venne: Mr. Speaker, here is my question. Is the Prime Minister aware that, by jumping into bed with Guy Bertrand, he is directly in opposition to the person who was the head of the Quebec no side during the referendum?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister, who is in Quebec, I would like to say first of all that our participation in the case before the courts in Quebec City this week is not to support Mr. Bertrand, but to support the rule of law.

I think it is very important to emphasize that the rule of law is what gives stability to the country, Quebec included, for the people of Quebec. Democracy and the rule of law are directly linked. I think this is very important, and that is why we are involved in this case before the courts.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, where is the government headed with its strategy, a strategy which denies democracy, while at the same time going up against its former Quebec allies on the no side?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, they talk of democracy. A referendum can be held in order to determine the opinion of the population. That is democracy.

But it is not democratic to say, once such a consultative referendum has been held, that the Constitution as a whole, the rule of law in this country, have been removed or nullified. That is not democracy. It is antidemocratic to say such a thing, and we are before the courts in Quebec City this week simply in order to support the principle that, above all, in Canada we have the rule of law, which applies for the good of all Canadians.

* * *

[English]

FUEL PRICES

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the constituents of my riding of Mississauga East and countless other Canadians are struggling to keep their businesses and households afloat while being drained by rising fuel prices.

Oral Questions

There is a strong and growing sentiment that gasoline subsidies are unfairly inflating prices to the detriment of the consumer.

Will the Minister of Industry explain what steps the government is taking to address this longstanding grievance?

• (1450)

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier today the member of Parliament for Ottawa Centre and five other citizens of Canada filed with the director of investigations and research a request, pursuant to section 9 of the Competition Act, for an inquiry into gas pricing in Canada.

Today the director has initiated a formal inquiry, pursuant to section 10 of the act in response to the section 9 request.

The member for Ottawa Centre and other members who have raised this issue deserve credit for taking some initiative in this and for filing the appropriate request for an inquiry. The director will investigate. If he finds evidence he will act accordingly.

I point out to the House that as recently as this January he was successful in obtaining a conviction under the Competition Act and a fine of \$50,000 was levied against Mr. Gas here in Ottawa for the offence of price fixing.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, apparently the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is setting its nets to catch another \$14 million a year by taxing boats across the country, including recreational boats. This will apply to previously untaxed vessels such as small motor boats, sailboats and even rowboats.

I am not sure if the tax will be so much an oar, so much a seat or so much a mile. Regardless, my question is about the \$14 million. Is this supposed to address a safety issue? Is it merely a pain in the oar, or is this just another tax grab?

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. In Ontario alone, there were four deaths involved in recreational boating this past weekend.

The idea of recreational boating fees is based on marine safety. The industry has suggested that government may want to help by making sure that those who go on the water, whether in a small boat or a large boat, are first trained in safety and have the qualifications and the training courses that are necessary to ensure that the loss of

life, be it on salt water or freshwater, is kept to a minimum. We hope to be able to contribute in that area.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, safety is a big issue but obviously taxes are also a big issue.

In the March throne speech, the government was very clear that there would be no new taxes. Since then we have had tax increases on fishermen, tax increases on cassette decks, tax increases on retirement and now a new tax on rowboats.

The throne speech said one thing, the government is doing another. Is this broken promise another act of God or are we merely heading into uncharted waters looking for more tax revenue?

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is not suggesting that he is not in favour of more marine safety. Is he suggesting that the taxpayer should pay it?

We are using a policy which has been used before by this government, and which I am sure they have used in their budget suggestions: services that are provided to the public should not be paid for by the taxpayer but by those who use the service. That is the principle at issue here.

* * *

[Translation]

SOMALIA INQUIRY

Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

Last week, barely five hours after the minister was questioned about the dubious arrest of Corporal Purnelle, seven charges were laid against the latter, because he allegedly defied the orders of a superior who wanted to prevent him from giving evidence before the Somalia commission.

How does the minister justify the fact that, five hours after he stated in this House that no member of the army was or would be prevented from giving information to the commission of inquiry, seven charges were laid against this corporal, who had the courage to defy the order of his superiors and give evidence before the commission?

