



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 118A • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

• (1000)
[English]

POINTS OF ORDER

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I seek unanimous consent to move:

That the Order of the House of June 8, 1998, respecting motions pursuant to Standing Order 57 and 78(3) be rescinded.

The Speaker: The government House leader has asked for unanimous consent to put a motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

[Translation]

Mr. René Laurin: What is this about, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: My colleague asked a question. For his information, the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons has moved a motion. It reads as follows:

[English]

That the Order of the House of June 8, 1998, respecting motions pursuant to Standing Order 73 and 78(3) be rescinded.

[Translation]

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

• (1005)
[English]

The Speaker: The reason I explained this to the hon. member for Joliette was that he wanted to know what the motion was. However, I had already asked for unanimous consent to put this motion and I heard a “no” from my left. Therefore, the motion cannot be put.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government’s response to 20 petitions.

* * *

[English]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Hon. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to table the report of the parliamentary wing of the United Nations called the Interparliamentary Unions where delegates worked effectively to raise the urgency to commit to the humanitarian clearing of land mines and the removal of same and moved to adopt the needed Ottawa convention.

Therefore, it is my pleasure to table the report of the 99th interparliamentary conference held in Windhoek, Namibia, on April 5 to 11.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure and honour to table today, in both official languages, the third report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food on biotechnology.

Your committee reviewed the issue of biotechnology as it pertains to agriculture and agri-food. As part of the process of renewing the Canadian biotechnology strategy it came up with a number of recommendations which are contained in this report.

The new Canadian biotechnology strategy involves three departments: Industry, Health and Agriculture and Agri-Food. With the explosion of genetically modified products, this strategy will have

Routine Proceedings

to be an ever-changing one which members of parliament will have to respond to.

The committee is also requesting a comprehensive answer to the report from the government pursuant to Standing Order 109.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the committee members from all sides for their work. I also wish to thank the committee staff, especially our research co-ordinator, Sonya Dakers, who will be retiring at the end of the month. This happens to be her last major piece of work after 12 years with the agriculture committee. We all wish her well.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 56(1), and having raised the issue earlier today, I move:

That the Order of the House of June 8, 1998, respecting motions pursuant to Standing Order 57 and 78(3) be rescinded.

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the government House leader is trying to put this motion to the floor this morning, but this is the time for routine motions to be put and this is not a routine motion.

• (1010)

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, to assist the Chair, if I may, I know that the opposition House leader has raised the proposition that this was not, in his view, a routine motion. I draw to your attention Standing Order 67(1)(p) which states:

(p) such other motion, made upon Routine Proceedings, as may be required for the observance of the properties of the House, the maintenance of its authority, the appointment or conduct of its officers, the management of its business, the arrangement of its proceedings, the correctness of its record, the fixing of its sitting days or the time of its meetings or adjournment.

I think this very well covers the fact that indeed this motion is receivable the way it was presented under Standing Order 56(1).

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am very new to this place and I do not profess to be an expert in this, but my understanding is that what happened yesterday was that a substantive motion was passed on the floor of the House and that cannot simply be overturned by a routine motion from the government. There is a procedure that has to be in place. There is notice that has to be given. My understanding is that this cannot happen in the way that the government House leader is trying to put it before the House.

• (1015)

The Speaker: The House leader for the Conservative Party makes a very interesting point, as does the opposition House leader.

I point out to the House that it would be one thing to go with the strict wording of this rule. However a motion was put on February 19, 1998 which perhaps went beyond the scope of the wording and it went through the House. On December 1, 1997 a motion pursuant to Standing Order 56.1(1) was put and it went through the House.

My interpretation of both of those motions is that we cannot pick and choose on the way through. Those two motions went through before and they seemed to go somewhat beyond the scope of the wording, and at that time no one raised a voice of objection.

I am loath to interfere at any time like this. I would rule that because of these other two motions that went through as precedents, I will allow this one to go through. I would strongly urge the committee on procedure to perhaps take this up again and to give direction more clearly to the House and the Speaker. I am going to allow this Standing Order 56.1 to stand.

Mr. Randy White: Mr. Speaker, what happened in this House last night was in effect an order of the House. Now we are going to get into a discussion of the principles of this House of Commons. It is an order of the House. The government cannot just come in here and change an order of the House, something which was passed by this whole House. Otherwise all of the issues we deal with here—

The Speaker: I made a ruling on this issue. Now the House will have a chance to pronounce itself.

An hon. member: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The Speaker: Not on this issue. I have made a ruling.

The question is on the motion. Will those members who object to the motion please rise in their places.

The hon. member on a point of order.

• (1020)

Mr. Ken Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I point out to your attention Standing Order 67:

67.(1) The following motions are debatable:

The Speaker: This motion is not debatable. I repeat, will those members who object to the motion please rise in their places.

And 25 members having risen:

The Speaker: Because there are 25 members standing in their places, this motion is deemed withdrawn.

(Motion withdrawn)

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 27(1), I move:

That, commencing June 10, 1998 and concluding June 23, 1998, the hours of sitting be extended to 4 a.m.

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased actually to debate this motion. Could you tell me, Mr. Speaker, first of all how much time I have?

An hon. member: As long as you want.

Mr. Randy White: Until 4 a.m., right? I have until 4 a.m. Let us start it off.

The Speaker: The hon. opposition House leader wanted some information regarding timing. The entire debate will take two hours and the hon. member has unlimited time.

An hon. member: Take two hours, Randy.

Mr. Randy White: What does a fellow do for two hours in the House of Commons any more?

The need for this motion is obvious to those on this side of the House. We have said continuously in the 35th Parliament and the 36th Parliament that we are sick and tired of standing up in this House expressing the viewpoints of those people we represent across this country to seats that are empty.

Time and time again, we come into this House. We stand here. We try to do what we can for people across this country. We try to get our points across and we stand here and talk to maybe one person who is reading a newspaper who does not have the least bit of interest in what opposition parties say in this country. They are told what to do time and time again by the Prime Minister and the cabinet.

I guess it is time now that we are getting close to the end of June that we have this debate and we extend it as long as we have to.

• (1025)

It is ironic. Here it is the 10th of June today.

An hon. member: The 9th.

Mr. Randy White: Who can tell? It will be the 10th at four in the morning anyway.

Here we are on the 9th of June and the government says “We are going to punish you people. We are going to make you work for a change. We are going to make you come in here until four in the morning”. Well I have news for the government. We do not mind that in the least.

We have a lot of things to talk about in this country. Maybe for a change we will get this government back on issues that are

bothering average everyday grassroots Canadians out there like debt, like spending, like taxes, like problems at the immigration department, like crime, like where is the national victims bill of rights. For instance where is the bill on drunk driving that was committed to by this government in May and which was reneged by this government, that was changed apparently to November 30. Now we understand it is not going to do that either when every party here in opposition agreed with the government for a change.

Now the Liberals say “We have some things on the agenda”—not too much on the agenda I might add—“and we cannot have our own way, so you will have to stay until four in the morning”.

Mr. Speaker, could I have a clarification on the rotational order on this two hour debate? After it goes from me, could you clarify whether it goes to the Liberals or back into opposition?

The Deputy Speaker: That will be a matter to decide depending on who rises to participate in the debate. It is a difficult issue to predict, but I think the hon. member can expect that there would be some movement back and forth. The hon. member has two hours at his disposal if he chooses to use it. That is the maximum length of time for this debate and the question will be put at the end of the two hours.

Mr. Randy White: Mr. Speaker, I needed a little break to confirm something else as well.

Here we are wanting to deal with the estimates today. We understand that the House may possibly not sit next week. We do not know.

I think the overriding issue here is something that the government forgot once again. That is that we are sick and tired of talking to the wall. We have brought this up numerous times. All we ask for in this House in opposition from all parties is just a tad, a little bit of respect. Listen to what we are saying. It may not go through and the government may not buy what we are saying, but at least people listening or people watching CPAC can at least understand that there are two, three, possibly four different positions on any subject in this House.

Without the government sitting on the other side, it is darn difficult to get a decent debate and a decent hearing on any issue. Why is that so hard to understand? With some 150 members over there, why is it so hard for them to understand that all we ask for is quorum in this House? Quorum in the House of Commons. Twenty people, 20 bodies out of 301. Why is that so hard to get? Quorum in any other organization is usually 50% plus one. Yet the government cannot manage to sit enough people across the House and even on some days as yesterday, there is nobody. Do the Liberals understand how people in all the parties across here feel when there is nobody sitting on the other side?

What do we get to do about it? We cannot say there are no members there, that there is no one sitting there. The Speaker does not allow it. Somehow we in opposition have to show the

Routine Proceedings

frustration and that is all. One member over there is counting the heads over here. Quite frankly, there are more opposition members in this House right now than there are Liberals on the other side. Every day is like that and that is fact.

• (1030)

We have drawn the line. Henceforth that will not occur in this House. Henceforth we will be drawing up unanimous consent motions such as this one. Henceforth this government is going to go through the mill on this issue. When it gets lazy again and when it misses its shot at trying to watchdog what is going on over here, it will find we are going to deal with it. I wonder what the people watching this today think.

I heard someone say they have an idiot standing here talking.

Mr. Jason Kenney: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe I heard the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine remark that the House leader of the official opposition is an idiot. I think that is out of order.

The Deputy Speaker: It certainly would be a word the Chair would find offensive. The Chair did not hear the word. If the hon. member said it I am sure she would not want to leave that on the record. I do not know whether the hon. member wishes to clarify the position.

Mrs. Marlene Jennings: Mr. Speaker, it is nice to know that there are people in the House who know which riding I come from.

As to the point of order, Mr. Speaker you are right. I lost my head for a moment, as Reform members often do. I did use a word which was unparliamentary. I called the leader of the House for the official opposition an idiot. My parents did not raise me to call people idiots, so I withdraw the word.

Mr. Randy White: Mr. Speaker, that is really good. There are those who would say I have been called worse than that before.

I guess in parliament it is a little different. They seem to get excited when the opposition over here catches them sleeping. They seem to get excited actually when we bring up an issue near and dear to the heart of most Canadians like what exactly is a democracy. Is a democracy sending parliamentarians to Ottawa to represent their constituents and to stand up here in the House and talk to no one on the other side? Is that what democracy has come to?

I have heard from a number of people this morning already on this issue, not parliamentarians but other people, who said it has been like this for a while. It is going downhill in the House of Commons. The opposition parties get plain frustrated because there is no one on the other side.

I think because we are drawing a line here today it is most appropriate and I think this government is going to hear from all opposition parties very likely that we are just sick and darn tired of this.

I am not going to take any further of my time on this. I know there are other members that want to talk to this. But if I can impress any one thing on this other side, do not take this issue lightly. We did not come here to face the other side with all the seats empty. We are going to make this a very large issue and it is going to cost a lot of time in this House in debate time. It is going to cost a lot of hours and it is all unnecessary. All we ask is the respect of a majority government to sit and listen and debate and consider what we have to say.

This government should understand this. It has very few seats where I come from and we do represent the people where we come from. If it does not have that representation, for instance in the Fraser Valley of British Columbia, I am a part of it.

• (1035)

There is an obligation to listen. There is an obligation to be in this House. We may not like what they have to say across on the other side but just as much as my colleagues from all parties across this side have to sit in here and listen to the things they say.

If this is truly to be a house of democracy then what is really required is a government to pay attention to the people from all regions of this country and listen to what they have to say. Do not ever again empty the seats on the other side or the government will find the next motions before it a lot tougher than this one.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to participate in this debate. Following this rather intense discussion, I immediately wrote a little something for my colleagues from the Reform Party. It reads like this:

[English]

“Everybody loves somebody sometime. Everybody calls for Reform members. Something in your moves just told me your sometime is now”.

The Deputy Speaker: I am sure all hon. members appreciate the hon. member for Quebec East's vocal talents but perhaps they would be better exercised in the lobby.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the House leader for the official opposition for being brief and giving others a chance to speak to this motion because I am sure he must have been tempted to take up the whole two hours but he did not and this will give others an opportunity to speak.

I will speak against the motion and preface my remarks by saying I very much regret that the House has come to this place in

Routine Proceedings

its proceedings. I regret the use of 56(1) whenever it is used and I remember when this particular measure was brought in, I believe in 1991, by the Conservative government at that time. I remember with irony when the House leader of the Conservative Party indicated that he thought this motion was inappropriate at the time. I think this motion is inappropriate at any time.

This motion is what I called it then, sort of the parliamentary ubermenchen clause. This is the clause that means that in the end the government can do anything. I realize it did not succeed in using 56(1) and has now moved to have a much longer process.

A lot of the rules the government has at its disposal are rules it opposed when they were brought in and if we were serious about parliamentary reform we would have a good look at these rules and we would all imagine ourselves some day in opposition. Some of us imagine ourselves in opposition all the time.

Opposition will come to the government as surely as I am standing here, eventually in one form or another. We all have the responsibility to try to imagine what is best for the institution. What is not good for the institution are these motions. But what is also not good for the institution, and I think here is where the Reform Party has done parliament a service by bringing this to a head, is the perpetual absence of government members in the course of debate.

• (1040)

What was common practice in this House for many years is that at least one cabinet minister was present during all debates and perhaps there were two or three ministers and a cadre of government backbenchers. They may not have always liked what opposition members were saying. They may not have always listened carefully and took notes of what opposition members were saying. But they were there. Opposition members had both the perception, some might say the illusion, and the reality of the fact that somebody from time to time was listening.

What I have seen happening in this parliament, and I have raised this with the government House leader on numerous occasions, is that the government has sunk into a form of contempt for parliament. I suppose it comes from a contempt for the opposition, but that is beside the point. That is quite beside the point. We are talking here about a contempt for parliament that is ultimately destructive of this institution and of our democratic values and our democratic way of life. It cannot go on like this.

I know it is not the responsibility of the government House leader technically speaking. It is the responsibility of the whip or in this case the deputy whip because we know that the whip is not able to be on the job these days for medical reasons. But somebody is responsible over there. Overall the government itself is collectively responsible for how it treats parliament. It cannot go on like this.

I think this speaks to a larger problem. It is not just the contempt the government is showing for parliament or for the opposition or for both. It is also a matter of the declining perception of the relevance of the House of Commons to the decision making process in this country. That is something all of us have to deal with and presumably we should try to deal with it in a non-partisan way. To the extent that we deal with it in a partisan way, and I know this is not avoidable at all times but it is certainly more avoidable than is usually the case, to the extent we deal with the powerlessness of parliament and the growing irrelevance of parliament in a partisan way, we simply contribute to its growing irrelevance and powerlessness because we reinforce the stereotype that this is just a place where people fight.

We are all tempted to do that. I think we are all guilty of that each in our own way. So I urge members to try to think their way through the kind of partisanship that sometimes manifests itself on the floor with respect to parliament itself. It is fine to be partisan about issues. There are choices that people have to make between political parties with different perceptions, different policies and different positions. It is all in the course and the nature of democracy that people will be partisan, will be polemical, will be political, will argue with each other. I think that is all fine and dandy in a democratic society but we ought not to be partisan about parliament itself.

I think this is what has happened. It is very regrettable. I hope the Reform Party members see the irony of the fact that they are now, in many respects by virtue of circumstances beyond their control but somewhat within their control, playing exactly the same kind of parliamentary silly games they made a career out of criticizing before they came here. I am sure that must bother them as it bothers me on occasion when I am forced to play these kinds of games.

Sometimes we play them with joy and sometimes we play them with sadness because the government gives us no option. I think the government has created this situation. This morning it had 39 members on the other side—

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My hon. colleague has been saying a lot of things that are exactly true and right.

• (1045)

Most important, he said that we are talking about the Liberal government never being here to hear the debate or to hear the concerns. It operates in an autocratic fashion. My point is that there is not one cabinet minister here to listen to him.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not think that is a valid point of order.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I think the point is well taken even if it is not technically a point of order. It is not factually correct in the sense that the government House leader was at the table. We have one cabinet minister whose job it is to bird-dog this debate. He better not leave in any case.

I say this with the greatest respect to the government House leader. I believe he is as troubled by what is happening on the other side of the House as anybody. He has been here for a while. I have always regarded him as somebody who has a great deal of respect for parliament. He has come up through the ranks over the years. I am sure he is not happy with what happened yesterday, not just for the trite political reasons that it is embarrassing to the government and he now has to go through all this hassle to get the motion that was passed unanimously overtaken by subsequent procedures of the House. I am sure he is unhappy with the fact that this situation could even have been created.

As I started to say before the point of order this morning, when the government needed members for its own purpose there were upwards of 40 members on this side of the House. As soon as they saw they were not needed any more, the place cleared out like it was on fire or something.

Here again we see the government not being willing to even maintain the same percentage of their caucuses that opposition members maintain in the House. If we have 10% or 15% of our caucus here and the government and all other caucuses were to do the same we would have quorum all the time. That would not require very many government members.

We all have committee responsibilities. People cannot hide behind committee responsibilities. We all have to take our share in committees. We all have the problem of having to be in more than one place at one time. It is difficult. I do not think the public appreciates the way the timetable works in the House. Members are supposed to be in the House of Commons, be in committee and be meeting with people. It is not always easy.

I see absolutely no reason the government could not maintain a semblance of the appearance that it is listening. It should have at least one cabinet minister in the House, if not two. I would recommend at least two and its share of quorum, which means over half.

Hopefully we would have more than quorum because in parliament members are supposed to be talking to each other. Even if we do not like what the other person is saying we can get up and argue. I often do not like what the hon. member from Calgary is saying, but I can get up to ask him a question. We can have some kind of exchange.

However what is happening is that we are all seeping away from this place. The collegiality that exists even in conflict in debate is disappearing from this place. People just come in here, do their

thing and take off. This is not good for parliament and it is not good for the country.

Mr. Denis Coderre: You are always here.

Mr. Bill Blaikie: I hear somebody saying I am always here. No, I am not always here. For heaven's sake can the member not listen to these comments as being directed at all of us, no matter what party we come from, as parliamentarians who have a responsibility to this institution? Or, does everything have to be cheapened by the kind of remark I just heard from the hon. member?

I will finish with a word of constructive criticism. I hope it will be taken in the spirit in which it is offered. What we also see in declining relevance of parliament is the culmination or the fruit of a decade of dumping on politicians. We see it not only here, but we see it in legislatures across the country. For a decade people have been told that politicians are bad, they are the worst thing that could ever happen to a society, that the real good things that happen in the country happen elsewhere and that somehow we are all sort of parasites.

• (1050)

Some of my colleagues in the House have arrived in parliament and want to make a go of it. I admire them for that. However, it is an irony that they are trying to make a go of it at a time when the consequences of some of the things they have been a part of are kicking in. I would ask them to think of that as well.

From here on I ask the government to let us see some members over there. Let us have some respect for parliament. That is a responsibility the government has and it has not been executing it. Anything that comes out today from what the Reform Party did last night that helps the government see more clearly and to get its act together will be of benefit to all of us.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I commend the member on his remarks. The House leader of the fourth party is one of the most distinguished parliamentarians in this place. I usually disagree with things he has said, but he is a man dedicated to parliament as an institution and should be recognized as such.

The hon. member has been in this place for some time, nearly two decades or more. Does he think that the current attitude of the government to the business of the House is consistent with the history of this place? Or, is this an increasing problem over time, this disregard of parliament as a place of debate?

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I have just started my 20th year. I think there have been times when we have had complaints about the government's attitude toward parliament, but I cannot remem-

Routine Proceedings

ber a time when the government was not willing to maintain quorum. This is a new development.

We have complained about governments that did not listen, governments that were arrogant, governments that changed the rules in a way that gave government too much power over the opposition, et cetera. There is a long litany of things that have happened over the last 20 years which all in themselves have reduced the power of parliament.

I do not remember a time when the government benches were consistently empty in the way they have been over the last while. This is a new development and something that is greatly to be regretted and greatly to be resisted. In the sense of what is now happening I think it is a good thing.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, like my hon. friend from the western Reform Party I commend the member who previously spoke. The House leader of the NDP obviously has a great history in this place.

He spoke very eloquently to this issue. He spoke to the fact that closure was first brought to the House of Commons by the Conservative Party. Like the NDP, the Conservative Party has been around a long time, a claim that the Reform Party cannot make.

Does the hon. member feel there are times that closure might be a useful tool for parliament, if exercised with discretion, if used by the government, tempered at times, and if used on occasion when the opposition may be misusing or taking up parliamentary time?

I am not suggesting that is what happened in this instance, but I am suggesting there are rules that have to be respected by all members of the House and procedures that have to apply to everybody. If used with fairness and equity those rules can be adhered to and the rule of closure can be used on occasion and used properly.

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to suggest that closure originated with the Conservative Party. Closure in itself goes back in the history of parliament. Certainly I remember that closure was moved during the pipeline debate of the fifties.

• (1055)

I was suggesting that the immediately previous Conservative government brought in the various reforms in 1991, having to do not just with closure but with other ways in which the government could trump various things that the opposition might be able to do. That is the point I was trying to make.

There is a role for time allocation and closure but it should be a very rare thing. The problem is that it is not rare. In previous

parliaments it just grew like Topsy. People get used to this kind of thing so it is not a big deal any more. When the opposition tries to make a big deal out of what is appropriate to make a big deal out of, the media are tired of it and the public is tired of it.

What has happened over the course of many years is that the opposition is eventually weakened in its ability to hold up government legislation, not just procedurally but politically, because people regard the whole debate about closure as a big yawn when they should not but they do.

Sometimes it is appropriate to regard it that way because it is a kind of pro forma battle between government and opposition. People kind of twig on to that and they lose interest. What happens is we throw out the baby with the bathwater on that. Sometimes when it really is important people are not paying attention or they cannot see just how important it is.

One of the things that has happened around this place is that the function of delay has been devalued, again because we have a cult of efficiency in our culture now. We think that everything should happen like a corporate boardroom or some kind of production planning and control mechanism for a factory floor. That is not what parliament is. Parliament, by its very nature, is a parliament, a place where people talk. To the extent that the only kind of talk we now regard as valuable are things that happen on talk shows rather than what happens in parliament there is a very funny thing happening here.

At the same time as our whole culture is obsessed with talk on the radio it has no time or appreciation of the talk that goes on in this place between the people elected to talk about what kind of country is wanted. That might be the subject of some kind of thesis for some student. It is more than I can go into at the moment. I think there is an interesting irony there.

What has happened is that the power of the opposition has been systematically reduced so that we cannot put up the kind of resistance we used to put up to a government measure and then take the political consequences. If we are delaying something and there is not a lot of support for delaying it, sooner or later we will stop delaying it.

We need to stop regarding that as a waste of time. That gives people time to mobilize. It gives the Canadian people time to figure out what is going on. It gives the media time to decide that they are going to cover it. If they only have 48 hours between the time the issue comes up and the time it is resolved, there is no time for any of that to happen. There is no time for process. What we have done here is killed the opportunity for that to happen in many respects.

Some issues drag on and there is time for that. I am not making an absolute categorical statement here, but that is part of the problem. It is not just closure in any of its formal forms. It is the

Routine Proceedings

self-imposed closure we all do on ourselves by saying it does not matter whether we have anything to say in here because nobody is paying any attention anyway, particularly the government. It is not even willing to go through the motions any more. Over time everybody loses heart. When we lose heart we lose the very thing that is absolutely essential for a democratic culture.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have more of a comment to make than a question. I always enjoy listening to the House leader of the NDP. I respect him for his respect for the parliamentary institution we are a part of. I will admit I have only been here for five years so I am still learning. I am still wet behind the ears compared to the member who has just spoken. It is not only my read on history. There are rules by which we govern ourselves in our standing orders and in Beauchesne's. They state that reasonable delaying tactics are acceptable in the House of Commons.

• (1100)

In other words, the government is not right to expect and it should not expect that we make it as efficient as possible over here. It is not within the realm of reason for us to say whatever you want to do at whatever timeframe you give us, we will just have to do it.

I wish government backbenchers, not just cabinet which understandably wants to run it like a business, would realize that the role of all parliamentarians is decreased every time the government brings in time allocation. This is about the 50th time this government has brought in time allocation, although this is not time allocation. The government has brought it in so frequently that the public and even the government backbenchers say I guess that is just the way we have to do it.

It is a shame when people come here with the best of intentions only to find out those intentions cannot be followed through on because no discussion, no debate and no delaying tactics are allowed. The government just says it is its way or—

The Deputy Speaker: The time for questions and comments has expired. I am afraid we have run out of minutes. I did my best to hint to the hon. member that we were doing that but I am afraid the time has expired. Given that this is a two hour debating time, the Chair is going to be relatively strict on that point.

Let me also advise the House that when the hon. member for Langley—Abbotsford rose to speak, the Chair indicated he had unlimited time. In review of the standing order, the Chair was apparently incorrect in making that ruling and we wish to apologize to the House. The ruling should have been that it was a 20 minute speech because the motion is not a government order. It is a motion under routine proceedings. Accordingly, the speech should have been a 20 minute one, subject to questions and comments, and it was not. The Chair wishes to apologize to the House for that error. We did not want to have a bad precedent set by that ruling.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is with some regret that we find ourselves debating this issue but it is obviously a very important one. I am honoured to be following the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona who has a long and storied history in this place. He spoke very eloquently about the changes he has seen during his years in parliament.

I think of former parliamentarians who are watching what is taking place in this place, members like Robert Howie from Fredericton, New Brunswick who have served in this House and all members across the country who look back and occasionally follow the parliamentary channel. They must wonder what is taking place. There is obviously a digression. There is something afoot that seems to be undermining the relevance of parliament.

I strongly suggest that occurrence is a result of a change in attitude, an attitude on behalf of a government that has now been sitting in the government benches for five years and some months. It has decided in its arrogance that it is going to do what it wants to do. That was displayed in the House this morning. After a motion was properly moved and tabled by the opposition, the government decided in its wisdom to come forward and to try to rescind it, simply rescind it without any debate or consultation. It was simply going to run roughshod over the opposition as it has done, as has been its wont in the past months.

The opposition on this side of the House has shown a non-partisan unison by banding together and saying no, we are not going to let that happen. The time has come to draw a line in the sand and say it is not proper that the government is going to do this.

So here we are. Standing Order 56 has been debated. It has been used on a number of occasions in this parliament. It was used in the last parliament as well to stifle the opposition on occasion. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona acknowledge that there is a time and a place when closure can be used, much like the rules of procedure themselves where there is a time for their application. But this was not the time or place for the government to exercise that discretion. It did so in such a way that it displayed an attitude such that the opposition parties felt that was enough.

We are debating this issue when we could perhaps be debating other more important issues.

• (1105)

However, the issues that will arise in this debate are the issues that do govern the House, set the rules of engagement and set how the rules of procedure will be applied. Therefore it is an important debate and I am hoping there will be some lessons learned and some exchange of information and ideas that will perhaps improve the way we choose to apply these rules for the months and years ahead that will bind us in the House.

Routine Proceedings

I think it is high time that the government realized that MPs in the House, whether its own backbenchers or opposition members, are not irrelevant and are not here to be taken for granted by the government.

It was a bit of irony to see the reaction of the government House leader when this occurred, a complete overreaction I would suggest, an attitude of disbelief that the opposition would have the audacity to stand up and oppose what was about to happen.

We have seen occasions where the government had no hesitation whatsoever to applying the whip to its own members. It happened in a very poignant way during the debate on hepatitis C. It was not at all afraid to fill all of the benches on the government side to ensure that every single member was present in the House when it suited its purpose.

However, time and time again opposition parties bring forward issues they feel are of relevance and importance to their constituents, be it in the east, the west, Ontario or Quebec. They want to debate relevant issues to put their voice and the voices of their constituents on the record in parliament and to be heard by the government. There are far too few members on that side of the House. That does not lead to a healthy discourse or to the exchange that should take place in parliament.

As has been referenced by the previous speaker from the New Democratic Party, parliament is supposed to be about speech and about the exchange of ideas, thought and thought provoking debate. The debates that occur in this place should be of interest and importance. I hope Canadians around the country, abroad and those serving overseas who hear about what is taking place in their own Canada should have no more focus than on parliament and on what we say and do in this place.

As well, what we have seen are a lot of shifting priorities on the part of this government. One of the things I viewed with great regret was the use of press conferences on the part of the government as a means to announce shifts in policy and to broadcast the direction in which the government had chosen to go rather than making ministerial statements here in the House, allowing members of parliament to be given the first opportunity to review what the government had chosen to do and allowing members of parliament to perhaps ask relevant questions and discuss the decision the government had made to move in a certain direction.

The Minister of Justice has done that on two occasions within the last number of months. Rather than bring forward new legislation on the Young Offenders Act and talk about the priorities of her department, she chose to hold a press conference and leaked that information to the press before members of the House were given an opportunity to speak on it.

We had a very relevant and lively debate yesterday about the status of parliament as it compares to the judiciary and how some

members of the opposition are feeling that perhaps parliament is losing its relevance when it comes to the making of laws. Again that is a sad reflection on this place when some members in the House actually feel we are becoming that irrelevant, that we are not the supreme court of the land when it comes to the making and passing of legislation.

We must be a House of democracy and a place that is most reflective of the fact that Canadians have entrusted us and have put their faith in us as members of parliament to come to Ottawa, leave behind our homes and the places I am sure each of us would prefer to be, and bring forward their ideas and deal with the problems that do exist out there. There are many problems out there when one looks at the high rates of unemployment, the declining quality of our health care and the problems within our justice system, to name a few.

• (1110)

If Canadians as well as parliamentarians, are feeling that this place is losing its relevance, this is a sad day. One would only hope that we can learn from this debate.

As a result of discussions today and as a result of circumspection and looking back on what has occurred, perhaps the government will not be quite so quick to react in the manner in which it did to inform us that we are now going to be speaking and called on to debate issues until 4 a.m.

As the Leader of the Opposition said, so be it. If that is the way it has to go, we will be here. I know members of the Progressive Conservative Party will be here as they always have been.

We are prepared to be in this House if called on until 4 a.m., until the wee small hours of the morning. We will be here. I give that assurance.

To send a message to the government, I am very pleased that the official opposition has taken this initiative. I think we will see there is a non-partisan tone to what has taken place here.

The purpose of this was to send a message that the opposition matters. I am sure that many members in this House have been questioned, those in opposition. What can one really do as a member of parliament in opposition?

If for no other reason, the message that comes out of today's debate is that there are occasions when we can hold the government accountable. We can say no, that is not the way it should go, it will not run roughshod over the entire opposition with its motions.

That is not a bad message to come from this debate. We certainly know this is a busy place and that people do work. I do not think there is any suggestion that government members as well as opposition members do not have a very busy schedule on the Hill,

Routine Proceedings

the amount of work that goes on in committees, the amount of work required in striking that delicate balance between the obligations of serving one's constituents and the obligations brought on either by a ministry or a critic's portfolio. Those are very important roles and it takes a great deal of time and effort to do the job we are charged with.

There also has to be a shift in attitude. There has to be a conscious change in attitude on behalf of the government when it comes to its arrogance toward the opposition. That has been reflected time and time again in the manner in which the rules of this House have been applied.

We cannot simply acquiesce. In opposition we cannot simply say we are powerless, we accept that we are the opposition and the government has the majority and it can do whatever it pleases. That only goes so far and finally the opposition, as we come to the end of this session, says enough is enough.

I hope the government in its wisdom will review this situation and realize there was an overreaction here that did not have to happen. The role of the opposition here is to hold this government accountable. I am sure that all members on the opposition side take that task very seriously.

If we can somehow improve the influence and perhaps improve the relations we have with this government, again I that is going to be a positive outcome from today's developments. We are also charged with protecting the public interest.

There are some times that government initiates policy that is not perhaps in the best interest of the Canadian people. We certainly should have the opportunity to question it when that occurs.

This has been a healthy debate. This has been an opportunity to perhaps raise the level of intellect, the discourse that should be taking place properly in the House of Commons. Perhaps now we will see the government a little more anxious to call to arms its own members when there is debate occurring in the House, not only for its own purposes but for the purpose of improving generally the way matters proceed in the House of Commons.

We certainly hope the trend spoken of by the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona and other members, the downward spiral of disinterest and the perception of unimportance that might exist out there, will change. We can put a stop to that by showing more mutual respect between government and opposition.

• (1115)

I would certainly hope that we are not going to see a continued trend of righteous indignation on behalf of government members when opposition members decide to stand and question what it is they are doing here in this place.

If that message gets through and if we are not forced to use a tool such as the tool which was used this morning to try to block, outmanoeuvre and outflank the government, perhaps we will not be forced to digress into this type of debate again. Perhaps then and only then will we be able to get on with the discussion of the important issues and the important tasks that we have been given as parliamentarians.

It is a matter of respect and attitude. If we can learn from this, if we can hopefully get past this interlude and move on to the issues that matter most to Canadians and do away with this contentious, non-important attitude that seems to exist on behalf of the government toward opposition members, then I am sure we will all be better off and the level of debate and the type of importance and emphasis that is placed on this parliament will improve.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough for his comments. I always enjoy listening to his comments and as the House leader for the party I know he has a lot of interest in the whole procedural part of parliament.

It is unfortunate when the public looks on and says "I am not sure what is going on. There are a lot of green seats and there are some things flashing on the screen, but I do not know what it is all about".

However, I believe that it is critically important today to discuss the issues of the role of parliament and the role of the opposition parties, collectively, in a properly functioning parliament.

I appreciated the comments that the member brought forward regarding the need to respect this institution and the need for people on all sides of the House, especially the government which holds the big hammer, to understand that there is a role to play. A proper functioning democracy needs an efficient opposition.

The member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough and I spoke to the Cuban delegates together some time ago. We talked about two things. I talked about the role of the opposition. I told them that we think a good government can be made better by an efficient opposition. The opposition is important in making a government more efficient and accountable; not just efficient in the sense of quickly passing legislation, but efficient in the sense of doing the right thing and representing people better. The opposition is required. I made it perfectly clear when I talked to the Cuban representatives that the opposition was important.

The member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough talked about the importance of a free media and its role in a functioning democracy. In other words, there are the people themselves, the voters, the active participants that not only vote but make their feelings known to their politicians, there is the role of the media to actively report not only what is sensational but the meat and potatoes of what goes on in this place, and there is also the role of

the opposition parties. All of that is key to a properly functioning democracy.

What can be more key in that parcel that we are involved in, which is partly media and partly debate, than to have the right to speak to important issues? The public may say "This is just a debate on restricting your ability. They are going to try to wear you out by sitting until 4 o'clock in the morning". The public should know that it is the crux of a democracy to be able to speak out in parliament when we do not agree with something. It is the quintessential essence of parliament to debate, to talk, to be able to get our points across.

This was before my time, but when the pipeline debate came to a head and the government restricted debate, what happened at that time?

• (1120)

The pipeline was one issue. It was a big issue. It was an important issue for the country, but what the subsequent election turned on was the use of closure. Mr. Diefenbaker made proper use of that. He said "It is not just the pipeline, it is the fact that we were not allowed to talk about it". The election turned on that.

In my province of British Columbia, back in Dave Barrett's day, the opposition of the day, which was led by Bill Bennett, made the point that the government was not using the legislature. The legislature was not sitting. The government was bypassing it by using orders in council to pass everything, to spend millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. Bennett went around the province and his rallying cry was "Not a dime without debate". He could not go to the legislature and cry it because it was not sitting. He went out and said to the people of that province "It is not right that the government is bypassing the legislature, bypassing parliament, and running the province by executive order. We need to have public scrutiny. We need to have public debate. We need to have the legislature sit".

That was back in the early seventies. It was such a big issue that he won the next election because the government refused to do its job, which was to sit, to withstand the barrage of media scrutiny, to withstand the scrutiny of the opposition parties who put questions to it and to debate legislation. Because of that the Barrett government fell. It was one of many reasons, but that was the rallying cry leading up to it.

That happened about 25 years ago. In 25 years we have come so far that this government has used closure and time allocation 50 times to restrict debate on routine issues of the day. It just does not want to bother talking about them.

This is not a national pipeline debate. It is just "We don't not like the cut of your jib, so we are going to cut off debate".

Routine Proceedings

Changes are necessary. We had a debate on potential changes to the standing orders. I put forward six or eight ideas that I thought could improve this place to make it more accountable and also to limit the extreme power of the government. I wonder if the house leader of the Conservative Party could detail for us some of his ideas on standing order changes which would make this place function better.

I have dealt with things such as referral before second reading and a lot of other things, but I would be interested to know if there were some specifics that he thinks could improve this place so that the government does not only holds all the cards but play them underhandedly.

Mr. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for that question. As always he brings a great deal of history and a great deal of knowledge to the debate, even though he is a relatively new member to this Chamber. He is not as new as I am, but I always respect and enjoy hearing the hon. member speak.

He has a great depth of knowledge of the history of the Conservative Party of Canada, which leads me to believe that there may come a time when he will be back in the party. I am very encouraged to hear the hon. member speak in such glowing terms of some of the past glories of the Diefenbaker years and the Conservative Party itself.

To turn to the question, he asks specifically about some of the changes that I or the Progressive Conservative Party might like to invoke or to see take place within the standing orders themselves. I have not turned my mind to that, except at this very moment.

One suggestion might be, in terms of the use of this card that has been played, this heavy-handed card of closure or time allocation, that the government within a certain term of parliament would only be allowed to use that card a specified number of times. It could be limited. Perhaps that would address the problem that has been referred to by the hon. member, that it would appear this government uses this measure, this shotgun approach to a mosquito, basically with no discretion. They simply, at a whim, decide that debate has become irrelevant, or a nuisance or a bother and they shut it down.

• (1125)

That might be one suggestion.

But I think, generally, the rules of procedure, obviously, like the law itself, are like a living tree. They have changed over time. They have evolved. The rules of procedure are not necessarily the problem, just as it is with the law. It is their application. It is the tool in the hand of the person that is using it, the old expression being that a poor carpenter blames his tools. The government has, in my opinion, displayed an attitude of arrogance and irreverence toward the opposition. It has misused the rules or the tools of this place.

Routine Proceedings

If there was a change in attitude, a shift in the focus of the government as to its role as juxtaposed to the opposition, and if it had a little more respect for the opposition, I think that would go a long way to improving the way in which this place operates.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is an outcry today.

Last week, we were treated to a marriage between the Bloc Québécois and the Reform Party, and today we have moved on to adultery between the Conservative and Reform parties. Members opposite are all so perfect. It is the Jimmy and Tammy Baker Show.

Now they are telling us how to do our job. These are people who ask questions in the House about India and Pakistan when there is not even a Conservative Party representative on the foreign affairs committee.

These people are so self-righteous, telling us there is nobody in the House, when we know that parliamentarians are also required to work in parliamentary committees.

There is nothing worse than a weak opposition. The opposition is weak because the opposition is weak. Today, we see why. The polls show the Reform Party with only 12% of popular support and the Conservative Party with 15%. The reason we have 55% is because we do our job. They are such a mighty opposition that, when 25 members were asked to rise in the House, there were 13 Progressive Conservatives and only 12 Reformers.

At some point, the ridiculous comments have to stop. Enough of this hypocrisy. I will tell members something about hypocrisy.

There are people in the Reform Party constantly saying that they are looking after important matters. I am on the sports subcommittee, and Reformers were never visible. The only time they showed their faces was when the National League governors were there, or when representatives from the Montreal Expos came to testify, because then there were cameras present. When there is a photo op., when there is a chance to show off, to play a little game, then they are there. But when there is a discussion of important issues, where are they then?

They got all holier than thou about Stornoway, saying it should be turned into a bingo parlour, but now their leader is living there because, as he said, "I have received mail on this, it is shocking. I was forced to move to Stornoway".

Now we see all the nonsense that is going on now with these people—not just the leader of the opposition, but also members of his party and the Conservative Party—trying to cover up. I heard the NDP member commenting on "How dreadful it is, you are not there". He should go see how things are in the foreign affairs and justice committees. To be honest, the only ones doing their job

properly aside from of the Liberals are the Bloc Québécois. They take committee work seriously, the only ones who do.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Denis Coderre: We do not agree on the basic premise, but we will—

[*English*]

Mr. Dick Harris: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sure that the whole House heard the hon. member accuse the Reform Party of a cover-up. I would like him to either explain what he meant or withdraw that comment.

The Deputy Speaker: I think the hon. member is getting into a debate here. On questions and comments perhaps he will be able to elucidate that issue. The hon. member for Bourassa.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Coderre: The truth hurts, Mr. Speaker, but that is perfectly normal. They are trying to pull a fast one. Allow me to point out something. When there is a fight going on, one tries to fight to the finish, to reach a conclusive outcome.

• (1130)

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. member has reached a new low in his reference to the foreign affairs committee.

Everyone knows that the member for Burnaby—Douglas fell off a cliff and has been recuperating from his injuries for the last several months.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is on a point of debate, not a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Coderre: Mr. Speaker, the truth hurts and pressure is building up on the other side. This once again shows the weakness of the arguments from the other side of the House. The opposition wants to sit until four in the morning? I have no problem with that. I have been working hard for 10 years to be a member. I can be here for hours and speak forever.

Opposition members want to raise points of order? Let them do so. I do not see many members from the NDP in the House. I do not see many Conservative members, nor members from the other opposition parties.

If they want to start a war, they better be prepared to fight to the finish. If I am going to be the only person here to take a count in parliamentary committees or in the House, I am prepared to do so. They better be prepared, because if they want to take things

Routine Proceedings

seriously, they will see that if they start a fight, they better be able to win it.

There is nothing more belittling than to see members opposite shooting themselves in the foot and continually telling us that the government did not do anything and does not take the public's interest seriously. It is this government that eliminated the deficit. It is this government that took position—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Ms. Angela Vautour: On the back of the unemployed and the poor.

Mr. Denis Coderre: The other side is whining again. It is this government that put the emphasis on the fight against child poverty. We allocated \$850 million.

Another point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. While it is true that the Liberals balanced the budget, they did it by implementing 37 tax increases.

The Deputy Speaker: It sounds to me we are getting into debates here on phoney points of order. The hon. member for Bourassa has the floor.

Mr. Denis Coderre: Mr. Speaker, it is not the debate that is phoney. It is the members of the opposition who are phoney.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: I think hon. members might allow the member for Bourassa to complete his remarks. I know that what he is saying is clearly provocative. On the other hand it is not a matter of consent.

The hon. member may be provocative in his remarks but with respect, when we have points of order raised that are not points of order, that are phoney points of order and that disrupt a member's speech, we know this on every side, that it causes more difficulty for all members. I urge hon. members to allow the member to complete his remarks.

There is a period for questions and comments at the end when members are encouraged to make comments and ask questions, and argue with the hon. member. I hope that members will take full advantage of the 10 minutes that will be thus afforded.

Mr. Denis Coderre: He is going to cry again.

Mr. Ken Epp: Mr. Speaker, there is a point of order here. The member insists on using language which demeans other members of parliament and that is against the standing orders.

The Deputy Speaker: If the hon. member uses unparliamentary language, I am sure the member for Elk Island will draw it to the

attention of the Chair, if the Chair does not pick up on it himself. The Chair tries to ensure that the words used in debate are within the rules. So far, the Chair has not heard words that are in and of themselves unparliamentary from the hon. member for Bourassa.

Mr. Denis Coderre: There is a short fuse, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

When the truth hurts, this is what happens. Last evening, they tried to pull a fast one on us. This morning, we begin to see the weakness of their arguments and realize that they just wanted to be in the news again.

But Canadians will not be fooled. They realize what is going on and they showed it again last week in the polls. The Liberal Party of Canada has the support of 55% of Canadians, compared to 12% for the Reform Party and 15% for the Conservative Party. Even without a leader, the Conservatives are more popular than the Reformers. This may be why the Reform Party is trying to conclude other sorts of alliances. They committed adultery and gave birth to the NDP. Look at the results.

The people of Bourassa are proud of their Liberal member in this House.

• (1135)

They are proud to see that the Quebec caucus is working like crazy for its people, while the members of the opposition are not taking their role seriously, they whine, they clown around and they put on sombreros in protest against the Senate. Some people here are managing the country and working for the public.

They can make all the fuss they want. They can whine, try to get themselves on camera all they like. People are not going to be fooled. The opposition will never form the government simply because it is again showing itself to be a band of clowns. That is today's reality. Perhaps they will make the evening news today or tomorrow, perhaps they will say all sorts of stupid things—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Denis Coderre: Mr. Speaker, they are getting upset.

[*English*]

Mr. Dick Harris: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Surely, the calling of hon. members in this House a bunch of clowns has to be unparliamentary language. I would ask the member to withdraw that statement.

The Deputy Speaker: With great respect to the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley, I do not believe there is a precedent saying that the expression “a bunch of clowns” is unparliamentary. It is somewhat unrestrained. As your Speaker, at times when I have been in the House I have heard the expression used in relation to different groups. I will not rule it unparliamentary.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

Mr. Denis Coderre: Mr. Speaker, we are beginning to understand them. If the word “clown” is not unparliamentary, I will say it again. I think they are going to create the order of clown, the deform party circus. Mixing the Bloc Quebecois and the Reform Party makes the deform party.

This band of clowns goes in for props. They really like props, but when it comes to basics, to serious business, the reason is clear why the Liberal Party was put in power. It is simply for that. They can make all the fuss they like, trot out their music, wander about in sombreros, make blunders and even try to stick the system—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Denis Coderre: —but people will not be fooled. We have a government to be proud of.

They tried to put one over on us, but the people of Bourassa, like the people in all the ridings that elected Liberal members are proud and are saying “At least you do not go off with the chairs and you do not say stupid things. You are working for the public good”.

I am proud to describe all we have done, including create new jobs and, as was mentioned yesterday, an agreement to clean up the St. Lawrence. In terms of the environment, we have done specific things. In terms of finance, we have shown our mettle, our stature and our knowledge of handling public funds.

The most demeaning thing in politics is to act like a clown. The most demeaning thing in politics is to watch the opposition members fussing about and then to have them say to us “Look, there is no Liberal member in the House”.

When they try to hurt us, they are hurting themselves, because now we can talk about committees, such as the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, the Standing Committee on Finance, the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, and the Standing Committee on Health.

Members want numbers. I will give them numbers. There are five members from the Liberal Party, two from the Reform Party, three from the Bloc Quebecois, one from the New Democratic Party and one from the Conservative Party. Where are the others?

On the Standing Committee on Finance, there are six members from the Liberal Party, one from the Reform Party, none from the Bloc Quebecois, one from the New Democratic Party and one from the Conservative Party.

The Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade has eight members from the Liberal Party, one from the Reform Party, three from the Bloc Quebecois, none from the New Democratic Party and none from the Conservative Party.

As for the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights—and justice is important, although they are still pulling their holier than thou routine here—it has eight members from the Liberal Party, one from the Reform Party, one from the Bloc Quebecois, none from the New Democratic Party and none from the Conservative Party.

[English]

Mr. Dick Harris: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member is going to quote numbers, he should at least quote them accurately. As a matter of fact the Reform Party has three—

The Deputy Speaker: I am afraid disputes as to the accuracy of the hon. member's remarks cannot constitute a point of order. The member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley may want to ask a question or make a comment during the time provided and dispute his figures, but that is a matter for debate.

• (1140)

[Translation]

Mr. Denis Coderre: I continue, Mr. Speaker. We are in no rush. Members of the official opposition want to speak at length. There is no rush, we will take our time. While members opposite are parading around in sombreros and playing the clown, we are working.

The Standing Committee on Health has eight members from the Liberal Party, one from the Reform Party, none from the Bloc Quebecois, one from the NDP, and one from the Conservative Party. Who is doing the work?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Denis Coderre: Who is doing their job? Who is actively looking out for the public's interests? The figures are there. They can all rise in the House and say that they want to debate, that it is terrible, that they have been silenced. The fact is that members must have something to say and when they say it, it must be sensible.

But no, we have this little procedural tussle. When we have an international, local, provincial and regional role to play, and opposition members are not even present on parliamentary committees, we have to wonder.

I am clearly proud to be a member of this party. I am proud to be a member of this government, because we know where the priorities lie. We know where the work needs to be done, and we know that a member's role—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Denis Coderre: They are whining again. Next we know, they will be in tears.

The other day, I heard someone say that backbenchers were unhappy in this place. That is nonsense. Sheer nonsense.