[English]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer I gave the hon. member for Charlesbourg last Wednesday and the answers of my parliamentary secretary on Friday are exactly the case.

Oral Questions

There is no incompatibility with coming forward, giving evidence to the commission and also obeying the rules and regulations of the Canadian Armed Forces. There is no incompatibility. I am surprised the hon. member is continuing to raise this question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think the minister and the parliamentary secretary are hiding behind the supposed military discipline, but this does not satisfy the people. I think the minister has no choice but to withdraw the charges against Corporal Purnelle.

Otherwise, the minister will be telling other military personnel that they will be court-martialled if they co-operate with the commission to shed light on events in Somalia.

Is this the message the minister wishes to send?

• (1455)

[*English*]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are two messages to members of the Canadian Armed Forces. First, all of them, if they have evidence germane to the inquiry, are expected to come forward. The second is that as a member of the armed forces they are obligated to follow the rules and procedures of the National Defence Act. That is a condition of their service. There is no incompatibility between the two.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on the question of the hon. member for Charlesbourg.

The Minister of National Defence instructed soldiers to bring forward any relevant evidence to the Somalia inquiry, promising there would be no reprisals. Corporal Michel Purnelle finds that hard to believe. He tried to appear before the commission but was arrested even after the commission had told military authorities it wanted to see him.

Why is the minister, contrary to his assurances, permitting his department to intimidate witnesses?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was expecting to get this kind of question from the hon. member for Charlesbourg, but to get it from the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, a former colonel in the armed forces, who knows full well everything that should be known about the military justice system, is to me quite disheartening.

The fact is there is a military justice system. People are obliged to follow the rules. They are also obliged to come forward to give evidence to the inquiry. There is no incompatibility here.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, at this moment the military justice system is under a bit of a cloud and I think the minister should simply reassure us.

In a letter to the commission, Corporal Purnelle said that he felt vulnerable to abuse of power and was even fearful of physical violence because he had come forward. The minister must send a clear signal to his department about openness.

To prove that he will tolerate no interference with this public inquiry, will he ensure that Corporal Purnelle's future career is not adversely affected by having come forward? What will he do to ensure that military authorities do not again hinder or intimidate potential witnesses?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have stated in the House before that no one would suffer any reprisals for coming forward to the commission. That message has been sent loud and clear.

The hon. member asked for a clear message. What could be clearer than the Minister of National Defence publicly stating in the House of Commons that all members of the armed forces have an obligation to come forward and that there will be no reprisals?

However, the minister cannot and will not interfere in the judicial process which is taking place.

* * *

HAZARDOUS PRODUCTS

Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Could the minister advise the House on the department's participation in a demonstration project promoted by the International Association of Firefighters to identify hazardous materials in transit, a project code named "Operation Respond"?

Could the minister indicate if the demonstration project will be extended to a Canadian site?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

We have sent two observers to the "Operation Respond" sites in the United States and they will continue to be there monitoring what is taking place. If they come across procedures or come up with suggestions that would improve our system, we would be very pleased to look into those. That is why they are there.

I would like to add that right now we do have a very good emergency response information centre, the Canadian Transport Emergency Centre, or CANUTEC, which operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

Concerning his last question with respect to sites in Canada, if these are proceeded with, we will look into incorporating them into the types of studies we are doing at the present time.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

He will know that while in opposition he and his Liberal colleagues opposed Conservative cuts to UI that were not as deep as those they are pushing through the House today. Indeed, the minister's predecessor said the Tory cuts made Margaret Thatcher look like Mother Theresa by comparison.

As the red book committed the Liberals to restore public trust and confidence in government, would the minister tell the House how public trust and confidence in government can possibly be restored with such an about-face on UI?

• (1500)

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is important to recognize in all of this, and I am sure the hon. member is aware of it, is that we have gone through two years of discussions and consultations across the country on the reforms to the employment insurance program. I do not think very many pieces of legislation in the history of this place have been subjected to the same kind of scrutiny.