Not only are we happy to be members of this government, but together with this government we participate in taking important stands in the interest of the public, while these anti-francophone people are not interested in anything besides their own little power plays and ensuring that their leader can keep going for another week.

We look after the public interest. We work for the public interest. We, on this side, whether francophones or anglophones, are working for all Canadians and treating everyone on an equal basis.

What am I hearing from the Reform Party? When they are not clowning around in sombreros, what do they do? They put francophones down. They are anti-francophone. We, on the other hand, are taking our responsibilities.

Instead of continually standing up in this House with their petty rhetoric, their hogwash, their whining and their strings of petty points of order, which are even more trivial, they should really shut up, because the more they talk, the more they damage their case.

As a member of the Liberal Party, that suits me just fine; the more they talk, the better we fare in the polls. That is how we had a member elected in British Columbia. There was a reason for that. People are not stupid. While they were clowning around, parading in sombreros, while they were giving us their hogwash, we were working, and the people took notice.

What was the ultimate test? While Reformers were clowning around in sombreros, we demonstrated to the public that we were looking after the best interest of the country and its people properly. Do members want proof? The only time the Reform Party could have demonstrated they were right, we got a Liberal candidate elected in British Columbia. This just goes to show what the real, the ultimate test is, where the public can show how satisfied or dissatisfied it is.

The truth hurts. The facts speak for themselves. I am proud to be a member of this government. People need not worry, we are working. They have tried to lead people to believe that we are not here to do our job. That is b.s., that is not true. We are working.

We do committee work, we work in our ridings, we make announcements left and right, we travel thousands of kilometres to serve the public. We are doing our work in this House. Just because some barnacle comes along two minutes before the adjournment to try to play procedural games, nobody is going to take away the value I attach to this institution.

The more Reformers run down the institution, the more harm they are doing to themselves. If they want to be effective, instead of saying dumb things, instead of playing the clown, going around in sombreros, they should act sensibly and talk sensibly.

It is not a matter of how much time there is for speaking, but one of speaking when one has something to say. This can be done in a restrained and precise manner. The day Reformers figure this out,

Routine Proceedings

they will understand what the role of a real member is. Respecting the institution requires self-respect.

Judging by what I have seen this morning, opposition members ought to be ashamed of themselves. This is not a great day for the institution, because once again, if the opposition is weak, it is because the opposition is weak.

• (1145)

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: As predicted, we have a lot of interest in questions and comments. I suggest we will do this in one minute segments and we will get five in.

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the closing comments were said accurately and succinctly.

We have just witnessed what one speech coach gave to an aspiring speaker. The speech had been developed and the points had been developed reasonably well until very close to the middle of the speech. Then there was a point that really did not relate to the rest of the speech and was not developed very strongly. The coach said to the young aspiring speaker to shout like crazy at that point because the point is weak. That is what we just heard, a shouting diatribe of intemperate railing filled with inaccurate facts and unwarranted attacks on individual members.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Coderre: Mr. Speaker, if the shoe fits, let him wear it. They have been spouting nonsense since the sitting opened this morning. Playing the clown, dancing about in sombreros, none of this is very serious. Members must pay attention. Not only am I speaking out loudly, but my words also have a bite to them. Not only am I proud of my words, they are also inspired by the nonsense and hypocrisy I have seen across the way.

Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC): Mr. Speaker, today in the circus ring we heard the clown speak. He referred to committees and to pride in his party. I would like to point out that we in the Conservative Party number only 20, not 156.

Something happened here yesterday. There was not one member of the government in the House for debate on a motion. That is unbelievable, when there are 156 of them. I am not afraid to bite, and I am not afraid of being bitten back.

The hon. member is proud of his government and of his committees. When I was appointed to the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development, I tabled a motion for examination of the employment insurance reform, which also impacts upon the hon. member's riding. The committee voted it down. Is he proud of that? Just recently, the members of his party voted against compensating some of the victims of hepatitis C. Is he proud of his government for that?

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Denis Coderre: Mr. Speaker, not only am I proud, but I am honoured to be part of this government. If there are only 20 Conservative members and 16 committees, it means one Conservative per committee. If the member is present and does his job, I have no comment.

Why is he whining? He is no clown and he is not wearing a sombrero like the Reform members. But if the options frustrate him, he should perhaps remember that we had the first Liberal majority government in 1993 because we got rid of the Conservatives.

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment and to ask my colleague from Bourassa a question.

I think the hon. member raises some very important points. This is my first term as a member of parliament.

[English]

It is my first mandate as an elected official to the House of Commons. One of the first things I learned here is that the work of a parliamentarian takes place in the House and it also takes place in the committees. The hon. member for Bourassa made an excellent point when he gave out the numbers as to the permanent committees of the House that were sitting this morning and who was actually there. I think the point was very well taken.

• (1150)

When the hon. member says:

[Translation]

“The Reform party is fond of props”, I must say he—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry, but I indicated there would be only a minute for each question and comment.

Mr. Denis Coderre: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague.

I will simply say, as the public has seen and understood today, that, when Reform members spit it lands on their noses. By trying to demean the institution, the Reformers have once again demeaned themselves. After the whole business of the clowns and the sombreros, we were given another circus performance today.

[English]

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have just witnessed the member for Bourassa finish up with a very loud speech, the complete antithesis of speak softly and carry a big stick. Apparently the member for Bourassa believes that if he has nothing to say, to at least say it loudly.

I would also like to point out to the member that if he does not like the fact that the opposition agreed on something unanimously, then the solution to that is very simple. Some members on the

government benches could deny the unanimous consent to things they do not want.

The member railed on and on about all the bad things that we are doing here. I would note again that there are no ministers in the House at this point.

The Deputy Speaker: The latter part of the comment of course the hon. member knows he should not make because it is against the rules.

[Translation]

Mr. Denis Coderre: Mr. Speaker, respect for the institution means respect for the rules. In fact, the last thing he said about who was present and who was not contravened the rules.

[English]

He should be ashamed of himself.

[Translation]

If you sling enough mud, some of it will stick. One thing is sure, I repeat, if they want to do battle, they will have to make sure they can win. They are not going to win in the polls with circuses, clown acts and sombreros.

[English]

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the remarks. Facts do matter. There is one important thing that should be put on the record which is that the Conservative Party has but one member on each committee. When we have one member there, we have 100% of our membership on that committee present. That is a very important fact which should be on the record.

I guess a lot of the members on the government side have chosen not to be in the House to hear the vitriolic, adrenalin driven remarks of the hon. member. I am recalling a phrase my grandfather used to use. To mix metaphors with a big stick here, he used to say that occasionally one could find a good stick of wood in a pile of manure.

One point that was made was that members should do their duty in committee, but they should also do their duty in the House. On balance, I would like to know from the hon. member for Bourassa if he is saying that a member should be at committee when there is important debate going on in the House. We have been in that position a few times when ministers were in committee and important debate was happening here.

[Translation]

Mr. Denis Coderre: Mr. Speaker, first, I want to tell the parliamentary leader of the Progressive Conservative Party that he should talk to his whip, because there are currently no Conservative members on the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights,

Routine Proceedings

and on the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade. They should do their job in that respect.

Mao made this extraordinary statement: "Cow dung is more useful than dogmas. At least it can be used to make fertilizer". This is the reply I could make to him.

Finally, I have always taken part in the debates on substantive issues. You can check if you want. I always have. I do not want to downplay the role of parliamentary committees, because it is at that level that the work is done in the legislative process. This is extremely important, because the legislative process is based on the work done by parliamentary committees.

If the Progressive Conservative Party is not represented on the Standing Committee on Justice, then its members should not ask us questions in the House when they cannot do their job.

In conclusion, I am prepared to take part in a debate, but only when there is one.

• (1155)

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: We will call it quits for questions and comments on this speech at this time. Resuming debate.

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is actually amusing to watch the Liberals' response to the motion put forward by their House leader earlier. The reason we are here today is that the Liberal government was caught in a very visible way last night at a practice it has been doing since the 1993 election when the Liberals were elected as government. That practice has been to continually show utter contempt and disdain for the opposition parties in this House. That has been shown very clearly on an ongoing basis by their lack of presence in the House.

In other words, what the Liberals were saying to the opposition parties as we debated issues that were important to all the people of Canada was that they simply did not care enough to be here. They do not care enough about what we are saying to even show up in the House. This is evidence today. We are debating the Liberals' own motion and there are only three Liberal members in the House.

I know where two of them are. The deputy whip is looking for a safe place to hide today, no doubt. The House leader is out on a massive pout trying to figure out how he can get even with those dastardly Reformers who caught them in the act last night of their utter contempt for this House of Commons and the opposition party.

The hon. member for Bourassa spoke so loudly earlier about the presence of one Reform member at many of the committee hearings. The simple answer to that is that one Reform member can handle six Liberals in debate any time of the week. Mr. Speaker, you will like this. One member of the Reform Party appropriately

handled the entire Liberal government last night. One of us is worth a thousand of them.

The House leader certainly put forward this motion because the Liberals got caught last night. They got caught with no members in the House. Mr. Speaker, as you well know and could probably confirm, this is typical of what we see during debate most times. We see a goodly amount of opposition members while across the way we see no government members. We certainly see no ministers when we are talking about issues. That shows they do not really care about what the people of Canada who are represented by this side of the House have to say.

Mr. Jason Kenney: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Given that on this debate about the absence of government members there is only one government member opposite, I think quorum ought to be called. Could you see if there is a quorum here.

An hon. member: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: I have to do a quorum count. There has been a call for quorum.

And the count having been taken:

The Deputy Speaker: I see a quorum. We will continue with the debate please.

Mr. Dick Harris: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the members who just ran in came to hear the rest of my speech. I thank them for showing up today.

I will address some of the points made by the member for Bourassa where he incorrectly accused the opposition parties for not showing up for committee meetings. He will find out if he looks because it is documented that many times in this session the chairman of the Indian affairs committee could not get a meeting together because not enough members from her own party showed up to make quorum.

• (1200)

Therefore the committee meetings had to be cancelled or delayed. I think it is astonishing that the government itself cannot get enough of its own members to a committee meeting.

This whole thing is about the government's having respect for the opposition, for the points the opposition party has made and I want to talk about two very good examples. There may be some heads hung over there as I remind them of how they have shown their contempt for decisions that were made in this House.

I start with a motion put forward concerning the victims bill of rights. This was brought into the House in the last parliament. It was debated and voted on and it was carried unanimously in this House, that the government would take steps to enact a victims bill of rights. Its own members voted for it. But to this day, and it is

Routine Proceedings

well over a year, there has been absolutely zero done by this government.

This was on a motion passed unanimously in this House two years ago. The government has done nothing to bring it into some sort of legislation. That is a slap in the face to the democracy that is supposed to go on in this House and it is certainly a slap in the face to the millions of Canadians who were supporting in their own way a victims bill of rights, certainly to victims of crime when a government will not deal with a bill that has been passed in this House. Its refusal to deal with that bill was another example of its contempt for the opposition parties and the ideas that we bring forward in this House.

I want to deal with another matter dear to my heart, the Reform supply day motion that called on the government to examine all areas of the Criminal Code that dealt with the crime of impaired driving in order to enhance deterrence and ensure that the penalties for this very serious crime reflected the seriousness of the crime. That motion was debated in the House. It was passed unanimously. A minister of the government made amendments.

He made an amendment that would send it directly to the justice committee and also another amendment that instructed the justice committee to deal with this whole issue and report back to this House with appropriate legislation as a result of its findings by May 15, 1998. There was a mix-up when it was reported in *Journals*. We approached the government and this was cleared up on a Speaker's ruling.

The government has totally disregarded the will of this House. It still has not dealt with that motion. The chairman of the justice committee as I understand, and I wonder how much power chairmen of committees have, has been telling the government that she will not handle this motion. This was a motion that was passed in this House and sent directly to the justice committee with a timeline directive and the justice committee chairman has told the government and this House and all the people in Canada concerned about the serious crime of impaired driving that she simply will not deal with it, notwithstanding what has happened. That is astonishing.

This is another example of the disdain and contempt of this Liberal government that allows her to get away with this. We still do not know when the justice committee is going to deal with the issue of impaired driving in this House. We go on waiting for it to change the Criminal Code to try and stop the epidemic of impaired driving.

• (1205)

Every single day that has been wasted by this Liberal government, statistically four and a half people have been killed in this country by impaired drivers.

In the six or seven months since this motion was passed about 50,000 people have been injured by impaired drivers. The government still refuses to deal with that issue. That is another example of the disdain of this government and the contempt it holds for the opposition parties. It does not understand democracy.

The member opposite who just spoke said that the first thing she learned in this House was the democratic fashion and the way it operates. I suggest that the first thing she learned was to do exactly what her whip told her to do.

Obviously some Liberal members are going to be taken to task for not doing exactly what they were told to do last night, not to mention the deputy whip. I will not dwell on that. She is the one who is really in trouble today.

We in the Reform Party find a lack of attention given to issues we represent. We are a federal party and represent Canadians not only who voted for us in our ridings but across this country from coast to coast. We bring those issues before this House to be dealt with, we trust, by the government in a sensitive and intelligent manner.

We do not come to this House to frivolously debate issues that make no sense. We bring very serious issues to this House only to speak to empty chairs opposite because this government has no interest in showing up for debate unless it has to speak. There might be one.

We can go on and talk about closure and time allocation. Closure is simply put in by this government because it does not want to hear any more. It never wanted to hear from the opposition in the first place and it finally ran out of time on its agenda and so it implements closure.

We are here today because the Liberal government got caught last night doing what it does best, having no interest in the debate in this House. Apparently now the House leader for the government is lashing out at the opposition members and at the Reform Party which caught him by coming to this House like a petulant child and saying "we are going to get you, we are going to sit until 4 a.m."

That is fine with us because maybe now we will get some more time to debate the issues that are important to Canadians. We will be here until 4 a.m. and we welcome the Liberal members to join us en masse to have a good discussion about a lot of the issues that concern Canadians.

I know my time is just about up. Lots of members from the Reform Party are anxious to continue debate on this. I wish the deputy whip well today as she climbs out of her tight spot. I am sure she will.

By the way, we probably will be supporting this motion to extend hours because we think it gives us a lot of good parliamentary time to bring forth the issues that concern Canadians.

• (1210)

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the Reform Party thinks the purpose of a whip is. Is it to be in the House at every single moment to deal with its deleterious and destructive motions? I can assure members that no whip spends every moment in the House of Commons, nor should we.

Speaking of spending time in the House of Commons and who is interested in the issues, the member has the gall today to talk about drunk driving, a resolution of this House, and victims rights and the justice committee and what it is doing about that. While Mothers Against Drunk Driving were at committee this morning talking about exactly both those issues, who was there listening to them? Not the Reform Party which drags its tragedies into the House of Commons and bleeds all over the floor about them, but eight Liberals and one Reformer.

I think people should know there were nine committees meeting this morning. That is nine Liberals on every committee. That is 81 Liberal members in committee listening to groups like Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the International Centre for Human Rights. No, they do not want to sit here in the House listening to these people blathering on time after time and making the same speeches over and over again. They want to be in the committees, doing their work, caring about things like drunk driving, like victims of crime, like human rights. That is where they have been this morning.

There are many times I sit in this House and Liberals as well are speaking to empty benches opposite. We accept that members of parliament have many responsibilities. We do not frankly jump up and criticize them every time they are not here sitting in the House listening to us.

Mr. Dick Harris: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the deputy whip of the Liberal Party got her information. At the justice committee as we speak and as it has been for quite some time now, there have been three Reform members present which 100% of our membership in that committee. But apparently there are only about three Liberals there and that is 33% of their membership of that committee.

Let me tell the hon. deputy whip of the government what the subject is this morning. The subject is victims rights. Surprise, it has taken two years for the Liberals to start talking about victims. This is one of the points I made in my speech. After the motion passed in this House, two years later they decide just maybe we should have a little committee talk about this victims rights issue. With all due respect to the deputy whip, the MADD organization is there to talk about victims rights. It would love to come to the justice committee and talk about impaired driving. But nothing is being done to allow that by this government.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I quote from an article that appeared in the Ottawa *Sun* today in which the government House leader admitted he and his MPs had only themselves to blame: “Randy White is right. I don’t like it that he is right”—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member knows he cannot refer to other hon. member’s by name, even when he is reading. I know that is awkward but I invite the hon. member to comply with the rules in that regard.

Mr. Jim Pankiw: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I was quoting the paper. I did not realize that.

Even the government House leader admits that it is their fault. They made the mistake. Now what they are saying is “because the Liberals screwed up, we are going to penalize the rest of the House and make you guys sit until 4 a.m.”.

The truth is the major blunder made by the Liberals last night is typical and indicative of the level of incompetence they display time and time again not only in the House but in the management of the affairs of operating the government.

I wonder if the member would like to comment on that.

• (1215)

Mr. Dick Harris: Mr. Speaker, it would not take me long to talk about the good management of the government because there is precious little to talk about.

The member is quite right when he talks about the neglect of the Liberal Party in being here to engage in substantive debate. Last night was just another example.

The Liberals are gone now, but the fact is that we had 25 members here to prevent a procedural trick the Liberals tried to pull this morning. That is why we were absent for a short time from the committee meetings, but when the trickery of the Liberal Party and the House leader was exposed and defeated our members diligently went back to the committees where they are now. They are keeping the Liberals accountable for everything they do.

We do not care if it is three to nine on a particular committee. I say once again three Reformers can easily handle nine Liberals on any committee. We could actually bring some back and handle them on committee.

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think we must all subject ourselves to a dose of reality. If anybody in the House believes that one Canadian is interested in our procedural wrangling he or she is totally mistaken, totally out of sorts with what the Canadian people believe and feel.

Routine Proceedings

This is why it is important that instead of procedural wrangling we get back to debating substantive issues. The sooner we do it, the sooner we will be responding to what Canadians elected us to the House to achieve.

Mr. Dick Harris: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the hon. member that it was in fact—

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. minister is quite right so I suggest we seek unanimous consent of the House to have the Liberal motion we are currently debating withdrawn.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not know that the hon. member can ask for consent to withdraw a motion that some other member has put forward. It strikes me as a little irregular. However, is there unanimous consent to withdraw the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: There is no such consent.

Mr. Dick Harris: Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the hon. secretary of state's comments, but I would like to point out very clearly to the Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions who has a long title and does a good job, I am sure, that it was his party that brought forward the motion we are debating right now. He may not know that because I think he just got here.

He accuses our party of procedural wrangling but it was his party that brought the motion forward. His House leader brought in the motion that we are to sit until 4 a.m.

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that just before the two hours are up we are talking about membership in the House and whether or not the Liberals will be attentive and already we find that we do not have quorum in this place. That is truly unfortunate.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to count heads in this place once again after all this debate.

And the count having been taken:

The Deputy Speaker: I see a quorum.

• (1220)

[Translation]

Mr. Jacques Saada (Brossard—La Prairie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is very interesting.

This morning, the hon. member for Bourassa accused the Reformers of not having substance, of not taking part in the debates, of contradicting themselves and of being interested in technical rather than substantive positions.

Of course, this upset them. The Reformers rose and started protesting. They swore that this was not their intention.

Let me give you one example, just one. The Reformers talked about human rights, about democracy. Barely two weeks ago, we led a mission that went to Chiapas to look at the situation of human rights, democracy and people whose lives are threatened. No Reformers accompanied us, because of a decision made by their own party. They are not interested in protecting the interests of people or democracy. They are not interested in fighting poverty. They are only interested in debates of a technical nature.

[English]

Mr. Dick Harris: Mr. Speaker, talking about human rights in response to that nonsense, I only need to say that if the Liberal government cared so much about human rights why was it so anxious to jump in and sell a bunch of Candu reactors to the country of China without first discussing human rights with that country?

The Deputy Speaker: It being 12.21 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 27(2) it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House.

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 yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1250)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 191)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Anders
Assad
Augustine
Bailey

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anderson
Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker

Bakopanos
 Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Bevilacqua
 Blondin-Andrew
 Bonwick
 Boudria
 Brison
 Bryden
 Byrne
 Cadman
 Cannis
 Carroll
 Casson
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Chatters
 Coderre
 Colletette
 Copps
 Cummins
 De Villiers
 Doyle
 Drouin
 Duhamel
 Earle
 Eggleton
 Finestone
 Folco
 Forseth
 Gagliano
 Gilmour
 Goodale
 Gray (Windsor West)
 Grose
 Harb
 Hart
 Harvey
 Hill (MacLeod)
 Hubbard
 Jackson
 Jennings
 Jones
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keyes
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Konrad
 Lastewka
 Lee
 Lincoln
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Maloney
 Manning
 Mark
 Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
 Mayfield
 McDonough
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McNally
 McWhinney
 Mifflin
 Minna
 Muise
 Myers
 Nystrom
 Pagtakhan
 Paradis
 Patry
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Kent—Essex)
 Power
 Price
 Proud
 Ramsay
 Reed
 Richardson
 Ritz
 Rock
 Schmidt
 Scott (Skeena)
 Shepherd
 Speller
 Steckle
 Stinson
 St-Julien

Barnes
 Bélair
 Bellemare
 Benoit
 Bertrand
 Blaikie
 Bonin
 Borotsik
 Bradshaw
 Brown
 Bulte
 Caccia
 Calder
 Caplan
 Casey
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Clouthier
 Cohen
 Comuzzi
 Cullen
 Desjarlais
 Dion
 Dromisky
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Duncan
 Easter
 Elley
 Finlay
 Fontana
 Fry
 Gallaway
 Godfrey
 Graham
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Guarnieri
 Harris
 Harvard
 Herron
 Hilstrom
 Iftody
 Jaffer
 Johnston
 Jordan
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
 Knutson
 Kraft Sloan
 Lavigne
 Leung
 Lunn
 Mahoney
 Manley
 Marchi
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Matthews
 McCormick
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 McTeague
 Meredith
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Morrison
 Murray
 Nault
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Pankiw
 Parrish
 Penson
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Pratt
 Proctor
 Provenzano
 Redman
 Reynolds
 Riis
 Robillard
 Saada
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Serré
 Solomon
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Brant)
 St-Jacques

Stoffer
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Thompson (Wild Rose)
 Ur
 Vautour
 Volpe
 Wayne
 White (North Vancouver)
 Wood—206

Routine Proceedings

Strahl
 Telegdi
 Thompson (Charlotte)
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Vellacott
 Wasylcia-Leis
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)
 Williams

NAYS

Members

Alarie
 Bellehumeur
 Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
 Bigras
 Dalphond-Guiral
 Debien
 Dubé (Lévis)
 Dumas
 Gagnon
 Girard-Bujold
 Guay
 Marceau
 Ménard
 Plamondon
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
 Bergeron
 Brien
 de Savoye
 Desrochers
 Duceppe
 Epp
 Gauthier
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 Laurin
 Marchand
 Mercier
 Sauvageau
 Venne—29

PAIRED MEMBERS

*nil/aucun

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

MARRIAGE

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured today to stand in the House to present a number of petitions signed by people mostly from the wonderful riding of Elk Island. I represent them in the issue of the definition of marriage. There is a petition circulating now by people who are concerned about the redefinition of marriage. These petitioners simply ask that we leave it the way it is, that it be defined as a marriage to be entered into only by a single male and a single female.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions on another subject.

These petitioners ask that the House of Commons preserve the right of families to exercise caring, loving discipline to their children and that right not be removed by the removal of section 43 of the Criminal Code.

Supply

MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present a petition on behalf of my constituents pursuant to Standing Order 36.

The petitioners, mainly from Kamloops, Winnipeg, Kitchener and Guelph point out the concern they have regarding the MAI. They are aware that the government simply set it aside until later this fall in an attempt once again to impose this agreement on the people of Canada and eliminate much of our sovereignty. They point out that they are simply against the MAI and urge the government not to consider it any further.

• (1255)

PENSIONS

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in another petition, the petitioners are concerned about the changes the government is planning to the pension system of Canada. They say that Canadians have worked hard over the years to build our country. In no way should they have their pensions clawed back as the present system does and particularly as the proposals have it. They are simply against any of the suggestions so far regarding changes and amendments to the Canada pension system.