I do want to say to my hon. colleague that one thing which has been very positive from the exercise has been the tremendous contribution made by members of Parliament who sit on committees and who attend the meetings of those committees.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of Mr. Chen Bangzhu, Minister of Internal Trade of China, and his accompanying party.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: I also wish to draw the attention of the House to the presence in our gallery of Mr. Serge Poignant, member of the Committee on cultural, family and social affairs of the National Assembly of France and MNA for Loire-Atlantique.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]**GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS**

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

* * *

PETITIONS**HUMAN RIGHTS**

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition which contains over 330 signatures from Manitoba supporting the amendment to the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation. These signatures are of people from all age groups who firmly believe that discrimination on any basis should not and cannot be tolerated.

Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, because of certification, I was unable to present this petition before the passage of Bill C-33. However, it is still my privilege to present the petition on behalf of approximately 240 individuals from Edmonton.

The petitioners would like to draw to the attention of the House that the human rights act not be amended to include the term sexual orientation, in order that no Canadians receive special rights or privileges based solely on sexual behaviour.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, like the previous member, this petition has to do with Bill C-33 but was not certified in time.

• (1505)

I rise today to present to Parliament a petition signed by 484 people in my riding and from other parts of Alberta. The petitioners call upon Parliament to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination based upon sexual orientation, that which the courts have declared to be the law.

Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour of presenting two petitions.

In the first petition the petitioners pray that Parliament not amend any act or code to include sexual orientation as a prohibited grounds of discrimination.

In the second petition the petitioners pray and request that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships

Routine Proceedings

or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase of sexual orientation.

THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. Tony Valeri (Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is an honour for me to present a petition on behalf of the constituents of Lincoln. The petition is signed by 410 constituents who are calling on Parliament not to amend the Constitution as requested by the Government of Newfoundland and to refer the problem of educational reform in that province back to the Government of Newfoundland for resolution by some other non-constitutional procedure.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have some petitions.

The petitioners request that Parliament refrain from passing into law any bill extending family status or spousal benefits to same sex partners.

WARTIME MERCHANT NAVY VETERANS

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak on behalf of a deserving but ignored group of Canadians. They call upon Parliament to consider the advisability of extending benefits or compensation to veterans of the wartime merchant navy equal to that enjoyed by veterans of Canada's World War II armed services.

This petition was signed by 75 members of the lower mainland and I am pleased to present their petition.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present petitions containing several hundred names from all across Canada.

The petitioners pray and request that Parliament proceed immediately with amendments to the Criminal Code that will ensure that the sentence given to anyone convicted of driving while impaired or causing injury or death while impaired does reflect both the severity of the crime and zero tolerance by Canada toward the crime.

GASOLINE TAX

Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of a number of petitioners from across Saskatchewan. They raise concerns about the possible increase in gasoline taxes which they believed we were prepared to include in

the budget. On their behalf I do want to raise them now and I am pleased to do so.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions today.

The first one states that whereas the traditional heterosexual family is the building block upon which society is based, the petitioners request that Parliament refrain from passing into law any bill extending family status or spousal benefits to same sex partners. Further, they request that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the human rights act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights code or the Canadian Human Rights Act to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase of sexual orientation.

TAXATION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition comes from Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

The petitioners would like to draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to our society. They also state that the Income Tax Act discriminates against traditional families who make the choice to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

The petitioners therefore pray and call upon Parliament to pursue initiatives to eliminate tax discrimination against families who decide to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

LABELLING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the final petition comes from Elmira, Ontario.

The petitioners would like to bring to the attention of the House that consumption of alcoholic beverages may cause health problems or impair one's ability and specifically that fetal alcohol syndrome and other alcohol related birth defects are 100 per cent preventable by avoiding alcohol consumption during pregnancy.

● (1510)

The petitioners therefore pray and call upon Parliament to enact legislation to require health warning labels to be placed on the containers of all alcoholic beverages to caution expectant mothers and others of the risks associated with alcohol consumption.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

AGREEMENT ON INTERNAL TRADE IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-19, an act to implement the agreement on internal trade, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Yves Rochelleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by repeating the remarks I was making concerning the establishment of a coast guard fee structure.

Before the ink has even dried on this internal trade agreement, supposedly designed to stimulate commercial activity, hence strengthening economic and trade ties between various parts of Canada, a fee structure is imposed by the coast guard for services provided by ships operating in Canadian waters, which will only create division at a time when efforts are made to effect economic unification once and for all. As a result, three main regions will be created—the western region, the central region and the maritimes—with three completely different tariffs. This in itself flies in the face of the political will expressed at the time the agreement was signed.