TAXATION

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in this petition, the petitioners are concerned about the unfair tax system that presently exists in Canada and are urging a complete study of fair tax reform. They are suggesting that every corporate tax exemption be considered on its merits. They assume that none of them have any merit that would withstand a fair evaluation. Therefore, they are anticipating that we will simply do away with all corporate tax loopholes.

MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I too have a great many petitions to present concerning the multilateral agreement on investment.

This is an agreement that was to be concluded in October but was not. A great many Canadians are happy about that. However, they want the government to go further than simply not arriving at an agreement in October. They want parliament to reject the current framework of the MAI negotiations. They want the government to seek an entirely different agreement by which the world might achieve a rules based global trading regime but one that protects workers, the environment and the ability of governments to act in the public interest.

I have many such petitions rolling in from all across the country. It shows that Canadians are urging the government to take a more critical attitude toward the current globalization model and seek a

different way of forming a global community, that is to say, forming a global community and not just a global marketplace.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, similar to the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona, I also have a petition that touches on the subject of the MAI and the manner in which the Canadian government has negotiated or attempted to negotiate this agreement behind closed doors.

This petition calls upon the government to have more open participatory discussions in the public forum that are transparent. They urge the government to do so forthwith.

I am very honoured to table this petition on behalf of the constituents of Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough and do so pursuant to Standing Order 36.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I just want to rise quickly and pose the question that I have posed on numerous occasions here in the House with respect to Question No. 21 that languishes further on the Order Paper, eight months and counting. We are very anxious to have this question answered.

It is a very straightforward question but we have been told time and time again that it involves a great deal of investigatory work on behalf of the government. There are 30 departments and we want to know where ministers were at a certain set period of time. Perhaps we could get an indication from the parliamentary secretary when an answer will be coming.

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary to the House leader is presently chairing a committee meeting and I will bring this submission to his attention at the first opportunity.

The Deputy Speaker: Shall all questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

MAIN ESTIMATES, 1998-99

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, laid upon the table on Thursday, May 28, 1998, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: Since today is the final allotted day for the supply period ending June 23, 1998, the House will go through the usual procedures to consider and dispose of the supply bills.

In view of recent practices, do hon. members agree that the bills be distributed now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I just need some clarification. We just passed a motion that the hours would be extended to 4.00 a.m. as of June 10. As it will turn into June 10 at midnight tonight, I was just wondering if the House is sitting tonight voting or whatever we may be doing at midnight, does the order kick in at that time and we will be sitting until 4.00 a.m. Is that correct?

• (1300)

The Deputy Speaker: It is reasonable to conclude that the order brought by the government House leader, which was voted on a few minutes ago, applies to the sitting days starting on June 10. Since the sitting will commence tomorrow afternoon at 2 p.m., I assume it is the one that will be extended until 4 a.m. and it is not anything that might happen this evening.

When we conclude the business of supply and the other deferred divisions this evening, I think the House will adjourn at whatever time that might be and not sit until 4 a.m. That would certainly be the Chair's interpretation of the situation.

I believe the standing orders provide that the extended sittings start tomorrow night. Tonight is not an extended sitting except by reason of the fact that we have a final supply day.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—JUSTICE

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$193,805,000, under JUSTICE—Department—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is an important day. Today the House will consider the motion to concur in the main estimates for the current fiscal year.

Members of the House will approve all spending of the government and will debate the main estimates for 1998-99. We also have before us 50 motions in opposition to specific items contained within these estimates. Consequently the government has a similar number of motions on the table to reinstate opposed items. We will debate the first opposed motion presented by the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough under the justice department

Supply

for operating expenditures in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999.

We have licked the deficit monster. We have looked it in the eye and we have met the challenge. We have put the programs in place to fight the monster and we have slain the monster. Four years ago few if any could have imagined the success we have achieved. Since the tabling of our fifth budget the fiscal achievements are still making news not only across this great country of ours but also beyond our borders. For the first time in 30 years the federal budget will be balanced this fiscal year. That is a reduction of \$42 billion in just four years.

Along with the U.S. we are the only G-7 nation to balance its budget. Using the accounting standards of the United States we registered a surplus last year and a surplus of \$12 billion is projected for this year, easily the best record in the G-7 nations. We will balance our budget next year and the year after. This will mark the first time in nearly half a century that Canada has three consecutive balanced budgets.

Put simply, we are at the start of a new fiscal era. As the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have said repeatedly, this success story is due to the will, the forbearance and the patience of all Canadians.

In our efforts to restore the health of our nation's finances we have pursued a balanced approach, reducing the deficit steadily step by step while undertaking within our limited resources strategic investments to build a strong economy and a secure society. We will continue to follow the balanced approach of sound economic and financial management. It is an approach that works.

Looking back only four short years ago the financial markets considered Canada to an economic disaster in the making. We were lumped with every troubled economy in the world. *The Wall Street Journal* called Canada an honorary member of the third world. Canadians did not need *The Wall Street Journal* to convince them. They knew we needed a fundamental change.

• (1305)

Canadians were prepared to take the harsh medicine necessary to restore Canada's fiscal health. With this firm commitment we reduced government spending and encouraged economic growth without increasing personal income tax rates. We cut \$14 billion from federal program spending. In fact we were the only country in the G-7 to actually reduce spending in absolute terms. I emphasize that we have cut more in our own backyard than in transfers to the provinces.

Between 1993-94 and 1999 to the year 2000 transfers to the provinces will have dropped by 5.3% compared to a decline of 8.7% in direct federal spending. The result is a leaner and more cost effective federal government. In fact as a share of the economy Government of Canada spending is headed back to where it was in

Supply

the post-war era of the 1940s. Program spending to GDP fell from 16.6% in 1993-94 to 12.4% in 1997-98, a decline of 4.2%. We will never go back to overspending.

In 1999-2000 we project federal program spending will be down to 11.5% of the GDP, a drop of nearly 8% from a peak of over 19% during the mid-1980s.

More Canadians are now working. More Canadians are now paying taxes. More Canadians are now buying goods and services which in turn means higher sales tax revenues and increased corporate tax revenues reflecting higher profits. That is what a healthy Canadian economic growth is all about: more jobs, more sales, more production and a larger economic pie. All of that is good news for Canadians.

Our economy has improved thanks to our sound fiscal policies and our will to put our fiscal house in order. Thus now is not the time to relax and rest on our laurels. We now have to reduce the debt burden. The truth is that while we have won the battle of deficit we have not yet won the war on the debt burden. That is why we will stay on course.

We will take the same systematic determined approach to the debt that we successfully took against the deficit. Step by step, year by year, we will steadily reduce the debt and we will continue to present fiscal plans based on prudent economic planning and assumptions.

In the mid-1980s the government spent \$1.20 on programs for every dollar of revenues collected. This year, given our large debt and cost of servicing, 72 cents of every revenue dollar collected will be spent on programs.

Notwithstanding our high debt and the need to service it, the government recognizes that the tax burden on Canadians is too high. It must and will be reduced. In each of our previous budgets we have introduced targeted tax relief measures for those most in need and where the payoff is the greatest. Now that the government will be balancing its books we have also begun to provide general tax relief starting with low and middle income Canadians.

The 1998 budget eliminated in its entirety 3% of general surtax on those whose incomes were approximately \$50,000 and reduced it for those with incomes of up to \$65,000. We have also added \$500 to the amount that low income Canadians can earn tax free.

While these measures are necessarily modest for now they are significant. In fact over the next three years the measures announced in the 1998 budget will provide some \$7 billion worth of cumulative tax relief for Canadians. Ninety per cent of all taxpayers will get some degree of personal tax relief from the 1998 budget. Thirteen million filers will no longer pay any federal surtax and another one million will pay significantly less surtax.

Four hundred thousand low income Canadians will be taken off the income tax rolls entirely.

• (1310)

Furthermore, as the Minister of Finance clearly stated, when financial resources permit we will broaden and deepen tax relief. In addition, to build a stronger economy the government's approaches entail investing in areas critical to our long term economic performance and to the achievement of our social goals. To do otherwise would be short-sighted and bad economics.

While the government recognizes that the private sector is the engine of job creation, we also believe the government has an important role to play in the economy. That is why we chose to invest in access to education, in skills, in low income families with children and in health care in the 1998 budget.

The centrepiece of this effort is the Canadian opportunities strategy. The strategy is a co-ordinated set of measures to provide greater and more affordable access to the knowledge and skills needed to help Canadians succeed in the 21st century. We want to ensure that we have the best educated and most skilled labour force in the world.

To that end the strategy increases access to post-secondary education through scholarship, grants and loan relief. It makes it easier for adults to return to school and helps parents save for their children's education. Our balanced approach to investing the fiscal dividend for the long term benefit of Canadians will ensure that we will build a stronger economy and a more secure society at the same time.

The measures we introduced in the 1998 budget are carefully targeted and matched to our ability to pay. They are a measure of our fiscal success. Also fuelled by our fiscal success the Canadian economy is showing significant strength. In 1997 the economy grew by 3.8%, our best performance since 1994. It was also the best performance of the G-7.

When the government came into office in 1993 Canada was caught in a vicious circle. Today we have set in place a virtuous circle that has made Canada an attractive place to do business, to invest, to produce goods and services, and to conduct research and development.

Job creation is up sharply. Over one million jobs have been created since 1993, 372,000 jobs in 1997 alone. The unemployment rate is now 8.4%, the lowest level since September 1990, down from 11.2% in 1993. While the level is not satisfactory the improving trend is clear. Long term interest rates are at their lowest levels in about 30 years and our inflation rate is one of the lowest in the world.

Supply

Our determination to keep it that way is illustrated by the fact that the government and the Bank of Canada announced in the budget that we were extending the current inflation control targets of 1% to 3% until the year 2001.

Looking ahead, both the IMF and the OECD expect Canada to lead the G-7 in economic and employment growth this year. The good news is that we have reached a major milestone in our path of fiscal and economic health. The best news is that we have natural resources, the economic resources and, most important, the human resources to build an economy that has durable strength and a society that has security second to none in the world.

Canada will enter the new millennium with a healthy economy and Canadians can count on us to stay on track with sound fiscal policies.

• (1315)

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member.

He spoke of his government's accomplishments. He spoke of the fact that the budget has now been balanced. He mentioned that the unemployment rate is now coming down. These are all positive things and Canadians should be pleased with them.

However, I wonder if the hon. member will acknowledge and recognize that it was the previous Conservative government that implemented many of the very important economic policies, like the free trade agreement and the much hated and maligned GST, and for those brave initiatives there was a great electoral price to pay.

Will the hon. member not acknowledge that it was those policies, which were adopted and expanded by his government, that really share much of the credit for what he would have us believe is his government's initiative?

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson: Madam Speaker, most people in this House would know me as one who does not get involved in idle partisan debate and discussion.

There is no question that one administration leads into another. There is no question that it does not matter which party is elected to form the government, they all do some things right.

However, I must say that the political will was not there in the last government. In fact, what Mr. Mulroney said and what he did were two different things.

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have listened very intently to my colleague's comments from across the way. He talked about the budget being balanced, that it was accomplished in four years' time and that the overall growth of the GDP in Canada has been some 3.5%.

In the 1993 election I recall that the Reform Party came out with a plan which we called our zero in three plan. We said that under our administration we could balance the budget in three years' time. We projected a growth of 3.5% in the economy. I remember very distinctly a lot of literature coming from the Liberal camp, and from my Liberal opponent, which said that it was impossible to balance the budget in three years. It was not even desirable to balance the budget. They also said that 2% of GDP was an acceptable level of deficit for any country. It was, after all, referred to as the United States' target of 2% of GDP which would have Canada's deficit at something like \$14 billion or \$20 billion per year.

I am quite amazed that in three or four years' time the Liberal philosophy has changed so much. I would ask the hon. member if he concurs that some of the change in the Liberal philosophy came about as a direct result of the platform put forth by the Reform Party in 1993.

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson: Madam Speaker, I thank the member for his question, but the answer is no.

What we have on this side of the House is a good management team. We have reviewed all of the departments. We have the ability and the will. Political will was lacking in the previous government.

I am not sure of the Reform Party and its political platform. I am sure its members had some projected statistics. But part of what it was going to do was to cut our social programs. It was going to privatize health care. It was going to reduce transfers to all of the provinces.

We have used a balanced approach. People of Canada have judged us. They have given us a second mandate. They recognize that we are doing a good job. We are investing in people. We understand the dynamics of a good economy, an educated and a healthy population, and we will continue to work in that direction.

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my colleague from Bruce—Grey may not like to indulge in partisan comments, but I do not have any such reticence.

I sat through the five years of the Mulroney government that the Conservative House leader referred to. I sat through five budgets where programs were cut and slashed, all in the name of reducing the deficit. However, the deficit kept going up and up. The amount of money that Canadians were paying on interest kept escalating and escalating. They talked a good game, but they really did not do a lot.

• (1320)

I sat through five years of unemployment that rose to over 11% and then heard the leader of the Conservative Party in the election campaign of 1993 saying that it would be well over that until after the end of the century. Now it is down to about 8%.

Supply

I saw all those years of high interest rates, high inflation and all those things that dampened business and economic recovery. I have seen a total change in those things since the Liberal government was elected.

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson: Madam Speaker, I thank the deputy whip for her comments. The hon. member has been here a long time and she witnessed a government that operated much differently than ours does. We are glad to have her on our side.

I know the member personally. I know her useful experience, which is on track with mine. People like her are very important for our government, as is the job that she conducts in this House.

Yes, I agree with my colleague when she says that the last government really was not a good manager.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Madam Speaker, I find it rather interesting that the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board would suggest in his comments a term called political will.

He talked about the wonderful economy that we have now.

There are three things that the Mulroney government put into place. One was the GST. The second was the low interest rate policy that we had in 1991, which was based on the low inflation rate policy of the Governor of the Bank of Canada. The third was the NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement.

I ask the hon. member, did it not take political will to implement all three of those particular policies? Why does this government not have the political will that he speaks of to scrap the GST, as was mentioned in the red book, to rip up the NAFTA agreement and in fact to go back to a high interest rate policy with higher inflation than we have right now?

Perhaps the hon. member would like to tell me where the political will of this government is with respect to those issues.

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson: Madam Speaker, the government looked at 17 different ways to find another accommodation and it found that a progressive tax like the GST was still required. It generated some \$17 billion.

An hon. member: Why did you promise it?

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson: Madam Speaker, as far as I know, we said we would look for a way to change the GST. We did look. There were 17 different things that we looked at and we came back to the same accommodation that the Europeans are using as well as everybody else.

We are running a good government. Last year, for instance, we paid down the foreign debt by \$14 billion. This is a government that is very responsible, that walks the talk, that understands how to

govern with a balanced approach. Slowly and surely we are refining government so that Canadians can prepare for the 21st century.

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I do not think we should let inaccuracies go unchallenged. I want to suggest to the hon. parliamentary secretary that there is no place that he will find in the Reform Party platform or philosophy where we are in favour of privatizing the medicare system of this country.

In fact, it is not the Reform Party that has gutted the health care system of this country, it is the hon. members across the way who have not been able to prioritize their spending to make sure that things like health and education are taken care of for average Canadians in this country. It is this government that has done that. It is this government that has gutted the health care system in this country on the backs of the taxpayers. It is not right for him to suggest that the Reform Party was going to do something that it has not done.

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson: Madam Speaker, in my estimation and on this side of the House, health care is one of the most important pillars of this country. There is no question. All we have to do is look at the way Reform approaches problem solving and we will find that the object is to privatize it, give it to the people with money so they can make money out of it.

• (1325)

However, I say that health care, the pocket book and the ability to pay by cheque is not the way to go for Canadians.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to have an opportunity to take part in this debate which focuses on the expenses and the priorities of the government. Particularly in this portion of the debate we are looking at the Department of Justice and the priorities that have been set by the minister and this government as they relate to justice.

Since the Minister of Justice appeared before the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights and did so only for a couple of hours, it is important that we have an opportunity now for a more open and transparent debate where we can exchange ideas and perhaps explain or at least go to some lengths to let the taxpayers know where their money is going as it relates to this very important department and perhaps even give some useful suggestions as to how we in opposition, and the Progressive Conservative Party in particular, would suggest that some of this money should be spent.

One of the very important initiatives that we have seen is the presentation of a DNA databank. This is without a doubt perhaps one of the most important crime fighting tools that we will ever see in the life of this parliament, if not in the life of many previous parliaments.

Supply

What it is aimed at specifically is using technology to combat crime. What we are talking about here is very violent crime, crimes of a sexual nature, crimes of violence that involve the most heinous invasion of a person's well-being.

If we are truly to take advantage of this particular piece of legislation, one would hope that the police would be given the opportunity to optimize the use of DNA; that is, that they would be able to take the DNA from a suspect at an appropriate time when a certain criteria has been met, namely, that enough evidence exists within the police officers' investigation to lay a charge, and when that does happen, when that particular bar has been crossed, the police will then be given the opportunity to take a DNA sample and use it in an investigation, use it perhaps to compare it to samples from crime scenes that had been taken previously. If a match occurs, then a very important link has been made to an accused individual and a crime. Due process, of course, will allow for the presumption of innocence, if it exists, to prevail.

This is an important piece of legislation that in its present form has come before the House and is flawed. There was an attempt made by members of the opposition on the justice committee to remedy that. We moved what I considered to be useful amendments. Unfortunately, and to the detriment of this legislation, the government chose to vote those amendments down.

I would suggest that this can be changed. This could be fixed quite simply by the initiative of the House.

There are other areas which are quite similar to this where the government could invest money, such as improving the Canadian police investigative computer system, the CPIC system, which police officers routinely use to track or to update themselves on the criminal involvement of suspects and those involved in committing offences against Canadians.

The violent crime linkage analysis system is another very useful system that, with the proper use of the police, could go to great lengths to help fight crime.

The government, however, has chosen not to touch that. It has chosen not to invest or to put the necessary resources and funding into these areas. Again, I really question the wisdom of that. The government, by doing so, is showing that it has no interest in optimizing this cutting edge technology that would, and I suggest could, prevent and, equally important, solve existing crimes.

I only use this example to emphasize this point. There are over 600 unsolved murders in the province of British Columbia alone. The statistics across the country would be even more disturbing and more staggering.

This is one area where the government could emphasize the necessity of putting resources into a specific area of technology and helping the police with this important crime fighting tool.

Another general area that I would refer to the House is the fact that the provinces themselves should receive greater funding, greater assistance in the administration of our federal laws. The Young Offenders Act is a prime example.

• (1330)

The federal government traditionally has been called upon and is legislated to supply or pay 50% of the cost of administering this federal act called the Young Offenders Act. In truth what is happening here is it is paying only on average 30% of the administrative costs of the Young Offenders Act.

There has been downloading of the majority of the cost to the provinces since 1994, and since 1994 we have seen a slashing of over \$6 billion from transfer payments. Those cuts have hurt not only justice but certainly in a broad sweeping fashion health care. The hon. member from the Reform Party spoke of the cuts to education. It cut the absolute basic necessities of Canadians.

This downloading on to the provinces and subsequently on to the municipalities can only serve to further undermine the justice system, the health care system, the education system and take away the provinces' ability to administer necessities to Canadians.

Is the federal government prepared to put its money where its mouth is? We have heard numerous announcements and those announcements, most traditionally in the area of justice, come outside of this Chamber. They are either leaked to the media or the government chooses to have a press conference as opposed to a ministerial statement of policy in the House. I certainly question the wisdom of that.

Is the minister really prepared to pony up and pay the provinces and ensure that the provinces have these resources to administer changes that she has initiated, changes she spoke of in her youth policy initiative? She has indicated she wishes to scrap the Young Offenders Act entirely, to throw it out, the baby with the bathwater approach. One questions the wisdom of that.

There is absolutely no doubt in anyone's mind that the Young Offenders Act requires changes. It requires significant changes such as lowering the age of accountability, bringing the parents into the system so that they too will be accountable and will be asked the hard questions as to what their role has been in supervising their child when that individual might be out committing an offence, or changing the Young Offenders Act where the emphasis is placed on prevention.

I know the Minister of Justice has contemplated these changes. She has spoken of them at length. She has given great master's thesis presentations on what she would like to see happening within the justice system, but what we see lacking throughout these entire machinations and the process that we see when the minister makes these announcements are any of the hard figures, any of the

Supply

concrete amounts, the dollar amounts that would be required to bring about this change.

The Young Offenders Act is just one of many changes that the government has spoken of, has taken the initiative to raise the consciousness of Canadians about and yet we are waiting and the clock is ticking. We see it time and time again where the government says it is going to do something and then when pressed on the issue or asked when we will see some legislation tabled in the House, the response has become a patented response. It has become the rallying cry of this government, in a timely fashion it will happen. There is a process that we must go through.

I certainly can respect that there is a process but as with health, as with education, when the time is rolling by, when the necessary changes that could have a positive impact are delayed, the result can be catastrophic. It is tantamount to not giving treatment in health care. One only has to look at some of the terrible examples of individuals suffering from afflictions like hepatitis, like cancer, and if the treatment is not administered the results can be death and injury.

That is equally true within our justice system. If there are preventive steps that can be taken, if there are measures that can be implemented that will improve the system, help prevent crime and help solve crimes that continue to be outstanding on the police record, if we can do something about it, why shouldn't we? Put aside partisan politics and move as quickly as possible to see that those legislative initiatives are taken.

On this side of the House, and I can only speak for the Progressive Conservative Party, if we saw that happening, if we saw positive changes like the DNA bill in its perfect form coming through this House, we would jump to our feet to support that. There would be no hesitation on our part to see those things happening.

Although the minister's policies look good on paper and certainly make for good press, we question their timeliness.

• (1335)

Another suggestion we have with respect to the Young Offenders Act would be to provide judges with more powers to provide or impose mandatory treatment or therapy when a youth embarks on a troubled career or the wrong path, and have that early intervention.

Further, the concept of restorative justice has become very prevalent in the discussions around young persons and actually more broadly within the justice system itself. Once more there has been a great deal of talk about what the government would like to do in this area but we have not seen anything concrete develop. We have not seen it materialize as yet. Restorative justice is something

that certainly would be a positive initiative. It would be something I believe the government would receive a great many accolades over if it were to actually invoke that type of legislation.

I will mention one other area I spoke of previously, further parental responsibility, involving the parents in the justice system where they would more fully appreciate the consequences of their children's actions. They, for lack of better words, would be called to task as to why their children were permitted to be out after a certain hour of the night, perhaps breaking into somebody's house or behaving violently, perhaps because they are emulating something they have seen in their own homes.

These are not new initiatives. I will not say this discussion is redundant but it is certainly information that is available. It has been discussed at justice committee. It has been discussed by the government's own experts. Recommendations were made for things like lowering the age of accountability and the government has chosen to ignore that. We in the Conservative Party question the wisdom of the minister in ignoring that advice.

Where is the money being spent? Where do this government's priorities lie? It is incredible, and it has become almost a ruse in this country, the staggering amounts of money being put into the ill conceived and not thought out long gun registry. The howls from the government benches when anyone mentions this are quite incredible. There are indignant cries of "you are against gun control, against safe handling of guns". That simply is not true.

I think the record will show quite convincingly that it was a Conservative justice minister who brought in Bill C-17 which was the most comprehensive legislation aimed at safe handling of firearms. The legislation spoke of safe storage. It spoke of safety courses that were to be implemented. It talked of trigger guards and keeping of ammunition separate from weapons.

The Conservative Party has always been consistent in its approach that it does favour safe handling of weapons. Simply putting a stamp with a serial number on a rifle and having that databank, a computer system that records who owns certain guns, is not in any significant way going to help combat the criminal use of firearms. We are targeting innocent Canadians who take part in sport shooting, recreational hunting, who go to firearms ranges. Why on earth would the government choose to spend the amount of money that this ill fated system will cost?

The cost has absolutely ballooned. The original figures said \$85 million. We know that with the start-up date of this legislation fast approaching the cost has already gone far beyond that original figure. We are talking about a figure that will be tripled or perhaps quadrupled by the time this legislation comes into place, half a billion dollars at the worst estimate.

The government has chosen again to put the money into an area that will not have a significant effect when it could put money into something such as the suggestion yesterday of having an advocate or ombudsman for victims within our system. It costs only \$1 million to have an advocate, the commissioner for correctional investigations. It would cost \$1 million to have an advocate for victims and the government chooses not to do that. That is a conscious priority decision that the government has made. One has to question why the government would decide to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on this gun registry.