This goes to show how difficult it is to run this country—it is a virtually impossible task—and the lack of a cooperative spirit.

In conclusion, one can say without fear of being mistaken that the federal government is dealing a blow to Quebec, to the people living along the St. Lawrence, to all the ports along the St. Lawrence, where 85 per cent of Quebecers live, without consulting even the most influential of stakeholders, who come from the City of Montreal, for example, from the entire urban community in both Montreal and Quebec City, who made representations again last week, in addition to the private users who came to testify and the representatives of aluminum plants and logging operations.

They told the government: “Do not impede our ability to compete with foreigners”. The government retreated into silence and arbitrary measures. They continued in that direction, deciding last Thursday to impose the first stage in the new fee schedule, \$20

Government Orders

million, and in the process sacrificing the political will that was supposed to exist in this agreement.

In spite of the fact that there was no real consultation, and this was strongly criticized, the minister is relying on a study called IBI, which is in fact a survey. This study was condemned by all those who appeared before the committee. Of 49 witnesses, 37 asked for a moratorium, so that the situation can be examined to find out once and for all the economic impact of this measure on users and to make a true description of services provided to users, given that the government wants to tax them. Make no mistake about it: this is a tax. It must also be demonstrated that the Coast Guard did undergo a self-imposed streamlining exercise, as it claims to have done, given that the majority of the witnesses doubt that this is the case.

In conclusion, signing this agreement and imposing this new fee structure both confirm, yet again, this government's lack of vision.

• (1515)

[English]

Mr. Tony Valeri (Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on Bill C-19, an act to implement the agreement on internal trade.

With all the issues we are faced with today, we may sometimes lose sight of how important trade is to Canada. From its very beginnings Canada has been a trading nation. It is the lifeblood of the country. The well-being of all Canadians depends on our ability to create and profit from competitive trading environments at home and abroad.

In the international arena we have been successful in negotiating and participating in a number of multilateral trading agreements. We are a founding partner in the North American Free Trade Agreement which has opened up our trading with the U.S. and Mexico.

Canada is a member of other trade organizations such as the WTO and GATT. We understand the need for formal agreements to set out rules that ensure fair trade between nations and that allow redress when a country fails to live up to the obligations it has accepted.

While we have long accepted the need to have rules of order and to have mechanisms to settle trade disputes on the international front, until recently we did not come to grips with the need to establish a framework to govern trade between provinces and territories within Canada.

We have that framework now in the agreement on internal trade. This bill, by making necessary and appropriate legislative changes within the federal jurisdiction, will enable the federal government to meet its obligations under the agreement and do its part to ensure the agreement is fully implemented.

The agreement on internal trade was signed by the Prime Minister and all other first ministers in July 1994. The agreement

Government Orders

is a made in Canada agreement to govern trade between provinces and territories and to open the domestic market to the freer flow of goods, services, people and capital.

The agreement provides a comprehensive set of rules that requires the reduction of existing ones and which prohibits the erection of new trade barriers. The agreement also sets out specific obligations in ten economic sectors.

It makes undertakings to streamline and harmonize regulations and standards between provinces and territories and has put in place a formal mechanism to resolve domestic trade disputes.

One of the most important points is that the agreement on internal trade, which Bill C-19 implements at the federal level, contains a formal commitment from all its parties, that is, from all 10 provinces and the territories as well as the federal government.

The commitment is to continue the process of trade liberalization within Canada within the framework of the agreement.

The need for this agreement has been well documented. We are all aware of examples of restricted trade practices or regulations which discriminate against certain businesses and labour groups.

These measures range from outright restrictions to bidding on government contracts to regulations affecting the mobility of labour or professionals between provinces, to differing standards for food or beverage products from one jurisdiction to the other.

We need to reduce these barriers through interprovincial trade in goods and services and to remove restrictions on the movement of people and capital within the domestic marketplace. The problems the agreement on internal trade is designed to address were built up over a long period.

Since Confederation there has developed in Canada a tangle of measures both well intentioned and deliberately protectionist which have prohibited interprovincial trade and restricted the free flow of persons, goods and services and capital between provinces.

Our government and all governments in Canada have come under strong pressures from the business community to change the scenario and to deal with the problems associated with internal barriers to trade and with the conflicting regulations on cross border flows of people and capital.

We have had representations from many leading business groups such as the Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, the Canadian Construction Association and the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, to name a few.

It is important to point out this is not just big business speaking out. Small and medium size enterprises also feel the negative consequences of barriers to trade between provinces and territories.

The criticism and pressure is not just that of isolated interest groups; it has come for sound economic reasons.

• (1520)

These barriers put Canadians and Canadian businesses at a comparative disadvantage by restricting the size of the domestic marketplace, the ability to develop competitive skills as well as abilities that allow Canadian businesses to compete globally.

In a time of increasing global competition and more open markets in other parts of the world this can have the additional negative impact of putting Canadian businesses at a disadvantage to international competitors even in our own marketplace. It is no wonder that a recent survey by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce found that 67 per cent of Canadian businesses thought governments were not moving fast enough to eliminate internal trade barriers and impediments.

There is a cost to labour and to consumers. Overall it has been estimated that barriers to trade within Canada cost Canadians in the order of \$7 billion annually in direct jobs and income loss. This problem has a direct impact on all parts of Canada and on all elements of society.

Governments have become the subject of pressure from the internal market issue. The reason is that it is quite simply wrong for any Canadian government for whatever local politically expedient reason to discriminate against Canadians because of where they live or work, because of where they learned or developed their skills and first had them recognized, because of where they bank or do business or because of where they sell or manufacture their goods and services.

The economic cost to Canada is high. Internal barriers and impediments tear at our national fabric. It is a cause for which governments must bear responsibility. We in the House can do something to help correct the situation by passing this bill. Internal trade is not just a federal government issue. It ranks high on the agenda of all of the provinces.

When the provincial and territorial leaders met at the annual premiers conference in St. John's, Newfoundland they renewed their commitment to the objective of reducing barriers to the free movement of persons, goods, services and investment in Canada. This agreement belongs to all of its parties. Its implementation is the responsibility of all of its parties, not just that of the federal government.

In order to address some misunderstandings of parts of the bill and to make manifest the intentions of the government, the Minister of Industry introduced amendments that made clear the exact scope for federal action under the agreement's dispute settlement procedures.

Government Orders

The legislation before us now is the result of a long process of negotiation and consultation that has involved Canadians of different political persuasions and with different regional perspectives. Even with these different perspectives and priorities the result has been agreement on the basic rules and framework for ongoing intergovernmental co-operation on domestic trade and other economic issues. The agreement on internal trade has given us that framework. Bill C-19 meets the obligations of the federal government to implement that agreement.

We must turn the page on what divides us and work toward economic solutions for Canadians. Together we can better meet the challenges and bring changes that are necessary. That is why this bill is important to all Canadians. That is why I support passage of this legislation through the House.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

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

And the bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The vote stands deferred until tomorrow following Government Orders.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, you would find unanimous consent to say that it is now 6:30 p.m.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Shall I call it 6.30 p.m.?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24.

(The House adjourned at 3.26 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, May 13, 1996

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Immigration and Refugee Board

Mr. Hanger	2639
Mr. Dromisky	2642
Mr. Nunez	2643
Ms. Meredith	2644
Ms. Minna	2646

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Employment Insurance Act

Bill C-12. Consideration resumed of report stage	2647
Motion No. 75	2647
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	2647
Motion No. 76	2647
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	2647
Mrs. Lalonde	2647
Ms. Fry	2648
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	2649
Division on Motion No. 76 deferred	2651
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	2651
Motion No. 81	2651
Division on Motion No. 81 deferred	2651
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	2651
Motion No. 80	2651
Division on Motion No. 80 deferred	2652
Mr. Young	2652
Motion No. 93	2652
Division on Motion No. 93 deferred	2652
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	2652
Motion No. 92	2652
Division on Motion No. 92 deferred	2652
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	2652
Motion No. 112	2652
Division on Motion No. 112 deferred	2652
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	2652
Motion No. 113	2652
Division on Motion No. 113 deferred	2652
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	2652
Motion No. 111	2653
Division on Motion No. 111 deferred	2653
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	2653
Motion No. 128	2653
Division on Motion No. 128 deferred	2653
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	2653
Motion No. 188	2653
Division on Motion No. 188 deferred	2654
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	2654
Motion No. 192	2654
Division on Motion No. 192 deferred	2654
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	2654
Motion No. 191	2654
Division on Motion No. 191 deferred	2654
Mr. Young	2654
Motion No. 215	2654
Division on Motion No. 215 deferred	2654
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	2654
Motion No. 214	2654