• (1340)

I will refer to another very questionable decision and a priority choice by the government, the now nefarious and subversive investigation into the entire Airbus affair.

There is an investigation into a Canadian citizen and a former prime minister. This brings the entire office of the prime minister into disrepute when this type of scandalous investigation is embarked on.

The truth is that the former prime minister under investigation has been harassed and defamed by the current government's administration. That again was a choice that the government made.

It certainly is not just about cost when a person's reputation is attacked and resources are put into it for perhaps some politically motivated reason. We know there was an out of court settlement of \$2 million. The cost of having government lawyers pursue that through the various court levels and appeals certainly expanded or doubled that cost. All this at the end of the day resulted in a very jaded apology and yet this investigation continues. It has expanded in its scope. There are more officers working on this file than before and to what end? Canadians need to know this is a choice the government has decided to make and pursue in the area of justice. It is certainly anything but justice that this is allowed to occur. It is a farce and Canadians should know that it is a farce.

What can we do about it? We can talk in the House endlessly and talk until the cows come home. We can make suggestions but it is the government ultimately that bears the responsibility and has the ability to act on these initiatives.

Many improvements could be brought to the system without spending a great deal of money by refocusing the choice as to where the money was spent and by taking the money out of the gun registry system. It is sad because the money is being spent and has been spent to a great extent. We know it is going to cost more. Police officers question whether it is going to improve the current justice system. The officers and those who are working directly on the front lines in our justice system are the ones who are best charged with the knowledge of whether this is going to work, and they say no.

Supply

Another example of a potential change in our justice system that would not cost the government a great deal of money would be the change to the Criminal Code with respect to impaired driving. It would be easy for the government to take an initiative to make changes to our Criminal Code as it pertains to impaired driving. On a number of occasions I asked the minister when that was going to happen. It has been before the standing committee. It has come back before the House and yet regretfully we are not in a position to bring about those changes.

I put these statistics on the record only to demonstrate how important it is that we deal the Criminal Code changes soon. Once again it demonstrates that as time goes by there is a very heavy price to pay in the area of human lives. Impaired drivers kill 4.5 people in Canada every 24 hours, every day of the week. In 1995, 1,519 people were killed in Canada by impaired driving. Impaired drivers killed 17,630 and injured 1.1 million in Canada from the years 1983 to 1991. Shocking statistics. The havoc wreaked on the highways of this country as we speak in the House should be cause for concern for all.

It is very clear that alcohol has significantly increased the risk of motor vehicle accidents and yet we have not dealt with that in a substantive way in the House. We have not rushed to try to remedy the situation. That is another example of a change that could be made.

Another example is section 745 in the Criminal Code, bringing about truth in sentencing. Individuals who are serving life sentences for committing the most heinous of crimes are still given the opportunity in this section to apply for parole. It truly is a shame.

• (1345)

I make these suggestions in good faith and with the hope that the government will react in a positive way. I will be very interested to hear what the government has to say.

Before I sit down I want to amend the motion that is before the House. I move:

That Motion No. 1 be amended by adding after "\$1,930,805" the following:

“, less \$49,000, an amount equivalent to the Minister's statutory salary and motor car allowance”.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The amendment is in order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi, PC): Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating my colleague, who can certainly not be accused of being pathologically partisan. On the contrary, thanks are due the constituents of Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough for electing such a distinguished parliamentarian, who tackles his work with such enthusiasm. He has already been very well accepted by all members of the House.

Supply

As did our colleague, the member for Brandon—Souris, the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough pointed out this government's complete lack of agenda, with examples from a few particular sectors.

This government was re-elected with a distinctly smaller majority than in 1993, after some completely incredible flip-flops on free trade. The Liberals battled the former government fiercely on this issue. However, this measure has resulted in our exports increasing from \$90 to \$215 billion. It was the same with the GST. We lost the election on the GST. They also had a lot to say about the acid rain treaty and defeated us because of national defence issues.

With such a track record of public contradictions, why was this government re-elected, even with a smaller majority? Was it maybe because the opposition parties are becoming more regionalized and divided?

In light of what my colleague, the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, said, I find it completely incredible that a government that makes historic errors on national agendas adopted by the previous government, that in some cases contradicts itself while in office by passing measures it voted against, particularly with respect to national defence, and that spent hundreds of thousands of dollars after making election promises not on the sly but right out in the open, on television, is re-elected.

Why was this government re-elected? I think it has something to do with an aspect of Canadian politics that has cost us very dearly to date. Is it not because of the proliferation of opposition parties, which have trouble reaching any kind of consensus that could be constructive for our country?

• (1350)

[*English*]

Mr. Peter MacKay: Madam Speaker, I want to respond first by thanking my colleague from Chicoutimi for his very kind remarks. I take it as very high praise coming from a parliamentarian such as himself who has continually distinguished himself in this House, regionally and nationally. My father had the honour of serving with him. I take it as a great honour that the member would make those remarks in this place.

To answer his question, if an answer is possible, I suppose it is a question that many in the opposition ask when we see the performance of this government on certain issues. The member has referred to historical decisions that they have made. One might call them hysterical if they were not so far reaching. One might call them hypocritical if one examined the record as to what was said previous to this government taking office. It does lead one to question as to why we have the electoral response that we have and the regional breakdown that exists within this House.

We know there was a great deal of dissatisfaction expressed against the Progressive Conservative Party in 1993. There was a huge price paid for the necessary and brave initiatives that we paid a price for and now this government rushes to take the credit. That is something history will sort out. I suspect that history will be very kind to the Conservative Party. We are hoping that in the very near future the Conservative Party will be restored to government and that is certainly the aim of our party.

We continue to make positive suggestions and positive constructive criticisms of this government in the hope that the environment is going to improve for all Canadians. That ultimately has to be the purpose of an opposition that wants to be credible and wants to one day form a government which we in the Progressive Conservative Party certainly do.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Madam Speaker, all this back slapping and patting on the back is really great. It is nice to hear. Everyone in here is of course a great parliamentarian. I would like to keep things in perspective however.

The member was speaking for some length about gun control. My recollection of a lot of history of the gun control issue is that Bill C-17 was simply the first step in a long progression that led to the gun control we see today.

I recall that when the vote came down, the Conservative caucus, in the Senate in particular that certain senators voted in favour of the gun legislation bill. I would like the member to comment on that because the veracity of the truth of his words has to be seen in the context of the whole picture if we are to believe that on this issue. We are also waiting for ex-parliamentarian Jean Charest to make his first comments from Quebec on that issue.

Has the member any comments on that?

Mr. Peter MacKay: Madam Speaker, I do appreciate the question and the opportunity to answer it.

I know the hon. member himself a former police officer has been very involved in the law enforcement community. I suspect he would be very reticent to suggest that anyone in this House is against gun control or the safe use of firearms.

Bill C-17 as I said in my remarks is the most substantive piece of legislation aimed at the safe handling of firearms and the safe storage of firearms. That is completely different, completely outside the parameters of what Bill C-68 does.

I do want to correct an inaccuracy. The Conservative senators did work in a very substantive way to see that Bill C-68 was not passed. It has never been a derivation from our platform that we did not feel that the registry of long guns was a complete waste of money and it was something that was not necessary. In terms of

priorities in the area of justice, it certainly should not be a high priority and it certainly should not be a legislative initiative that is going to cost hundreds of millions of dollars which is what is coming to light. Perhaps it could be a billion dollars before this is over.

Mrs. Elsie Wayne: I have been made the honorary chair of the rifle association because of our stand on it.

Mr. Peter MacKay: I do not mean to sound alarmist but this is the scope of this legislation. And the interim leader of the Conservative Party is the honorary chair of the rifle association. I know her personally to be a very straight shooter.

I appreciate the question and I look forward to further debate on this issue.

• (1355)

Mr. Joe Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I do not have a question but I feel obliged to break up this Woodstock Tory love-in that is going on over there.

I am sure the member had a lot of experience with this in his former capacity. I spent a couple of years working in Europe where there is a zero tolerance for impaired driving to the point where police are able to require blood tests when they pull someone over. It is not .08, it is zero. The argument is that one of the things that happens when you drink is that your judgment is impaired so why do we not set the bar at zero? Does the member or his party have an opinion on that?

Mr. Peter MacKay: Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for that question. When it comes to impaired judgment, his government has certainly led the way.

With respect to the specifics of his question, the blood alcohol level has been lowered to point zero in a number of countries in Europe. I believe Australia has gone to a zero tolerance with respect to alcohol consumption. The Conservative Party is not suggesting that, although it is certainly something that would deserve a great deal of debate. We are suggesting and I have put the initiative forward that we should consider lowering it to .05. I know that Conservative governments in Manitoba and Ontario are also considering making this change to their provincial legislation.

It is something that is currently before the justice committee. We will be getting into the area of impaired driving in the fall. I hope it will be on the legislative agenda sometime shortly after we get it at committee. I look forward to the hon. member's participation in the debate.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise on this last allotted say to talk about the estimates. Unfortunately it is a sham we go through in the House of Commons each and every year. We pretend to debate one of the most important things that affects all Canadians, the amount of taxes they have to pay and how that money is spent.

S. O. 31

According to the estimates for this year, we are going to spend \$145,460,380,000. We would think one of the most paramount responsibilities of this place is to talk about how we are going to spend that monstrous amount of cash and to make sure it is for the benefit of all Canadians. The first thing is that the rules prevent us from speaking about most of the money. We can only speak about \$42,422,644,000 because the rest being over \$103 billion is approved by statute, we are not able to speak on it.

The Speaker: My dear colleague you have just set the stage with \$42 billion. That will keep you going for a little while. It is almost two o'clock so we will proceed to Statements by Members. Of course the member will have the floor when we go back to the debate.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

TEACHING EXCELLENCE AWARDS

Ms. Elinor Caplan (Thornhill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Stavros Naxakis and Penny McLeod, two teachers from the riding of Thornhill who have been awarded the Prime Minister's Award for Teaching Excellence.

Dr. Stavros Naxakis is a chemistry and physics teacher at Vaughan Secondary School. Under his guidance Vaughan students consistently score in the top five percentage in an international chemistry contest, the University of Waterloo's Chem 13 News Contest.

Penny McLeod is a chemistry teacher at Thornhill Secondary School. She has spent 25 years developing new ideas for teaching her students. She recently has brought an integrated curriculum and new technologies to her teaching. Ms. McLeod has helped her gifted students excel and is also commended by her colleagues for her determination in seeing weaker students succeed.

On behalf of the students, the parents and all my constituents of Thornhill, I would like to congratulate these two outstanding teachers and thank them for their commitment to excellence.

* * *

• (1400)

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Portage—Lisgar, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, RCMP agent John McKay was murdered earlier this year on a road near his home in Erickson, Manitoba after he had reported several death threats to the RCMP.

The solicitor general might be interested to know that Mr. McKay was contracted for \$250,000 to act as a paid RCMP agent.

S. O. 31

While Mr. McKay signed an agreement in 1995 stipulating he would not be relocated or receive protective measures, the RCMP and the justice system had an obvious interest in protecting Mr. McKay.

I urge the solicitor general to investigate what appears to be gross negligence and to determine why a paid agent would be given the option of waiving protection in the first place, as well as to determine why the RCMP did not provide protection.

It is of utmost importance that the solicitor general initiate an immediate public judicial inquiry into this serious matter.

* * *

OPTIMIST CLUB OF BRAMPTON

Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Brampton West—Mississauga, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 6 Optimists from around the world celebrated Optimists in action for a better day. Each club planned an event unique to its own community. Whether it was tree planting, bike rodeo, a simple get together or a gala event, Optimists reflected on past and future goals.

For the Optimist Club of Brampton this was its fourth annual event with the motto "Friend of Youth". Optimists strive to set a positive example for youth. This year their main goals are to recognize the achievement of youth and the organizations that support the development of youth in our community.

I hope members will join me in offering my best wishes for continued success to the organizers and participants of Optimists in action day.

* * *

SCHIZOPHRENIA

Mr. Bill Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, schizophrenia is a devastating illness which has severe mental, physical and emotional consequences not only for those who suffer but for their families, friends and for society in general. Their suffering is made worse by the social stigma which sadly still attaches to people with mental illness. Approximately one out of one hundred Canadians will suffer from this disease in their lifetime.

Because schizophrenia often causes a lifetime of mental and physical health problems, the treatment costs to society are exorbitant, and because schizophrenics tend to have poor employment prospects, decades of productivity are lost for each patient, which just adds to the very high costs borne by society.

Schizophrenia causes acute suffering, increased homelessness and chronic unemployment. It is essential that more resources be allocated to research so that a cure may be found for this terrible disease.

RICHARD IVEY FAMILY

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the greater Toronto chapter of the National Society of Fund Raising Executives recently honoured the Richard Ivey family with the outstanding philanthropist award.

The Richard Ivey family name is synonymous with service and generosity. It is best known in London, Ontario for its generous gifts in support of the arts, community services, major donations to health care and research and its connections to the University of Western Ontario.

Over the years the Richard Ivey family has donated over \$40 million to the University of Western Ontario alone, including an unprecedented \$11 million to the business school in 1985.

Thanks to the generosity of the Ivey family the lives of many Canadians have been enriched. I recognize the Richard Ivey family not only for its contribution to the city of London and its inhabitants but for its contribution to Canadian society.

* * *

THE SENATE

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the chamber of sober second thought. What is supposed to be an effective check and balance to the House of Commons has decayed into an institution with little credibility left in the eyes of the Canadian public.

Why is this? Could it be because of the embarrassment some senators place on themselves, one living in Mexico, another convicted of influence peddling?

The best solution to restoring the honour of the upper chamber is to have senators elected. This would enable the good hardworking senators to stay and get rid of those who are simply there for the ride. It would invigorate the sleeping hollow Senate and make it an active and vigorous place.

Support for an elected Senate is overwhelming; 84% of British Columbians, 91% of Albertans, all want their senators elected. It is time the Prime Minister stopped using the Senate as a resting place, a landing pad for his friends. He must do the right thing. Canadians want value for their tax dollars. They want a democracy. They want an elected Senate.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the chairman of the National Capital Commission unveiled his vision of a elegant capital for the new millen-

nium. His vision for Canada's capital region is a challenge to us for the new millennium.

• (1405)

[English]

Marcel Beaudry's vision would see the opening of the waterways on both sides of the Ottawa River for all Canadians to enjoy.

A half century after visionary planner Jacques Gréber produced a master plan for Canada's capital, we now would see a new vista open up on to Parliament Hill. A world class boulevard would be developed in the core of the capital, creating a spectacular view of the Peace Tower.

[Translation]

I applaud this vision proposed to us by the NCC for a National Capital Region we can be even more proud of.

* * *

DRUMMONDVILLE

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, *L'Actualité* magazine recently described the Drummond area as an economic engine of Quebec, and once again the figures are proving it right.

For the sixth consecutive year, more than 1,000 jobs have been created in this region.

The last annual report of the Drummondville economic development agency shows that the 13,000 manufacturing jobs target has been exceeded, investments totaled nearly \$400 million, 92 new manufacturing industries and approximately 4,000 new jobs have been created over the past three years.

Encouraged by these results and in order to meet the demand, on June 11 and 12, the agency will be launching a job challenge to fill more than 1,000 additional positions in the manufacturing sector.

Speaking personally and on behalf of all residents of the riding of Drummond, I congratulate our local business community on its entrepreneurship and vitality.

* * *

[English]

MEMBER FOR ROSEMONT

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Ahuntsic, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member of Parliament for Rosemont has abused his parliamentary privileges in a partisan and non-authorized manner in order to promote and solicit support for the local separatist candidate in the upcoming school board elections.

This member sends letters to his constituents on House of Commons stationery asking them to support the MEMO separatist candidate.

S. O. 31

[Translation]

This is not the first time that a member of the Bloc Québécois abuses his parliamentary privileges. His colleague from Laurier—Sainte-Marie did promotional work for his wife when she ran in a school board election in 1994, again using House of Commons stationery.

The former member for Rosemont had also sent a letter in support of a separatist candidate in a CLSC election.

[English]

The abuse of parliamentary privilege has demonstrated once again that the Bloc members in this House have little respect for Canadians, for democracy or for institutions.

* * *

VALUES

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, recently a group of college students said that if they were faced with the choice between saving their pet and saving a human being, they would choose their pet.

We jokingly call looters non-traditional shoppers. Killers are described as morally challenged.

The time has come for us to recognize that while we must debate controversial issues we must not forget that there are non-controvertible ethical issues at the core and that were settled a long time ago.

The great literature of the world including, the Koran, Aristotle's *Ethics*, Shakespeare's *King Lear*, the Bible and the Analects of Confucius reveal these basic moral values: integrity, respect for human life, self-control, honesty, courage and self-sacrifice. All the world's major religions offer some form of the golden rule.

We need to relearn these basic values, teach them in our schools, practice them in our businesses and reflect them in the Parliament of Canada.

* * *

EDUCATION

Hon. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this year at the request of the Quebec government and our federal government, we made changes to section 93 of the Constitution, moving from a religious base to a secular, democratic and culturally inclusive English and French education system.

Last Sunday too many Montrealers found our democratic right to this choice compromised, no, lost by an undemocratic system put into place without enumeration, using a type of negative option billing which is antithetical to Canadian governance.

I remain outraged. Despite my timely efforts to register my vote and my right to exercise it, I was not listed.

S. O. 31

The revision procedure employed by the Quebec government shows a blatant lack of respect for a significant and deserving linguistic minority that should be valued in a sensitive and inclusive way, not excluded like was done during the referendum.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have spoken previously in the House about the Sayisi Dene of Tadoule Lake who suffered unjustifiably because of forced relocation by the government.

The Sayisi Dene are one of the Denesuline Nations of northern Saskatchewan and Manitoba that have outstanding concerns regarding their traditional use of land north of 60 land that is a part of Nunavut.

• (1410)

Bill C-39, the Nunavut Act amendments, received the support of parliament. My party supports the principle of self-determination.

It is imperative that the government deal with the concerns of the Denesuline before proclaiming the Nunavut legislation. We must not taint the principle of self-determination.

The Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs and the Assembly of First Nations fully support the objectives and initiatives of the Manitoba Denesuline, including the legal challenge before the Federal Court of Canada in defence of territory claims and treaty rights.

Must every issue this government deals with end up in the courts? These people have suffered long enough. The federal government has an obligation to meet with the representatives of the Denesuline—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Laval-Est.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC-JAPAN RELATIONS

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 100th anniversary of relations between Quebec and Japan.

Indeed, it was 100 years ago that the first Quebec missionaries arrived in the land of the rising sun. Today, Quebec and Japan are marking the event by organizing various activities under a theme that emphasizes 100 years of rapprochement between Quebec and Japan.

In co-operation with Japan's general consulate in Montreal and other public and private sector partners, a number of major events will be held in Montreal, including an exhibit of works of arts, crafts and kimonos, cultural activities at Complexe Desjardins and

at the botanical garden, and a Quebec-Japan forum for business people.

Quebec's general delegation to Tokyo will also celebrate these 100 years of rapprochement.

I take this opportunity to salute all my fellow Quebecers of Japanese descent and to welcome all the Japanese visiting Quebec.

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Japanese and provided the following translation:*]

[Translation]

You are all welcome to attend the events scheduled for Japan Week.

* * *

CALGARY DECLARATION

Mr. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one wonders on which planet Quebec's designated premier, Lucien Bouchard, lives.

Yesterday evening, he expressed surprise at the comments of Newfoundland's premier, Brian Tobin, who said that the Calgary declaration was an interesting first step toward constitutional talks. Of course, Mr. Bouchard was not pleased by these comments. Grouchy as always, he tried to downplay the significance of the Calgary declaration.

One wonders why Mr. Bouchard is wasting everyone's time with his phoney commission, whose mandate is to torpedo the efforts of those who dare work to improve Canada's future.

Whether you like it or not, Mr. Bouchard, a majority of people believe that Quebec's future is within the Canadian constitutional family. Call an election and you will see. Let it be known that the countdown has begun. The end of the Quebec separatist movement is in sight.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence introduced a new ombudsman today. I congratulate the new ombudsman and wish him well on his new job.

Unfortunately the minister did not go far enough. Even with the latest allegations of sexual abuse in the military, this minister refuses to act to create an office of the inspector general. He refuses to create an atmosphere that will lead to a more vigilant parliament.

When asked, this new ombudsman said he has not been told what his budget will be, how many staff he will have and has been given virtually no guidelines. Not a very auspicious beginning.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTIONS**

The minister can be assured that we will watch closely to see if he and his department will allow this new ombudsman to do his job. The complaints are piling up and there is a lot of work to be done.

* * *

*[Translation]***ACCUEIL BONNEAU**

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we have just learned that there has been an explosion in Montreal, probably caused by a gas leak, which has destroyed Accueil Bonneau and left more than 30 people injured.

Accueil Bonneau is a volunteer-run centre providing assistance and shelter to the homeless. The explosion happened at lunch time. The Bloc Québécois wishes the victims of this tragedy to know that our thoughts are with them.

I also wish to express the confidence myself and my colleague have in the ability of Accueil Bonneau to bounce back from this misfortune and to continue its mission, which is so essential to the Montreal community.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION FOR PARENT EDUCATION

Mr. Jacques Saada (Brossard—La Prairie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on May 16 I had the pleasure of speaking in Tunis to the International Federation for Parent Education.

This symposium was attended by representatives of about 40 different countries and the theme addressed was: Parents and globalization: their contribution to protecting children from its dangers.

In particular, I addressed issues relating to children's rights, child labour, child soldiers and antipersonnel mines, which, as we know, claim large numbers of young victims every year.

• (1415)

I called attention to Canada's heavy involvement in these areas, and stressed the fundamental role played by civilian society, the NGOs in particular, in addressing this problem.

I would like to congratulate the International Federation for Parent Education for taking the initiative to hold this symposium. My best wishes to the federation and its executive.

*[English]***HEPATITIS C**

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday a student asked the Prime Minister why he was abandoning the victims of hepatitis C infected through tainted blood before 1986. The Prime Minister answered by saying that from the government's standpoint these innocent victims were really no different than people who got cancer from cigarettes.

Would the Prime Minister mind explaining to the House exactly how he thinks these are the same?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I explained that there was a period between 1986 and 1990 when the government was negligent and could have done something which was not done. In terms of the victims of other kinds of problems that arise in the health care system, we have to look at the government's responsibility. I gave an example. There are a lot of people among those who were infected with hepatitis C.

The Reform Party has two types of compassion. It has compassion for those who got hepatitis C through blood transfusions, but it has no compassion for the people who got hepatitis C by other means.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, people who smoke cigarettes know about the risks of cancer. It is written on the label. These hepatitis C victims were infected innocently. They trusted the government to make sure the blood supply was secure and when they went into a hospital for surgery they had no idea that they would come out with a deadly disease.

How is it that the Prime Minister cannot see the difference when everyone else can?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, he is talking about people who got hepatitis C through blood transfusions before 1986. I am asking him about the people who got hepatitis C in other ways. If it is not a matter of responsibility, then it becomes a matter of compassion. Why does compassion exist for some and not for others in the head of the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder this issue is confusing. Day after day the Prime Minister has claimed that the working group of officials is trying to find a way to help compensate these victims and he has pretended to be sincere. Now it comes out that the Prime Minister thinks these victims are no more deserving of government compensation than cigarette addicts or junkies on illegal drugs.

Oral Questions

If that is what the Prime Minister really thinks about these victims, is it not obvious that this working group and this supposed negotiation is a complete farce?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the previous question, what about those who started smoking before there was any notice on cigarette packages who have cancer today?

At this moment 10 provinces with the federal government have arrived at a solution to the problem—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Colleagues, I think all of us not only want to hear the questions, but also the answers. I intervened because I could not hear the response of the Prime Minister. If the Prime Minister wants to continue his answer I invite him to do so.

• (1420)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the same people who managed to make a deal together, the 10 provinces and the federal government, are still meeting to find a solution.

We care about the victims. But that does not mean that everybody who has hep C should necessarily receive compensation. However, they should receive services from the government because they are sick and they deserve services from the government.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the long hot summer for the Liberals has started. A student in Regina just asked the question “How can you justify not compensating everyone?”