Division on Motion No. 214 deferred	2654
Mr. Young	2654
Motion No. 219	2654
Division on Motion No. 219 deferred	2655
Mr. Young	2655
Motion No. 216	2655
Division on Motion No. 216 deferred	2655
Mr. Young	2655
Motion No. 217	2655
Division on motion No. 217 deferred	2656
Mr. Young	2656
Motion No. 218	2656
Division on Motion No. 218 deferred	2656
Motions Nos. 9, 11 to 16, 19, 26 to 34, 37 to 71, 74, 77 to 79, 82 to 91, 94 to 110, 114 to 127, 129 to 170, 172, 174 to 187, 190, 193 to 199, 202 to 213	2656
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	2656
Division on Motion No. 9 deferred	2660
Division on Motion No. 11 deferred	2660
Division on Motion No. 12 deferred	2660
Division on Motion No. 13 deferred	2660
Division on Motion No. 14 deferred	2661
Division on Motion No. 15 deferred	2661
Division on Motion No. 16 deferred	2661
Division on Motion No. 19 deferred	2661
Division on Motion No. 26 deferred	2661
Division on Motion No. 27 deferred	2661
Division on Motion No. 28 deferred	2662
Division on Motion No. 29 deferred	2662
Division on Motion No. 30 deferred	2662
Division on Motion No. 31 deferred	2662
Division on Motion No. 32 deferred	2662
Division on Motion No. 33 deferred	2662
Division on Motion No. 34 deferred	2663
Division on Motion No. 37 deferred	2663
Division on Motion No. 38 deferred	2663
Division on Motion No. 39 deferred	2663
Division on Motion No. 40 deferred	2663
Division on Motion No. 41 deferred	2663
Division on Motion No. 42 deferred	2664
Division on Motion No. 43 deferred	2664
Division on Motion No. 44 deferred	2664
Division on Motion No. 45 deferred	2664
Division on Motion No. 46 deferred	2664
Division on Motion No. 47 deferred	2664
Division on Motion No. 48 deferred	2665
Division on Motion No. 49 deferred	2665
Division on Motion No. 50 deferred	2665
Division on Motion No. 51 deferred	2665
Division on Motion No. 52 deferred	2665
Division on Motion No. 53 deferred	2665
Division on Motion No. 54 deferred	2666
Division on Motion No. 55 deferred	2666
Division on Motion No. 56 deferred	2666
Division on Motion No. 57 deferred	2666
Division on Motion No. 58 deferred	2666
Division on Motion No. 59 deferred	2666
Division on Motion No. 60 deferred	2667
Division on Motion No. 61 deferred	2667

Division on Motion No. 209 deferred	2688
Division on Motion No. 210 deferred	2688
Division on Motion No. 211 deferred	2688
Division on Motion No. 212 deferred	2689
Division on Motion No. 213 deferred	2689
Motion negated on division: Yeas, 53; Nays, 103	2689
Motions No. 2, 4, 5, 8 negated	2690
Motion No. 6 agreed to on division: Yeas, 104; Nays, 52	2690
Motion No. 7 negated on division: Yeas, 31; Nays, 126	2691
(Motions Nos. 10A, 10, 20, 72, 80, 111, 191 negated.) ..	2692
Motion No. 18 negated on division: Yeas, 23; Nays, 134	2692
Motion No. 17 negated on division: Yeas, 32; Nays 125	2693
Motion No. 36 agreed to on division: Yeas, 127; Nays, 30	2694
Motion No. 171 negated on division: Yeas, 23; Nays, 134	2695
Motion No. 189 negated on division: Yeas, 23; Nays, 135	2696
Motion for concurrence	2697
Mr. Young	2697
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 104; Nays, 55	2697
(Bill concurred in and read the second time.)	2698
Agreement on Internal Trade Implementation Act	
Bill C-19. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading	2698
Mr. Benoit	2698
Mr. Rocheleau	2702
STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS	
SMILE	
Mr. Murphy	2703
Interest Act	
Mr. Frazer	2704
Fisheries	
Mrs. Payne	2704
Hamilton-Shawinigan Sesquicentennial	
Mr. Keyes	2704
Air Safety	
Mr. Asselin	2704
Taxation	
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	2704
Francophones Outside Quebec	
Mr. Duhamel	2705
Mining	
Mr. Stinson	2705
Louis Riel	
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	2705
Temporary Employment	
Mr. Malhi	2706
Bedford Junior High Band	
Mr. Regan	2706
Senator Jack Marshall	
Mr. Byrne	2706

Unemployment Insurance Reform	
Mrs. Lalonde	2706
The Senate	
Mr. Abbott	2706
Mining Industry	
Mr. Adams	2707
Publishing Industry	
Mr. Allmand	2707
Education	
Mr. Collins	2707

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Referendums	
Mr. Gauthier	2707
Mr. Rock	2708
Mr. Gauthier	2708
Mr. Rock	2708
Mr. Gauthier	2708
Mr. Rock	2708
Mr. Bellehumeur	2708
Mr. Massé	2708
Mr. Bellehumeur	2709
Mr. Massé	2709
The Constitution	
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	2709
Mr. Rock	2709
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	2709
Mr. Rock	2709
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	2710
Mr. Massé	2710
Referendums	
Mr. Duceppe	2710
Mr. Massé	2710
Mr. Duceppe	2710
Mr. Massé	2710
Canadian Wheat Board	
Mr. Benoit	2710
Mr. Pickard	2711
Mr. Benoit	2711
Mr. Pickard	2711
Referendums	
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	2711
Mr. Massé	2711
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	2711
Mr. Massé	2711
Fisheries	
Mr. Cummins	2712
Mr. Mifflin	2712
Mr. Cummins	2712
Mr. Mifflin	2712
Referendums	
Mrs. Venne	2712
Mr. Rock	2712
Mrs. Venne	2712
Mr. Rock	2712
Fuel Prices	
Ms. Guarnieri	2712
Mr. Manley	2713

Taxation	
Mr. Strahl	2713
Mr. Mifflin	2713
Mr. Strahl	2713
Mr. Mifflin	2713
Somalia Inquiry	
Mr. Jacob	2713
Mr. Collenette	2713
Mr. Jacob	2714
Mr. Collenette	2714
Mr. Frazer	2714
Mr. Collenette	2714
Mr. Frazer	2714
Mr. Collenette	2714
Hazardous Products	
Mr. Lastewka	2714
Mr. Anderson	2714
Employment Insurance	
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark’s Crossing)	2715
Mr. Young	2715
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	2715

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Zed	2715
Petitions	
Human Rights	
Mr. Duhamel	2715

Mr. Hanrahan	2715
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	2715
Mr. Malhi	2715
The Constitution	
Mr. Valeri	2716
Human Rights	
Ms. Augustine	2716
Wartime Merchant Navy Veterans	
Mrs. Hayes	2716
Impaired Driving	
Mr. Harris	2716
Gasoline Tax	
Mr. Collins	2716
Human Rights	
Mr. Szabo	2716
Taxation	
Mr. Szabo	2716
Labelling of Alcoholic Beverages	
Mr. Szabo	2716
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Zed	2717

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Agreement on Internal Trade Implementation Act	
Bill C-19. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading	2717
Mr. Rocheleau	2717
Mr. Valeri	2717
Division on motion deferred	2719

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

8801320

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canada Communication Group — Publishing

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Groupe Communication Canada — Édition

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from the Canada Communication Group — Publishing, Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, at \$1.75 per copy or \$286 per year.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant au Groupe Communication Canada — Édition, Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada,
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, à 1.75 \$ l'exemplaire ou 286 \$ par année.**