The Prime Minister cannot see the difference between a person smoking voluntarily and someone going into the hospital innocently with that dripping of tainted blood that his regulators supplied.

The Prime Minister had better explain why he does not understand the difference. There is a difference.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): I recognize that the previous government in 1986 made a mistake. It was Krever who said that, not me.

When there is no knowledge by the government, the notion of responsibility is extremely important. The money that the government spends is not the money of the Prime Minister, it is the money of the taxpayers—

The Speaker: Please, my colleagues, I appeal to you, in fairness, to listen to the question and to listen to the answer. The hon. member for MacLeod.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the difference between accidental and voluntary.

The Prime Minister started out by saying that drug addicts were the same. Now he says that smokers are the same. What will it be

next? People who get an insect bite and accidentally get infected? Is he going to compensate them too?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point we are making. We are making the point that we are responsible. Suddenly, the same people who want to cut all the social programs find a cause to try to gain votes with that. They are just trying to score political points and they are completely irresponsible.

* * *

[Translation]

HEALTH

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Health contended that Quebec was the primary source of the problems in the health care system.

Quebec is far from the only province facing problems. In Manitoba, the sick are having to seek treatment in mobile hospitals in the United States. In Newfoundland, the military is having to fly in to help out with an overload of emergency cases. There are any number of examples throughout Canada.

Is the minister so tuned out and so insensitive he cannot see that the federal government's \$6 billion in cuts have threatened the health care system not only in Quebec but in every province in Canada?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, between 1993 and 1998, in cumulative terms, the value of tax points increased by \$2.1 billion in Quebec alone. Equalization payments increased by \$1 billion, and the drop in interest rates should enable Quebec alone to save \$1.4 billion in debt servicing. That is how things stand.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Finance should tell us whether the drop in the Canadian dollar also helps repay the debt. Perhaps he should look at the studies done by the C.D. Howe Institute, which show that the average Canadian family pays Ottawa \$652 more than it gets.

I would like the minister—the new Minister of Health competing with the current one for the leadership—to explain how the cash payment dropped from \$678 per person to \$386 per person, nearly 50% less. These are the Minister of Finance's figures.

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member should know that this year, for the first time in ten years, there has been an increase in the average family's disposable income.

That means that, because of this government's economic policies, the economic recovery is truly taking place. The recovery is a reality and Quebecers and Canadians across the country are benefiting.

Oral Questions

• (1425)

[English]

Today, Professor Marchon of the University of Montreal released his study, which indicates that, of all the G-7 countries, Canada has the best economic management—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Roberval.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it must impress hospital patients to hear the Minister of Finance telling them how things stand, but omitting a few details.

An Angus Reid poll published by the Canadian Healthcare Association—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Roberval has the floor.

Mr. Michel Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, an Angus Reid poll revealed that the 61% of Canadians who thought we had a good health system has dropped to 37% as a result of this government's cuts.

I ask the Minister of Health if he is still saying that it is because of the poor decisions made by Jean Rochon that only 37% of Canadians now think we have a decent health care system?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Roberval mentions Dr. Rochon, but two can play at that. Dr. Rochon said, and I quote "It has been over two years since we began to transform the health and social services system in order to adjust to the evolving needs of the public, to take advantage of new technologies, to bring services closer to the public, and to shift the emphasis to prevention and health promotion". It was not a money issue for Dr. Rochon.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I see that the Minister of Health has been muzzled after yesterday's performance. Now we have the Minister of Finance fielding health questions.

At the last Liberal convention, the Minister of Health said "This government's greatest responsibility is restoring Canadians' confidence in the health system".

Will he not admit today that he was badly mistaken? He misled Canadians.

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Dr. Rochon went on to say, and I quote "Whatever the government's budgetary constraints, the need to transform Quebec's health services could no longer be ignored".

Dr. Rochon himself said that. For him, it was not a money issue.

HEPATITIS C

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it was downright sick for the Prime Minister to choose a youth audience in Regina yesterday to argue that compensating hepatitis C victims will open the door to compensation for smoking related cancers. There were no warning labels on the blood that infected hepatitis C victims; no labels that said "This blood is dangerous to your health". Why does the Prime Minister not just slap a label on his lapel saying "This government is dangerous to your health"?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the question was asked by a student in Saskatchewan and the position I have on it is exactly the same as the premier of Saskatchewan, who is an NDP premier. He is responsible and he knows the consequences of what is going on.

Before 1986 nobody in the system knew that it was dangerous to give blood transfusions. After 1986 we could have detected that. We had the responsibility. We have accepted our responsibility and we were the ones to take the initiative to compensate and the provinces did not want to do anything at that time.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, how low can you go? How sick can you get?

The Prime Minister signalled again yesterday his government's refusal to put another nickel into hepatitis C compensation.

• (1430)

Is the Prime Minister simply trying to lessen the resolve of hepatitis C victims to fight for fair compensation? Why is the Prime Minister actively sabotaging the success of negotiations for fair compensation?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the NDP does not understand that we were the ones who initiated the compensation and we put \$800 million on the table. At that time the provinces, including the socialist premier, did not want to put a cent on the table. It is this Minister of Health who decided that the compensation was needed for those infected after 1986 and he forced the provincial governments to the table to try to get compensation.

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, when asked about increased compensation for hep C victims the Prime Minister also stated "The money is not mine. It is very easy to be generous when the money is not yours". That is Canadians' money and they want all victims to be treated equally.

It is unfortunate that the government did not hold the same sentiment when it spent \$500 million of taxpayers' money to

Oral Questions

cancel a helicopter contract and then turned around and bought the same helicopters.

Could the Prime Minister tell us whether his comments mean that this government has no intention of compensating all—

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with permission I would like to say that the member is doing quite good so far. Since becoming leader she has managed to move her party ahead of the Reform Party, so I want congratulate her. I really do not know why her party would want to have the former secretary to Brian Mulroney be leader of the party when they have one who is doing so well at this time.

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Prime Minister for his kind comments. Now that we are working so closely together and all working in the same direction, will he please tell me if he is going to compensate all the hep C victims?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all the provinces are meeting at this time to try to find a solution to this problem.

I believe that it is very evident to the House of Commons that the hon. member is the evident candidate to be able to unite the right because to be ahead of the Tories, the Reform Party would have to unite with the Bloc.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, somehow I do not think the hepatitis C victims will be very amused by this.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton North.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has now said that there is really no difference between innocent hepatitis C victims and those who smoke. Except that cigarettes carry a health warning and blood products do not.

● (1435)

Obviously the health minister thinks this is okay. Can the health minister defend his boss who says that hepatitis C victims are really no different than two pack a day smokers or drug addicts? Is that okay?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the point that comes of all this is that the Reform Party likes to pick and choose those to whom it is prepared to show its political compassion. It is all in favour of certain victims that it puts in the gallery for show. But when it comes to the HIV strategy to help those with AIDS, even those who got HIV through the blood system, the Reformers will not support it. It is called hypocrisy.

The Speaker: Colleagues, on the word hypocrisy, or hypocrite, I would much prefer that we do not use these words in the House because it tends excite one another. I would ask that we not use this term in the House. The hon. member for Edmonton North.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this whole government has one agenda for the Prime Minister and that is to keep him out of town. Unfortunately they cannot keep him out of trouble.

He tries very hard to say that he cares so much about the working group and the hep C victims, but he made it obvious last night that he has no intention of helping these people who are in trouble through no fault of their own.

How can the health minister defend his boss who says such ridiculous, irresponsible, indefensible statements right across the country?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we can see for ourselves what goes on across the way—

An hon. member: Resign.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health has the floor.

Hon. Allan Rock: Mr. Speaker, Reformers pick and choose those to whom they calculate they should send their political compassion. They may not have been very successful in uniting the right over there but this party sure has united the wrong.

* * *

[Translation]

AIR TRANSPORT

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport, who told us last week that his government was taking decisions in the best interests of all Canadians. Once again, we have to face the fact that what is good for Canada is not good for Quebec.

● (1440)

Will the Minister of Transport admit that, by refusing to allow Air Canada to fly between Montreal and such lucrative markets as Milan, Mexico City and Rio, it is penalizing not only Air Canada but especially Dorval and the entire Montreal area?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, what is good for Canada is good for Quebec.

We have taken steps regarding air routes for all Canadians, regardless of the region they live in, even Montreal, even Quebec.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

We have a balanced approach that has helped everybody in the country. It is good for every city in the country and it is good for the health of a competitive airline industry.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, according to the minister, it was necessary to help Canadian restructure.

Using that same argument, will he not admit that it would be only right to also help Montreal, which has paid dearly for past federal government decisions relating to airports?

[English]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said last week, the Bloc is always whining. Yesterday I went to Dorval. I had a tour of the airport. I am proud of what ADM is doing to that airport. I am proud of the amount of traffic I saw there, international flights. There is no doubt that is the result of our policies in this government.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the supreme court's Delgamuukw decision, aboriginal bands across British Columbia have laid claim to the entire province, including Vancouver and Stanley Park.

Can the Indian affairs minister tell us what the government's position is? Can she tell us in the federal government's eyes who owns British Columbia?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday there is nothing in the comments of the opposition members that suggests anything except that they want to fearmonger and find scapegoats.

Let us be clear on what the First Nations are saying. I will quote Chief Ed John of the B.C. summit who said "First Nations share a common objective with other British Columbians that a strong and productive economy benefits everyone and we are prepared to do what we can to ensure there is economic stability in British Columbia".

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is fascinating to watch this minister pirouetting in her place, ducking and dodging the questions and giving no answers. This issue is far too important to treat in this flippant and self-serving manner.

Is the minister prepared to go to Vancouver, hold a town hall meeting and tell the people who show up there that the city belongs to aboriginals? Will she answer the question of who owns B.C.?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the opposition is totally out of touch on this. What it wants to do is legislate away aboriginal rights and blame aboriginal people for the economic woes in British Columbia.

The people of British Columbia understand it. In an Angus Reid poll this weekend nine out of ten British Columbians believe that aboriginal people have legitimate land claims and should be compensated. Seventy-two per cent say that settling these claims will either improve B.C.'s investment climate or have no impact on the business investment.

* * *

*[Translation]***AIR TRANSPORT**

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when we ask the Minister of Transport about the preferential treatment he is systematically giving Canadian Airlines, his only answer is that he is trying to foster healthy competition between the two carriers.

Can the minister tell us how it would hurt Canadian to give Air Canada a Montreal-Milan route, for example, or a Montreal-Amsterdam route, since Canadian Airlines does not even offer these two destinations?

[English]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the hon. member. He should know that there is a second carrier policy in place that Air Canada asked this government to put in place and which Air Canada should live by. When a market reaches 300,000 trips, then the government can designate a second carrier. I have said that we expect Taiwan to reach that position later this year and therefore we would designate a second carrier. The same will go for the other countries. Air Canada should live by the rule that it wanted this government to establish.

• (1445)

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the existing policy.

How can the minister explain that, in most cases where he refuses to allow Air Canada to fly to some destination, it is a route originating in Montreal?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seems to forget that Canadian Airlines currently employs 1,000 people in Quebec.

Oral Questions

[English]

In other words this fellow and his friends speak only for one company. He does not speak for the 1,000 people who work for Canadian Airlines in Quebec, unlike those on this side who speak for the interest of the travelling public. We speak for both airlines and the employees of both airlines, no matter where they live.

* * *

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the people of British Columbia talk about compensation. They want to know from the minister how much. How much will it cost Canadian people to pay for land claim settlements?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as usual opposition members have it all wrong. When we talk about money and talk about investments the people of British Columbia understand that by settling land claims we will improve the economy of British Columbia. Whether it be the Laurier Institute or KPMG, the issue here is the huge cost of doing nothing or at least of following their approach.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the media talk in terms of \$50 billion that these settlement claims will cost Canadians.

Canadians and British Columbians want to know from the minister after seven years of treaty negotiations how much it will cost the governments of Canada and British Columbia to settle these land claims.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, they ask how much for land claims but they do not ask how much for hepatitis C. Where is their compassion here? Systematically they undermine the aboriginal people. It is an outrage.

* * *

[Translation]

ATLANTIC GROUND FISH STRATEGY

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

A big demonstration in favour of a new groundfish strategy is under way as we speak in the Magdalen Islands.

We have been requesting such a strategy and the government has been thinking about it for quite some time now. What is the government waiting for to give an answer to these people who are expressing their dismay and crying out for help, especially since

the premiers of the five provinces concerned are asking the federal government to take its responsibilities?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as you know, we have worked very hard on this issue recently. I sent my own associate deputy minister to meet with provincial officials in the Atlantic region. We believe that the post-TAGS challenge to communities and individuals should be addressed in partnership with the provinces.

Now I am hearing the Bloc tells us “This is your responsibility, not ours”. It is always like that with the Bloc. It is either Ottawa’s responsibility or a provincial jurisdiction, depending on what suits them at the time. We are going to work on this issue in partnership with the provinces.

* * *

[English]

NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY

Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Brampton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Yesterday the *Ottawa Citizen* reported that Canada had promised to approve a \$1.5 billion loan to finance the sale of Candu reactors to Turkey.

What specific assurances can the minister give that the nuclear technology we are offering Turkey will not be used to develop nuclear weapons?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are a variety of safeguards in place with respect to current or future nuclear trade including the requirement of a bilateral nuclear co-operation agreement between Canada and the recipient country and including the imposition of the terms of multilateral agreements such as the non-proliferation treaty which involves complete inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency and all international safeguards that apply under the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Only countries that are prepared to sign on to these safeguards are allowed to do business with Canada.

* * *

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister does not seem to get it. The Delgamuukw decision has directly impacted on all economic sectors of British Columbia as well as of Canada. It is chasing investors out of Canada as well as jobs due to lack of land tenure.

• (1450)

How long will the Canadian public have to put up with the minister not making a decision with regard to the Delgamuukw case?

Oral Questions

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, look at the progress that has been made under the government. When we took office in 1993 there was one table of negotiations occurring in British Columbia. Now there are over 60. Thirty of those have framework agreements that are moving toward agreements in principle.

Perhaps, if hon. members opposite would go into their ridings and join the celebrations that occur as we make progress in this process, they would see that we have the right approach.

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we have continually asked the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development exactly what the government's position is on land claims and whether she understands how this uncertainty impacts on the people of British Columbia.

For two days the only clear thing is that the minister has no idea what we are talking about. She does not know how to do her job and she is way over her head.

I ask her very simply and slowly so that her friends can help her, what exactly is the federal government's position, what is her position, on the issue of land claims in British Columbia. Does she know the impact on the people of British Columbia?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our position is supported by the first nations. Our position is supported by the province of British Columbia. Our position is supported by all the economic sectors in British Columbia.

It is about negotiating in good faith and in a peaceful fashion around the table, not what these guys recommend when they talk about Ipperwash.

As I mentioned yesterday, when the hon. member for Skeena suggested the only solution in that case was to call in the army that must be negotiation Reform style.

* * *

RAILWAYS

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport has said that he was counting on the goodwill of the railways not to close branch lines until Justice Estey's federal review was complete.

CN Rail is closing two more branch lines including the Imperial subdivision in my riding. Why does the government delay acting to save our banking system until that task force reports but lets CN dismantle a rail system that is still under review? Why the double standard?

In the name of consistency why will the minister not order CN and CP to stop ripping up branch lines until Justice Estey's review is complete?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member was in the House when we debated the amendments to the National Transportation Act which give the railway some latitude in terms of dealing with their excess infrastructure, much of it in western Canada.

We put in place the Estey commission, the statutory grain transportation review, to look at all various aspects of grain transportation including rail line abandonment. What I found in our dealings with the railways is that they are very sensitive to the concerns of the hon. member, especially in his province of Saskatchewan, as we are here.

After all, we on this side of the House agreed to fund facilitators to help small communities that want to take over these branch lines.

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Transportation Act took any decisions about the railways out of the Liberal government's hands. Since those changes took effect the track record of the railways has been a failure.

Will the minister today stand up for western farmers and demand a standstill in rail line abandonments now? Will he back that demand with legislation if necessary?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the policy of 1996 has been very successful because five times as many short lines have been created as have been abandoned. That shows the policy is working. Smaller companies can take over these small tracks, make them economically viable and serve the interests of producers and especially farmers in Saskatchewan.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Greg Thompson (Charlotte, PC): Mr. Speaker, according to a recent consultant's report Canada's health protection branch is in a crisis. This is the second report in two years reaching the same conclusion.

The head of Canada's health protection branch says that the bureau is not working at peak efficiency and the minister says he has not read the report.

Will the minister take the time to read the report, at least one of them? If he does read it, would he act expeditiously to protect Canada's health and safety?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I want to stress that this report deals with the workplace atmosphere in the veterinary drugs department and has nothing to do with the safety or quality of its work.

It was Health Canada that engaged this consultant to examine the workplace environment.

Oral Questions

• (1455)

Recommendations have now been received, employees' concerns have been taken into account, and the recommendations have been presented to and discussed with the employees. I am assured by officials that the positive recommendations will be implemented shortly.

Mr. Greg Thompson (Charlotte, PC): Mr. Speaker, I think the minister is underplaying the crisis because it does involve real people and a problem at the health inspection branch.

I am quoting from this morning's statements in the CBC news: "The report describes managers as autocratic, abrasive, difficult to approach and dismissive". How can we have a functioning health protection branch when that is the attitude? It does come down to attitude and at the end of the day the health and safety of all Canadians.

If the minister refuses to do something, would he at least table the report in the House?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I emphasize again the report dealt not with the scientific capacity of the branch but rather the workplace environment. Recommendations have been made. The new director has been given a mandate to implement them. The employees have been spoken to about this change.

This is a report that was commissioned by Health Canada because we want to resolve this issue and we will.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Hec Clouthier (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

In many cases CF members, their spouses and DND employees are scared to talk to somebody in their unit because of perceived problems that could result from the truth.

Could the estimable Minister of National Defence tell the House what he plans to do to help those who are unfairly treated?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are making substantial changes in the system, providing a strengthening of the system for people who want to put their complaints in and up through the chain of command.

We are also providing an alternative for those who want to go outside the chain of command, who might feel more comfortable doing so. This morning I was very pleased on behalf of the government to announce the appointment of the first ombudsman of the Canadian forces and the Department of National Defence.

That person will listen to people who feel that their complaints need to be addressed by somebody outside the chain of command, a civilian, and I am very pleased—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Medicine Hat.

* * *

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, that is what you get when you unite the tripe, I guess.

The supreme court's Delgamuukw decision opens the way for huge financial settlements for natives in B.C. Experts are saying the Delgamuukw decision could cost up to \$50 billion in B.C., but unfortunately the finance minister has not seen fit to set aside anything in the main estimates in the form of contingent liabilities for this huge draw upon the federal treasury.

Why not? Why has the finance minister not put anything on the books? Where is this money to come from? Is it to come from increases in taxes or is he to cut social programs again?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us look at the difference between the approaches here. First we have the Reform who opposes the Nisga'a agreement in principle. We have the Reform who says that we can legislate away the constitutional rights of aboriginal people. We have the Reform Party that six months later, after the Delgamuukw decision, finally starts talking about it and then of course wants to bring in the army anyway.

If we look at our approach we are making progress with the Nisga'a. We understand and support the supreme court's recommendation that we negotiate solutions. Most important, the day after the Delgamuukw decision I was in British Columbia with our partners who are all at the table recognizing that to make progress on this very important issue we must be together.

* * *

[Translation]

DREDGING OF ST. LAWRENCE

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

Quebec stakeholders agree on the need to hold public hearings on the dredging of the St. Lawrence River. However, the minister will not hold such hearings, as authorized under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

How could the Minister of the Environment allow these dredging contracts to be awarded without public hearings, without giving members of the public an opportunity to express their views on the matter, when everyone, including the Quebec government, is asking for public hearings?

• (1500)

[English]

Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the issue my colleague refers to has been dealt with by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

In reviewing this project, it had two public hearings. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has given permits. I have reviewed the process and it has complied with everything necessary under the Environmental Assessment Act.

I am convinced that this project will be good for the environment. I will receive regular reports from my colleague on the remedial aspects of it.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this government has stated it will act responsibly toward the Dene of Deline and the terrible legacy inflicted on them.

Members of this community still watch loved ones die from these, to quote the government's words, deadly and insidious substances radium and uranium.

Will this government commit to immediate crisis assistance, the first step of the community's 14 point essential response and redress plan, yes or no?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is concerned with the potential impacts of historical uranium mining in the Northwest Territories. Along with my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, I am looking forward to meeting with representatives of the Deline tomorrow.

* * *

[Translation]

ICE STORM

Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Shefford, PC): Mr. Speaker, on June 5, the officials of Human Resources Development advised the offices in the regions of Quebec affected by the ice storm to stop all new activities involving additional funds.

Despite the injection of \$6.4 million into the program, the Quebec region is still short nearly \$2 million and there is still a desperate need. We have been told that an additional \$9 million plus is required.

Will the Minister of Human Resources Development follow the recommendations of his officials and ask Treasury Board for additional funds?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I receive a number of memos

Supply

and recommendations from my department. I always look at them carefully and with respect. I do the necessary follow-up in the best interests of my fellow citizens.

In this matter, as in others, I think we are considered to have been vigilant. We are following the situation very closely.

I think we acted quickly and efficiently in the case of the ice storm. We have invested between \$45 million and \$50 million from the employment insurance fund to help people through it. If more needs to be done, we will consider the matter with an open mind.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MEMBER FOR AHUNTSIC

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I know that you are very interested in the good reputation of the House and its members.

• (1505)

For your information and the information of members and of the general public, I would like to elaborate on a statement made by our colleague, the member for Ahuntsic, during the period set aside for statements by members, regarding an action by our colleague, the member for Rosemont.

In fairness to the member for Rosemont, and out of respect for him, I would like to point out that he acted in good faith, not realizing that he was breaking any Standing Order. When he became aware that he had done so, he immediately consulted the House's Director General of Financial Services, who confirmed that he had indeed breached the Standing Orders. The member for Rosemont therefore undertook to pay, and did in fact pay, the costs of the mailing, including postage, envelopes and letterhead.

I am therefore inclined to regard the remarks by the member for Ahuntsic as defamatory.

The Speaker: This is not really a point of order, but I thank the Bloc Québécois whip for this clarification.

Personally, I would prefer not to see members launching these sorts of attacks because sometimes we do not have all the facts. In my view, this is not a point of order, but I accept the clarification and I would like the matter to end there.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

MAIN ESTIMATES, 1998-99

The House resumed consideration of the business of supply.

Supply

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out that today, as we are debating the estimates, when we think the most important issue facing parliament is the spending of the public purse, the approving of taxation and the spending of \$145 billion of taxpayer money, we would take that very seriously in our debates in the House of Commons.

The unfortunate news is that we treat the whole process as a completely perfunctory process where we have the estimates tabled by the President of the Treasury Board and automatically refer them to committee.

Unfortunately we know that the committees do not take their work seriously as far as the estimates, the reason being they know they make no difference. Never in the last 25 years have we in this House been able to change one single penny of the estimates.

For that reason, the committees say why should they bother knocking their heads trying to introduce changes to the estimates, spending the money more intelligently, spending the money on issues that are more important to Canadians. The problem is this government is not prepared to listen and previous governments have not been prepared to listen.

When the President of the Treasury Board tables his estimates around March 1, he takes the arrogant approach and says he basically has the approval of the House even though here we are on June 9 voting on these amounts.

One of the big affronts is that we are dealing only with is \$42 billion of expenditures.

• (1510)

The other \$103 billion was approved by statute some time in the past. When I say some time in the past, that could have been 50 years ago. It was the last time that we in this House had the opportunity to pass judgement on a program that required expenditure of taxpayer funds.

When the legislation is passed, that is called statutory authority and the government never has to come back to this House again to seek its approval to spend the money on these programs as the costs balloon up and up.

It is a huge affront to this place and to the Canadian people that later on today we will be voting on only \$42 billion of a total expenditure of \$145 billion.

The other affront is the way the rules of this House have been organized to ensure the government gets its way. When we look at the normal process in the business of the House, a bill is introduced which can be amended and the amendment can be amended again. We first vote on the subamendment and if that passes, it amends the main amendment. If we vote on that and it passes, then we have

amended the piece of legislation. We will vote on the legislation and if that passes, the amendments have caused a change.

We start at the bottom and work our way up. Not so with the estimates because as soon as we table a motion that we want to reduce the estimates, in essence if we wish to amend the estimates, we do not vote on the amendment, we do not vote on any subamendment. The first thing the rules say is that when we put forth an amendment, that causes the President of the Treasury Board to move concurrence in his main amount.

I am looking at the 1998-99 estimates, parts one and two, page 1-44. Their total expenditure under Vote No. 1 is \$867,573,000. If we want to reduce the amount of money the Department of Health is going to spend by even \$10, that will cause the President of the Treasury Board to put forth a motion to concur in the total expenditure of \$867,573,000 and the House has to vote to say we are going to give the department that full amount of money. If that vote were to fail, the department would get no money and therefore our motion to reduce would be irrelevant.

That is why it is impossible to defeat a motion on the main estimates, because it is preceded by a concurrence motion. That is why the rules have been turned upside down.

I use health as an example because in the public accounts committee some months ago we dealt with the Department of Health and its supply of services to natives and aboriginals.

We found, for example, and this is no fault on the aboriginals but certainly every fault on the Department of Health, that they were approving payment of bills submitted to them by dentists and so on in amounts 40 times greater than the provincial amount approved for these procedures. A multiple of 40 is the mark-up that some dentists have been putting on some treatment, sending the bill to the federal government for payment and it was being paid without even a question.

The provincial governments have been trying to husband their health resources and scrutinizing the bills and saying they feel this is about the amount they are prepared to pay for this procedure. For the federal government there is no limit to what it is prepared to pay, even 40 times the regular amount. If we wanted to take \$55,000 out of health in the estimates today because we should be paying only the appropriate amounts rather than these exorbitant amounts, it would cause the President of the Treasury Board to move a motion to concur in the entire amount. Once we have voted for the entire amount, how can we turn around and say that we want to change our minds and vote for something less? It makes an ass of the system.

• (1515)

I am sorry to use something that may be close to unparliamentary language, but I am talking about the system, not a member, although that sometimes is open for debate.

Supply

Let me use another example, which is the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Again I think about our committee, the public accounts committee, where the auditor general pointed out to us a problem that he found regarding a water treatment system on one reserve in the province of Ontario. The water treatment plant, according to the consultant, could be fixed for \$26,000. But by the time the job was done, and it was not done properly, the bill was over \$2.3 million. There is no control. If we wanted to remove that amount from the estimates we could not do it. That is a serious problem that we have with the main estimates as they are presented and with the process.

The finance department will spend approximately \$45 billion a year on interest on our national debt. Because that is deemed to be statutory spending, as I referred to earlier, we cannot vote on one single penny of that \$45 billion. Surely it is the House that is supreme and it is the House that has control of the public purse. We thought we had control of the public purse, but obviously the House does not have control of the public purse.

Therefore, my question is: Where do we go from here? The good news is that there is an answer. The answer lies, in my opinion, in the report that was tabled in the last parliament, called "The Business of Supply: Completing the Circle of Control". It was an all-party committee chaired by the deputy whip of the government. It dealt with a lot of the problems I have raised here today. This report, which one eminent person called the best report on parliamentary procedure in 50 years, deserves a great deal of consideration by the House.

I believe that 52 recommendations were made. I will just mention one or two of them to give hon. members an idea of how "The Business of Supply: Completing the Circle of Control" report dealt with these issues.

It recommended that a committee be set up to monitor and review the estimates and the supply process. That is just a simple recommendation to say this asinine procedure of putting the cart before the horse should stop and we should get it back to the right way. That way the House will be able to express its opinion on how to change the estimates.

It said that the standing orders should be amended to create a standing committee on the estimates with a mandate to monitor and review the estimates, the supply process and related matters and that the work of the standing committees on the estimates be referred to them. That way we would be able to ensure that the committees that deal with the estimates would be dealing with them in an appropriate fashion and bringing back to the House appropriate recommendations based on all parties' opinions as to what they thought of the estimates.

It goes on to say that a standing committee on the estimates should be specifically empowered to report to the House on the estimates and on the supply process at least on an annual basis. We want to ensure, again, bringing back to the House the authority and

the primacy that the House is the granter of supply to the government.

The committee went on to recommend that the standing committee on the estimates be authorized to undertake periodic reviews of the mechanism used by crown corporations to report to parliament and the adequacy of the means by which they receive appropriations from parliament. That is an excellent recommendation.

It goes on to talk about how in this day and age, when we know that people want to spend all of the budget rather than achieve their objectives within budget, the parliamentary committees should be allowed to move up to 5% from one allocation to another. That makes common sense today when we hear so much about wastage and balloon budget spending toward the end of the fiscal year.

• (1520)

I could go on and on about the problems related to the business of supply and how the subcommittee on the business of supply dealt with the issue on a constructive, all-party basis that had the unanimous support of all parties in the last parliament.

It is high time this government and this parliament realized that Canadian taxpayers deserve much better and that this report needs to be adopted. The recommendations contained in the report need to be adequately considered, rather than being put on the shelf. I seriously hope this government will ensure today that we look at this report and adopt the recommendations contained therein.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address Motion No. 1, through which the President of the Treasury Board seeks to grant a vote of over \$193 million to the Department of Justice.

I wish to inform the House that the Bloc Québécois opposes the vote proposed by the President of the Treasury Board for the Department of Justice, for a number of reasons.

Since the opening of the parliamentary session in September, the government's justice policies have often been criticized by opposition parties and by Canadians and Quebeckers, who are tired of seeing their tax dollars being used for objectives that do not meet their needs.

The government has been turning a deaf ear for a long time. It runs the country as it pleases, without listening to what taxpayers have to say.

The Prime Minister and his Minister of Finance are the only ones to set priorities, and these priorities do not at all serve the interests of those most in need. Because of the government's way of

Supply

managing, an increasing number of our fellow citizens have difficulty making ends meet.

The Liberal government's priorities are very poorly defined. The measures taken by the Department of Justice are a perfect illustration of the Liberals' bankruptcy.

For example, by going ahead with its reference to the Supreme Court of Canada, in spite of all the opposition to such a measure, the Liberal government showed that it is prepared to blindly spend public money, against the interests of Canadians and particularly of Quebecers.

Quebeckers unanimously opposed the decision of the federal Minister of Justice because, among other reasons, the issue does not concern the federal government but Quebecers, who alone must decide on their future.

The reference to the supreme court is a prime example of how public money is wasted. What are we to think of the comments made by the Minister of Justice, to the effect that her government's representations to the supreme court are useless? Indeed, while the lawyer representing the federal government was pleading before the Supreme Court of Canada, the Minister of Justice said that, in any case, this exercise was useless. She said the process was unnecessary.

In fact, the minister is quite right in saying that the nine judges appointed to the supreme court will be unable to resolve the problem of Quebec sovereignty, because it is up to Quebec, in all legitimacy, to decide on its own future.

By admitting to the media that the reference is pointless from the constitutional point of view, the Minister of Justice was adding insult to injury. In addition to denying the right of the people of Quebec to self-determination, this reference is a total waste of public funds, and the federal government ought to be ashamed. This is one of the reasons for our opposition to the \$193 million-plus the President of Treasury Board has given to the Department of Justice.

In addition, it must not be thought that the funds committed to this political waste are coming solely from the coffers of the Department of Justice. People must be aware that the Privy Council, and the departments of Canadian Heritage and of Finance, are all very actively involved in the reference. We must not, therefore, be surprised to learn that the bill is a lot stiffer than the Minister of Justice suggests in her answers to questions in committee.

• (1525)

Funding of the reference to the supreme court comes not only from Justice, but from other departments as well. It is virtually impossible to know which departments have spent money on the

reference to the supreme court, but we do know that millions of dollars have been spent on it. Members will therefore understand that, when we are presented with a bill for \$193 million, the Bloc Quebecois is against it, knowing what the money is going for.

The supreme court reference on Quebec's right to be the only one to decide its future proves to us, without a shadow of a doubt, that the Liberal government holds the democratic rights of Quebecers in complete contempt. Unfortunately, the sombre list of Liberal nonsense does not end there.

The reference is not the only example of the profound malaise on the Liberal benches. In introducing her strategy for the renewal of the youth justice system recently, the Minister of Justice demonstrated again that her government was light years removed from the needs of its people, and especially light years away from what Quebec wants.

The reform of the Young Offenders Act, which, according to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, is to calm misinformed public opinion, is another example of poor management of public funds. As the primary stakeholders in the field of juvenile crime pointed out, the Young Offenders Act is sufficient. It needs only be properly applied. The problem is not the act, as I have said, but its application.

Quebec, whose youth crime rate is the lowest in Canada, sets an example for all Canadians in its application of the law. Instead of encouraging the other provinces to follow Quebec's example, the minister embarked on a costly reform that will not serve society's interests.

Instead of following Quebec's lead and intervening in the reintegration and rehabilitation of young offenders, the Minister of Justice has opted for stigmatization and easy votes in western Canada. Quite honestly, this is not a judicious use of public funds, of the taxes paid by Quebecers and Canadians alike.

The minister took the easy way out by ignoring the advice of experts in this area as well as that of her predecessor. The minister's predecessor, another Liberal justice minister, was also involved in this, but he did not share the current minister's opinion.

As evidenced by the following remarks, the current Minister of Health and former justice minister repeatedly spoke in favour of the existing legislation.

For the benefit of the people listening to us, I shall quote him. The minister said "The government continues to believe the youth justice system is a valid one and supports it. The Young Offenders Act as it exists at present is more than sufficient, if properly administered, to deal with juvenile justice in the country." That is what the then Minister of Justice, now health minister, said at the time about the Young Offenders Act.

Supply

Yet, the current minister is nevertheless going to legislate on the basis of an unfounded public perception fostered by the Reform Party. In addition, the minister indulges in unjustified spending, while her government owes the Government of Quebec \$77 million for the implementation of the Young Offenders Act. The Quebec justice minister repeatedly asked that the costs associated with implementing the act in Quebec be reimbursed to Quebec.

Quebec is home to approximately 25% of all young Canadians, while in terms of funding it receives only 18% of the federal budget for implementing the Young Offenders Act.

I personally questioned the minister on this, given how unfair this is to Quebec, which has been requesting funding for years, and in light of the fact that the predecessor of the current Minister of Justice all but admitted this money was owed to Quebec.

• (1530)

When he is asked to justify this imbalance, his response in committee is that Quebec got less because it had placed the emphasis on rehabilitating young offenders and these measures were less costly than the measures involving incarceration which were used by other provinces.

I find this answer rather fascinating. Since the objective of the Young Offenders Act is reintegration into society, I would have thought the province best applying the act would get more money, but the opposite is true. In Quebec we are penalized because we are implementing an act passed by the federal government; however, the western provinces, which have focussed on structures and on locking people up, will get more money, because that approach is more costly.

There is something illogical about this, and members will understand that, when one sees the Department of Justice spending the \$193 million it will be getting via supply, why the Bloc Quebecois cannot agree with this, given that these monies are mismanaged and misspent by a minister concerned only with raising her profile and getting easy votes in the west.

The Department of Justice's strategy on youth crime can, therefore, be summarized as follows. It sets up a new, expensive, and inadequate program; it turns a deaf ear to Quebec, which is implementing the legislation properly; it refuses to reimburse Quebec for doing so.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Muise: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just wonder if you would perhaps check if we have quorum or not. After this morning's debate, I am concerned about what is happening.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Just to be clear. Is the hon. member for West Nova requesting a quorum call?

Mr. Mark Muise: Mr. Speaker, yes I am calling quorum.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We have quorum.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, I invite the Liberals to stick around and listen. What I have to say is extremely interesting. I extend that invitation to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister in particular. It would be worth her while.

To get back to what I was saying before I was interrupted by the quorum call, which incidentally the government, and not the opposition, is responsible for maintaining—if a quorum is called for, it is because there are not enough government MPs in the House, and this needs to be explained because people are not aware of it—

What the government MPs fail to understand is that it is up to them to maintain a presence in this House. They are the ones who have to maintain a quorum, not the Bloc Quebecois, not the Conservatives, not the NDP. They are the ones in power, and they are the ones who have to be here if the House is to keep operating.

That said—they cut me off in the best part and they are annoying me—the Minister of Justice's strategy for juvenile crime may be summarized as follows.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague should not leave but listen. She sets up an expensive and unsatisfactory new plan; she turns a deaf ear to remarks by Quebec, which properly applies the law; she refuses to reimburse Quebec for applying the law and, in the end, she is making political points in the West. Once again, the Liberal government should be ashamed of the way it manages its priorities.

Instead of spending most of this money on unlawful political forays such as the reference to the Supreme Court of Canada and unsuitable programs such as the reform of the Young Offenders Act and all the programs involving young offenders, the federal government should respond to the desperate needs of the people and to the legitimate expectations of Quebecers.

For example, when will the government agree to make the necessary changes to the Freedom of Information Act, among others? How many reports by the commissioner of information have to be tabled in this House before the Minister of Justice agrees to reform a law which lacks the teeth to ensure access to information in Canada?

I will quote the information commissioner, who says "After 15 years, the Freedom of Information Act must be consolidated and modernized".

• (1535)

He went on to say "The blame lies neither with fate nor with the law, it lies with the government and officials who prefer to complain of the demands of access to information rather than

Supply

espouse its noble objectives, who prefer to deny the public the information it paid for with its taxes”.

If the government spent carefully, perhaps we might see an access to information act that would give Canadians and Quebecers the transparency democracy requires.

What is strange, when one looks at past *Debates*, is that when the Liberals were the opposition, they made comments, for instance about the Access to Information Act, to the effect that it did not meet their needs, that it did not give access to all documents, that things were being concealed. They said that it was not strict enough, or this or that.

Now they are on the other side. They could amend the Access to Information Act, to reflect their criticisms while in opposition. But when one is on the gravy train, when one is busy concealing all manner of things from the public, and when one is in government, there is no desire to change things. That is where the Liberals are at now. They are hiding behind a law that needs changing, even the access to information commissioner says so.

I could also say a great deal about all the unnecessary expenditures, or more particularly what the department is not doing and ought to be doing, with the \$193 million or so that will be voted to it this evening.

Among other things, it could introduce a money laundering bill. Why does the federal government not spend some money on looking at the possibility of legislation to tighten things up so that Canada is no longer the hub of money laundering? Billions pass through Quebec, Ontario and the other provinces for that very purpose, and the federal government sits there with its arms folded.

It says “Isn’t it terrible about all that money laundering” but does nothing. The opposition has often asked questions on this and the members of the government do nothing about it.

The Bloc Quebecois did manage, through its efforts, to push the government across the way into introducing anti-gang legislation. I see the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve who worked hard with me on this issue in the Standing Committee on Justice, when we were the official opposition. We managed to get the Liberal government to make concessions, although not as many as we would have liked.

If we are going to give a little over \$193 million to the Department of Justice, why not add certain provisions to the anti-gang legislation, so we can go after gang leaders? As we know, all those who implement this legislation say that it does not allow them to go after the leaders.

It is time the government used its money for legitimate purposes. It is time it admitted to making some bad choices. It is time it

recognized that things are done differently in Quebec and listened to Quebecers’ concerns about, among other things, the Young Offenders Act, which is a very simple piece of legislation.

An hon. member: It costs a lot more in Quebec.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: One can see the ignorance of members opposite. One can see the ignorance of government members who say that it costs more in Quebec to implement the Young Offenders Act. This is not true. Look at the figures.

Even if you take into account the outstanding claim that the federal government is refusing to pay, Quebec gets less money per young offender than any other Canadian province. For a total of 10,000 young offenders, Quebec is getting eight times less than western provinces.

What I do not understand is that the person who made these comments is a member from Quebec. I think he should work harder at protecting the interests of his constituents. The member for Beauce should be ashamed of distorting the facts, as he is now doing, and not adequately protecting his constituents.

He should rise and tell the Liberals that it does not make sense to use public money the way they do, including the \$193 million allocated to the Department of Justice.

In conclusion, I wish the Liberals who are listening would be more perceptive. They look concerned. I get the impression that I taught them a few things today. They should take a closer look at the budget before voting on the business of supply tonight. I do hope they will at least check on what the Minister of Justice will do with this \$193 million.

• (1540)

I do hope that Quebec members—and many of them are listening—will also keep an eye on the Minister of Justice to stop her from spending Quebecers’ money on things such as references to the Supreme Court of Canada, because Quebecers have had enough of this.

[English]

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my hon. colleague with interest.

The removal of \$193,805,000 would completely remove the client services and the law and policy administration. I recall earlier this year that the Bloc Quebecois pleaded with the government for help with motorcycle gangs like the Posse, the Rock Machine and Hell’s Angels. Will my hon. colleague still be asking for that kind of help? Where would the money come from to fund that resource?

Supply

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, in a sense, I answered that question when I commented on the amendments to the Young Offenders Act.

If the member has been following the Bloc Québécois' arguments since 1993 regarding the criminal justice system, I will not be telling him anything he does not already know when I say that, when it comes to justice and the application of the Criminal Code, the federal government should simply withdraw. It should negotiate with the provinces so that they can recover full jurisdiction over the criminal justice system and all criminal courts. This should come entirely under provincial jurisdiction.

The present situation makes no sense. The federal government passes laws, but does not apply them. That is left to the provinces, because the administration of justice is a provincial matter. Perhaps back in 1867 the Fathers of Confederation—or is it federation, because the federalists opposite use a different jargon and cannot agree on whether it is a federation or a confederation, but that is not my problem, given the Bloc Québécois' objective—thought it would work well. But, as it happens, it does not.

As it happens, there is extremely expensive overlap and duplication. The federal government should withdraw and return full jurisdiction to the National Assembly and the other provinces so that they can have full control over the criminal justice system and all related matters. The \$193 million not spent by the federal government could thus be transferred to the provinces so that they can have jurisdiction and administer the criminal justice system properly.

I can give another very recent example. In committee, we are studying provisions that would create a kind of victims' assistance bureau, or something of the sort. A number of provinces, including Quebec, already have a law known as the victims of crime act. We have an office to help victims of crime, and compensation is given to these victims.

The federal government wants to legislate in this area and to parallel Quebec, because we already have this. I have heard from representatives of British Columbia the same thing I have heard in Quebec. They do not want the federal government intervening in an area of provincial jurisdiction and investing money in programs paralleling those already existing in the provinces. They want it to give the money to the provinces so they can spend it where it would do the most good.

So what I mean when I say I oppose the appropriations worth \$193 million we will be voting on is that the money is badly used and badly spent. If there is one area where the provinces are more competent and closer to the people in order to better respond to their expectations, it is the area of the Criminal Code and related legislation, and the provinces should have full jurisdiction there.

The other question the hon. member raised is that if \$193 million is cut, there will be no more money to go after the motorcycle gangs. In this regard, I will speak to you of Quebec. In Quebec, the Parti Québécois government—first under Mr. Parizeau, then under Mr. Bouchard, assumed its full responsibilities.

• (1545)

They created some highly competent squads with excellent results. The people across the floor may well laugh. The hon. member for Beauce may well not know his history, or what is going on in the National Assembly, but I think that where the anti-gang legislation is concerned, if the Government of Quebec had not acted on it, if the Government of Quebec had not helped the Bloc Québécois, the hon. members over there would never have had the political courage to listen to what many Quebeckers were calling for in connection with legislation against motorcycle gangs. The Minister of Justice decided to act because of the Bloc Québécois and the Government of Quebec.

Once again, I understand that the Liberal MPs from Quebec do not want to hear that. They are ignorant of their history, as we have often said, but today we have one more proof of it.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you will join with me in commenting on the eloquence of the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm, as he spoke with a depth one very rarely gets from that side of the House.

I would like to ask one question of my colleague, the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm. Can he tell us why it is important at this point in history and in the present situation with organized crime, to have MPs like those in the Bloc Québécois able to stand up and propose concrete measures?

My colleague referred to money laundering. This is cause for great concern. I would like my colleague, with his knowledge in this area, to raise the awareness of others, the government members in particular, who are a bit slow to assimilate anything new.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, money laundering is indeed a major industry in Canada. According to police officers and experts in the field—and the member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve can correct me if I am wrong—between \$225 and \$250 billion are laundered in Canada every year. It should come as no surprise that Canada is known internationally as a haven for money laundering.

As a Quebecker, this does not make me proud. We are working hard to achieve our goal but, for the time being, Quebec is still part of Canada. Every year, between \$225 and \$250 billion are laundered in our country. This bothers me a bit. We repeatedly asked this government to introduce legislation to make it harder to launder money in Canada, since it is done all too easily right now.

Supply

In its electoral platform, the Bloc Québécois suggested a very simple idea which the government could implement immediately. It could even be implemented before we adjourn for the summer. Canada is about the only country in the world with bank notes of \$1,000. No other country has \$1,000 bills. Why not stop producing these \$1,000 bank notes? Who in this House walks around with ten bills of \$1,000 in his pockets?

Mr. Réal Ménard: Raise your hand.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Come on, raise your hand. There are not many Liberals and there is no one on our side.

Mr. Speaker, do you have ten bills of \$1,000 in your pockets? No?

In Canada, \$1,000 bank notes are used almost exclusively for transfers, for buying land, or by organized crime members. Not many people walk around with \$1,000 bank notes in their pockets. I think that bills of \$100, \$50 and \$20 adequately meet the needs of Canadians, particularly since we make extensive use of credit cards. There is no need to carry large amounts of money in our pockets.

• (1550)

Why not, then, go along with what the Bloc Québécois requested during the election campaign and on a few occasions since 1997 and take one thousand dollar bills out of circulation? It is very simple.

I have a friend who is a lawyer, a judge now, whom I will not name for fear of making his life difficult—

An hon. member: Appointed by the federal government.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Yes, appointed by the federal government. Admittedly, I was once a Liberal, but he is still one.

The judge said that there was a case of a man appearing in a financial institution with a hockey bag stuffed with \$20, \$50 and \$100 dollar bills. He had the tidy little sum of about \$270,000 in there. As things now stand, the institution is not required to refuse this, to say the least, odd deposit.

This would be one place where the lawmakers could amend the law to reinforce this and not allow such strange deposits. An individual should be required to report the source of bills being deposited.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the

Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed a bill to which the concurrence of the House is desired.

* * *

[English]

SUPPLY

MAIN ESTIMATES, 1998-99

The House resumed consideration of the business of supply.

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the subject of the Department of Canadian Heritage estimates. I am splitting my time with the hon. member for Palliser.

Canadian heritage may seem like a vague term to most Canadians. However, when they begin to understand the areas which heritage covers it has tremendous importance to each and every one of us. When we talk about the heritage department we are talking about the Canada Council, the CBC, the Canadian Film Development Corporation, all of our libraries and museums, the art gallery, the CRTC, the NFB and all of the community grants and supports to individual artists.

I remember back in September of last year at one of the first meetings of the heritage committee we had a visit from the minister.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): If the hon. member for Dartmouth would excuse me for a moment, I just want to be assured that the hon. member for Dartmouth is speaking to Motion No. 1 which has to do with the Department of Justice. If the hon. member could work the Department of Justice into her intervention, it would make it much more relevant to the debate at hand.

Ms. Wendy Lill: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the Department of Canadian Heritage estimates.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The floor must then go to a member to speak to the motion that is being debated at hand. The hon. member for Dartmouth was splitting her time. If the hon. member for Palliser does not wish to continue debate at this time, I will then recognize the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough and also the member for Berthier—Montcalm propose to vote down the operating expenditures of the Department of Justice.

If the House approves this motion, it would prevent the Department of Justice from conducting its statutory responsibilities. The \$193.8 million in operating expenditures required in 1998-99 will allow the department to carry out its responsibilities for the legal affairs of the government as a whole and to provide legal services to individual departments and agencies.

More specifically, these funds will enable the department to continue to meet its responsibilities under three lines: one, the provision of services to the government; two, policy development and administration of the law; and three, the administration itself. I intend to elaborate on each line or point today.

• (1555)

[Translation]

The Department of Justice serves the government in various ways. It drafts all government legislation. It provides legal advice to all departments and represents the government in court.

To ensure the timely provision of the services they need, most department incorporate legal services in their departmental headquarters. These are the legal services falling under the justice department, in charge of providing legal advice, court representation and legal assistance on all legal matters that concern the various departments.

A network of regional offices provides most court representation services. These offices also provide legal advice to meet the needs of the government and its agencies in terms of regional operations.

[English]

There are three main areas where the Department of Justice has lead responsibility: criminal justice policy, family and youth law policy arising out of marriage and divorce; and human rights policy. The department also has the lead role in constitutional law, administrative law, aboriginal justice, access to information and privacy law, official languages law and the government's mandate for courts and judges.

The Minister of Justice and her department are responsible for over 40 statutes, many with major policy ramifications. The department must anticipate future legal and societal trends in order to provide timely, strategic and effective responses; to provide leadership both to the government and the public in understanding the changing legal world; and to provide guidance in achieving governmental objectives in a manner consistent with fundamental rights and freedoms, fairness, equality, accessibility, and effective and efficient legal policy.

To meet this challenge and to ensure Canadians have a fair, efficient, accessible and inclusive national system of justice, the department provides a range of services relating to the planning, co-ordination, development, promotion and implementation of justice related policies.

Supply

The Department of Justice 1998-99 report on plans and priorities shows that the department is moving forward with a balanced and focused policy agenda which responds to the issues Canadians have identified as important to them.

Let us examine some of the areas the department is currently working on. One is the crime prevention strategy.

[Translation]

Last week, the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General announced a new phase in the national community safety and crime prevention strategy, whose budget has increased from \$3 million to \$32 million a year. This strategy is designed to help communities address the root causes of crime.

The role of the justice department in this new phase of the program will be to promote the exchange of information between communities on effective crime prevention measures, help federal departments co-ordinate their efforts and establish relationships based on partnership between the governments, NGOs and the private sector. To this end, the justice department will have to call upon the interest, expertise, ideas and contribution of all Canadians.

[English]

Let me now turn to youth justice, on which the members of the opposition had much to say today. The Minister of Justice recognizes that Canadians' confidence in the youth justice system has been shaken in recent years. She announced a few weeks ago a youth justice strategy that would lead to the replacement of the Young Offenders Act. The reform would ensure that violent young offenders would face meaningful consequences for their crimes. It would also provide new ways of approaching youth justice that give young people the opportunity to turn their lives around.

The Minister of Justice does not believe, as the Reform Party does, that putting more kids in jail for longer periods is the solution. This is too simplistic an approach, as are most of the Reform Party's approaches on justice.

Violent youth will face custody but jail terms are often counter-productive for the vast majority of youth who are non-violent. The strategy involves looking at alternative approaches, approaches that specifically aim to instil the values of responsibility and accountability in youth.

[Translation]

The treatment accorded victims of crime is another of the Minister of Justice's priorities. The work done by the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights should provide the Department of Justice with useful information to find ways to guarantee victims at least two things: access to information and protection under the law.

Supply

• (1600)

[*English*]

Last night the Minister of Justice visited a town hall meeting that I held in my riding with the assistance of the hon. member for Mount Royal and other members of the Quebec caucus on the government side. Despite what the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm said, most people who were present at this meeting, although the Quebec system is a good one, still found a lack of funding for a lot of the resources that victims need.

One thing we are attempting to do through this type of consultation with Quebecers and all other Canadians across the country is to ensure that there is collaboration between federal and provincial governments and to ensure there are services available for victims. Certainly last night that was not the portrait presented in Quebec in terms of the system in place in Quebec which lacks funding. We encourage all members of the House of Commons to attend town hall meetings.

[*Translation*]

The department is looking to resolve victims' frustration by trying to improve access to appropriate information, especially as concerns the co-ordination and sharing of information on victims' rights and services.

The Minister of Justice has asked the department to examine the possibility—and, I repeat, possibility, one of the ones on the table, nothing is written yet—of creating a central office to assist victims. However, she never said, and reference was made yesterday at my town hall meeting, that this would duplicate something that already exists in the provinces. There is no question of that. It is only one of the things raised by the agencies working with victims. We are looking at all the options. Everything is on the table.

As for legal protection, counsel with the Department of Justice recently defended the constitutional validity of the new provisions of the Criminal Code aimed at limiting public access to the medical records of plaintiffs in proceedings involving sexual offences.

The department is also looking into the possibility of amending the Criminal Code to respond to their concerns by, among other things, permitting greater use of victims' statements.

[*English*]

Conditional sentencing is another favourite topic of the opposition. The Department of Justice is examining on an ongoing basis areas which are controversial. One of those areas is conditional sentencing. Since September 1996 when judges have been able to grant conditional sentences over 18,000 such sentences have been imposed. The vast majority of these orders were considered appropriate dispositions. However some decisions have caused concern and controversy.

One of the reasons they have caused concern and controversy is that they are constantly being exploited by members of the Reform Party. Sensationalizing the most violent criminals in our society seems to be the game of the day. Fearmongering is also part of Reform's strategy.

The Department of Justice is working closely with the provinces and territories to monitor conditional sentences at the request of the attorneys general of all provinces. This monitoring work is important to ensure that any reform to the law is based on real facts, not on perceptions based on media reporting or fearmongering on the part of the opposition.

Very recently the Supreme Court of Canada agreed to hear appeals in five cases involving persons who received conditional sentences of imprisonment. The appeals are expected to provide clarification and guidance in the use of conditional sentences in cases involving violence resulting in death or injury or other such cases. The department has also been asked by the Minister of Justice to consider the development of common guidelines that would assist prosecutors in deciding when to seek conditional sentences. We have acted despite the opposition saying that we do not act.

There has been a constant debate in the House on firearms control. We must never forget that opposition members oppose any type of gun control system in Canada, even though 80% of Canadians support a universal registration system for shotguns and rifles. The opposition is out of touch with Canadians.

Effective implementation of a firearms control program is among the highest priorities of the Department of Justice. The regulations required to implement the system have been made following the scrutiny of both houses of parliament. The system will be functional by October 1, 1998.

Registration together with licensing and the other aspects of the Firearms Act are aimed at facilitating the continued enjoyment of their sport by responsible owners using safe practices. This will decrease the risk of gratuitous violence and will promote a culture that recognizes safety and responsibility. We do not want children killing children in Canada.

• (1605)

The new firearms legislation is a positive effective contributor to the range of criminal and social measures put in place by the government to further a safe and secure society. The gun control legislation has the support of a large majority, as high as 80% and as high as 72% in some rural areas, and is a reflection of a country of peaceful communities, safe streets and fairness.

Concerning administration it is a third business line of the Department of Justice. It encompasses the range of corporate

management and administrative services required to support the department's program delivery and internal administration.

To conclude, I believe the department is managing its resources responsibly. The department's policy work will have an impact on the confidence of Canadians in their justice system. In addition the role of the Department of Justice in advising the government on legal issues—and let us not forget it is the legal department for all government departments—and in conducting litigation on behalf of the crown is vital to the proper functioning of the Canadian government and Canadian society as a whole. The department should be given the means to conduct its responsibilities.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am always amazed when the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice speaks in the House.

She is given the opportunity to bring forward the programs of government and the benefits that it believes will flow from those programs. She either seems to be uncomfortable or lacking confidence in her own position or in her government's programs and legislation because she always has to take up much of the time simply attacking the opposition.

The parliamentary secretary talked about the gun control program and said that 80% of the people supported the hideous, ill conceived Bill C-68. If that were the case we would not have four provincial governments having to answer to their electorate just as the federal government will have to do. If 80% of voters were telling their provincial governments to support the bill, we would not have four provinces and two territories supporting the constitutional challenge that is occurring now before the appeal court of Alberta. I will get back to this point when I speak in the House on the estimates.

The member talked about spending more money. The minister announced the expenditure of \$32 million in the area of crime prevention and so on. However, when the justice minister and her officials appeared before the standing committee on the estimates I asked this question of the minister: "Why is it that the province of Manitoba is considering litigation to get out from under the administration of the Young Offenders Act? Why is that happening based upon the fact that the federal government is reneging on its cost sharing program?" I also asked the minister where that stood and if there was more money on the table to bring Manitoba back onside. At that time the answer was no.

In view of additional expenditure in the area of justice, has new money been offered to the province of Manitoba to get it onside and to get it to continue to administer the Young Offenders Act, or is it still heading for court to get out from under the administration of the Young Offenders Act?

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos: Mr. Speaker, I take offence at the suggestion that we are trying to dodge our responsibilities in the House, be it the minister or be it myself as parliamentary secretary.

Supply

As far as the question the member asked, the \$32 million put forward by the government was the crime prevention initiative to ensure community involvement in terms of crime prevention.

• (1610)

We as a government, unlike the Reform Party, believe that we have to start early in order to prevent crime. Jail is not the answer for children. Nor is whipping, as one member would like us to believe. Nor is caning, as another members would like us to believe. We should take the \$32 million and sit down with the provinces, the municipalities and the private sector to come up with effective crime prevention initiatives across the country.

There will be ongoing negotiations with the municipal governments, the provincial governments and all other players, be they private or community based organizations, to ensure that we prevent crime and do not continue to spend as much money as we spend right now in terms of incarcerating people. That is totally different from what the Reform Party would like us to believe.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take a few moments to exchange views with my colleague, the member for Ahuntsic, who I hear is very involved in the school elections, but we will have another chance to talk about that. I nonetheless wish her good luck on Sunday, because she could find it rough going.

Can the minister tell us a little about what her government plans to do with respect to the Canadian Human Rights Act? I have its latest report here. I have always been extremely interested in the whole human rights issue, and we are urgently calling for an overhaul of the legislation.

This is a piece of legislation that has not been amended, except obviously for the addition of an 11th prohibited ground of discrimination last year. It cries out for an overhaul. Does the minister agree with those who think that poverty is a growing reality in Canada? Did members know that there have never been so many poor people in Canada? I can see, of course, that you are thinking that there is a direct link with the terrible cuts to transfers made by this government and you are not mistaken. The fact is that the income of approximately 40% of Canadians and Quebecers is below the poverty line.

What connection does this have with the Canadian Human Rights Act? The connection is that we should give economic rights and that we should never allow discrimination based on social status. May I remind you that in France, the mother country of us all and the elder daughter of the Church, there is an obligation for the human rights commission to review all acts, and to advise on the impact legislation passed by the French government will have on poverty. Might I ask the hon. parliamentary secretary, whose

Supply

sensitivity to this issue I am well aware of, whether she subscribes to such measures?

Second, does she acknowledge that her government is particularly clam-like, if not jellyfish-like, lacking in scope or ambition, when it comes to fighting organized crime? The hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm, a rising star in the Quebec firmament, has clearly pointed out to us that a meaningful policy against crime requires a number of significant measures that are lacking at present. Of course, there is all the business of money laundering.

I have no great expectations of the parliamentary secretary's answers to the questions, but if she would agree to cast a little light on this question, I would be grateful to her.

In closing, can she tell us who she plans to support in the school board elections coming up this Sunday, June 14, in Montreal?

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos: Mr. Speaker, first, we are not discussing school elections here. When a member abuses his privileges here in this House, it is my duty, as a member of this House, to point it out, even when he has repaid the money, because he still committed the act. Political parties do not enter into it.

I have never been involved in school elections. The Bloc gets involved in every one. Every time one is held, there they are. The former member for Rosemont would get involved, the leader of the Bloc has been involved and now the new member for Rosemont. Three times they have got involved. They are involved in school elections. I was not involved, I simply pointed out to all Canadians, including the people of Rosemont who complained to me, that the member for Rosemont sent a letter in support of MEMO, the gang of separatists in Quebec, to everyone.

• (1615)

That said, I will answer the question.

First, in terms of the fight against crime, I think the member for Hochelaga—Maisonnette is aware that the former Minister of Justice introduced the first bill against biker gangs in the House. I think we are in favour and that we can consider the suggestion by the Bloc justice critic on money laundering.

The Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice are aware of the need. We were the ones to first introduce anti-gang legislation here. We are therefore well aware of the problem to be resolved.

Second, on the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, I want to mention to the hon. member that the Quebec charter contains no provision on economic rights. I may be mistaken—

Mr. Réal Ménard: On social conditions.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos: Right, on social conditions. I do approve of his suggestion, though, and I think we should examine the possibility of adding another condition to the Canadian charter.

We recognize as a government that poverty is an important aspect of crime in this country. If people live in poverty, aspects of their lives may lead them into crime. This is why we invested \$32 million in crime prevention—in order to help people and prevent crime.

[*English*]

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I understand I have 20 minutes to address the estimates. The hon. parliamentary secretary to the justice minister refused to answer my question regarding the position that Manitoba is in right now.

Is there more money placed on the table to keep that government on side in terms of administering the Young Offenders Act? I asked that question very clearly. I repeated it and she refused to answer it. That is the type of response we get from this government on very vital issues. Yet she can stand in her place and criticize, scorn and mock the opposition, all opposition members, including the official opposition, that we have nothing good to say, nothing good to offer. There is nothing over here worth consideration.

Yet when we ask her a straightforward question about a province struggling to administer a key component of the justice system what do we get from her? Her answer is on the record. My question is on the record and her non-answer is on the record. She ought to be ashamed of herself.

To the motion we are debating now, Motion No. 1 moved by my hon. colleague from Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, I cannot support this motion because if passed it would mean that all funding would be eliminated within the solicitor general's department.

If these motions were to pass we would effectively shut down the RCMP, the DNA databank, the RCMP external review committee, the National Parole Board and Correctional Service Canada. Although we have some serious concerns and reservations about these departments and the expenditures within, we cannot support completely shutting them down.

I appreciate this motion put forward by the hon. member because it does open the avenue for the debate I think is very necessary in this whole area of justice.

We do not support certain expenditures under the solicitor general and we do not agree with particular expenditures of this government under justice.

Supply

• (1620)

Justice is one area the Reform Party believes funding should remain constant in, with priorities being shifted. The Reform Party would increase spending in areas such as community policing. Our police forces are slowly diminishing to the detriment of public safety. Thus we would propose increased transfers to the provinces to provide for more police on the streets.

We moved 200 RCMP officers to an international posting but we did not replace them. Imagine the positive effect of having 200 RCMP members wisely deployed across this country and the enormous deterrent they would have on the streets.

We are making these types of decisions and expending this kind of funding to help internationally while at the same time reducing the effectiveness of our police forces and law enforcement agencies at home. We question that.

I have proposed to reduce spending by \$20,390,330 within the Department of Justice under grants and contributions. This money has been allocated as a contribution to the provinces and territories for the firearms program. Under the supplementary estimates I proposed the \$87,467,000 allotted for the Canadian firearms registration system be reduced to \$1. It is no secret that the Reform Party is opposed to the expenditure of scarce dollars for the registration of rifles and shotguns.

For years we have been fighting long and hard to repeal Bill C-68 and its ill conceived firearms registry. We are adamantly opposed to the costly bureaucratic registry because to date the government has failed to provide any statistical justification for registration. The statistics used by the Department of Justice have caused significant controversy and concern among firearm owners, Canadians in general and specifically the Canadian Police Association since the release of a letter from the commissioner of the RCMP to the deputy minister of justice regarding his concern over the bogus use of RCMP statistics.

I have a copy of that letter from the RCMP commissioner's office dated July 21, 1997 to Mr. George Thompson, deputy minister of justice and deputy attorney general of Canada wherein he expresses his grave concern and the grave concern of the RCMP over the misuse of RCMP statistics.

In spite of that, these statistics were placed in a document called "The Illegal Movement of Firearms In Canada". One example is on page 10 of the document, and there are many other examples in this document. On page 10 is table III. The top of the table states "Firearms Involved in Crime. Type of Firearm Removed According to Offence". Then there are categories such as violent offences, rifles and shotguns, 915.

When this first came to the public's attention we met with members of the firearms section of the justice department and also

with a member of the RCMP. It was admitted to members of parliament that this creates an erroneous perception that all the 915 rifles and shotguns recovered in violent crimes, according to this table, was not accurate. Many of those rifles and shotguns had never been used in the commission of a criminal offence. They had been seized by police in other matters. For example, they would stop a drug dealer and conduct an arrest. He would have a rifle or a shotgun in the trunk of the car. It had not been used in the commission of a crime. They would seize that.

Another example given was they would attend a domestic dispute. Although the spouse had not been threatened by a firearm she felt that she had been threatened. For safety reasons the police would seize the firearm in the house.

• (1625)

They are using those kinds of statistics to justify what amounted to be an erroneous and false perception of the number of firearms used in the commission of criminal offences.

The worst part about this is that this letter expressing the concern of the RCMP was dated July 21, 1997. The Alberta court case, the constitutional challenge to Bill C-68, proceeded I think in November of that same year, a number of months afterwards. In spite of the concerns raised here there were six affidavits filed by justice officials containing these same bogus statistics, creating a false representation of the number of firearms used in the commission of a criminal offence. There we go. In the letter from the commissioner's office, concern is expressed that there was an improper and a false basis created to justify the creation of Bill C-68.

It is clear there is not anyone in the House who does not support firearms control. We have asked the former justice minister, now the health minister, we have asked all the proponents of that bill to please tell the House and the people of Canada how the registration of a rifle and shotgun will reduce the criminal use of those firearms. Of course they were never able to do that. If they could have shown us something that we were unable to see of course they would have had our support.

The fact is that is a myth. The registration of a rifle or shotgun will not reduce its criminal use. The weapon of choice for the street criminal is still the handgun, which has been registered in this country for the last 64 years. It has not reduced the criminal use of that firearm, because the use of that firearm, by their own statistics, is on the rise, certainly over the 64 years since registration was put into place.

When we look at the enormous cost contained within these estimates simply to administer, to set up the software, to get things ready for October 1, 1998, it is an unacceptable cost that ought to be going to crime prevention or it ought to be going to our DNA databank where it will have an impact on the commission of crime and there is a chance of reducing crime in certain areas.

Supply

Look at the polls. They quote the polls to support this erroneous, ill conceived piece of legislation. After this bill came into effect we had the province of Manitoba go to the polls, the province of Saskatchewan and the province of Ontario. In every case the party that formed the government came out strongly and publicly against the registration and licensing portion of Bill C-68.

If we want to talk about polls, the most significant poll we can get is a poll where the issue is debated and the people have a vote. That is exactly what happened in all three of those provinces. To suggest that 80% of the people support that portion of this ill conceived bill is utter nonsense. If that were the case we would not have Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta risking their political future by taking the most obnoxious portion of the bill, the licensing and registration portion, to court on a constitutional challenge. We would not have the two territories saying the same thing.

We have here a needless and useless piece of legislation and we are spending millions on it.

• (1630)

What we are saying is that there are other areas in justice crying out for these types of resources which are being ignored. Why? It is because the government has set itself on a path and will not change it in spite of evidence to the contrary.

What is the government going to do? The registration and licensing portion of that bill is not aimed at the criminals who use firearms, it is aimed at the law-abiding gun owner. If someone deliberately and knowingly refuses or neglects to register their .22, what is the penalty they will pay under the bill? The maximum penalty is 10 years in prison. Is that not wonderful? They will have to do that simply because they failed to fulfil an administrative requirement.

When we look at the legislation that has come forward since the Liberals formed the government in 1993, it is unbelievable that they are allowing conditional sentencing to continue. Convicted rapists and people who have been convicted of manslaughter have been allowed to walk free, and yet they are saying to the law-abiding rancher, farmer, gun owner that if they do not register their firearms by the year 2003 there will be a series of penalties, the most severe of which can be a 10 year jail sentence. However, the rapists are walking free. Violent offenders can walk free. It is a gift from the Liberal Party.

We have examined what is happening in our country in this particular area and at the economic impact. We had witness after witness appear before the standing committee, not only on the bill itself but on the regulations, who told us about the enormous negative impact it is having on the economy in certain areas of this country.

When we asked the justice officials if they had done an economic impact study on this bill and what impact, negative or otherwise, it would have on the economy, they said they had not done an impact study. They do not seem to care whether they drive people out of business or shut down gun shows, shooting ranges or gun clubs. They do not care.

When the witnesses appeared before the committee that was what they told us. Their testimony is on the record. They were saying that with the implementation of these regulations they may not be able to function as a gun club, as a shooting range or as a gun show any longer. The government is threatening to destroy the social events in the firearms community, those social events where people get together at a gun show to display their collections. They buy and they trade. It is much like a garage sale.

When we asked the witnesses from these shows who appeared before the committee if their activities over the past 20 years of running these gun shows had ever created personal or public danger to anyone, they replied that they had not. We asked them why they thought the government was regulating something that was not causing a problem. They had no answer for that. The minister has no answer to that question either.

The government is simply regulating many of these law-abiding organizations out of business, possibly through the increased insurance they are going to have pay.

This bill and the money that we are spending on this bill is wrong. It was wrong-headed at the beginning and the government has never been able to admit that it is wrong.

• (1635)

In spite of the fact that evidence to the contrary is overwhelming, it still continues with its mantra: gun control. Bill C-68 and the registration of rifles and shotguns is not gun control at all.

Everyone is in favour of the common sense control of firearms. The registration of rifles and shotguns does not contain the capacity to do that, nor does it contain the capacity to reduce the criminal use of the firearms.

The legislation will allow the confiscation, without compensation, of thousands of firearms. Bill C-68 will prohibit over 500,000 handguns. Why? The barrels are too short.

This is property which has been lawfully acquired and legally held for years. It is going to be confiscated, ultimately, without any compensation. Again, this is wrong.

We are saying that it is wrong to spend money on an ill-conceived bill like this and the government is not fully disclosing the cost to us.

The firearms group has said that it is the greatest boondoggle this country has every seen.

We will see. We will watch to see whether it comes into effect on October 1 and what kind of mess occurs. There are 20,000 to 30,000 of these handguns under this specific category that are going to be lost by the firearm owners themselves, the dealers. There is no law covering them. Therefore, they will lose them, apparently without compensation.

We will watch to see this ill-conceived piece of legislation as it moves into effect to see whether it brings safety to streets and homes or whether it continues to be an unmitigated mess.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. member that I do not pull figures out of the air.

In a recent Angus Reid poll, 82% of Canadians supported a system of universal registration of rifles and shotguns. There was 72% per cent approval for that same system in rural communities.

Those members just do not get it. This government was voted in after it adopted that piece of legislation, which had the support of this side of the House but was opposed by the opposition parties.

The hon. member keeps referring to a letter which he says distorts the facts. In fact, he is distorting the facts. The minister herself tabled a letter right here in the House which stated that the facts and figures represented in the first letter were true, but that they were based on a different system of calculation.

The hon. member refused, both in the justice committee and here in the House after it was debated on numerous occasions, to make reference to the second letter which was tabled in this House.

Constant distortion of the facts continues on this issue because the hon. member and his party refuse to accept that Canadians do not want children killing children, as happens elsewhere in the world, but in fact want to know that if somebody has a gun in their house the police know about it.

The RCMP and the Canadian Police Association endorse our policy of gun control.

Would the hon. member like to tell this House why he refuses to make reference to the second letter that was tabled by the hon. minister in this House which in fact says that the statistics are true?

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. She is asking me a question after she refused to answer mine. I will do what she did not do and answer the question.

I have looked at both letters. The RCMP is saying that our statistics are true. Those statistics that we gave represent firearms

Supply

used in the actual commission of a crime. What the deputy minister said was that their group looked at it from a broader point of view. They looked at firearms seized by the police in any type of investigation, not necessarily those used in a crime.

• (1640)

But that is not what is in this book of theirs. That is not in the "Illegal Movement of Firearms in Canada". Chart No. 3 is found on page 10 of that book. At the top of the chart it says "Firearms Involved in Crime". Under the violent column it says that rifles and shotguns were used in 915 crimes. When we met with the firearms officials, as well as a member of the RCMP, they admitted to us that the figure of 915 did not accurately represent firearms used in crimes, but that is the perception created there. They admitted it could very well create a false perception.

The point that we have been making is that this false and bogus piece of information was filed in the Alberta Court of Appeal in six different affidavits in the constitutional court challenge of Bill C-68. The figures are wrong. They were wrong then and they are wrong now.

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of brief questions for the hon. member.

I have watched the estimate of the cost of this firearms control effort rise from an estimated \$85 million to what it is now being estimated at, which is \$133.9 million just for this year alone. That estimate was made by the spokesman for the new firearms centre. It will be \$133.9 million for this year alone and it has not even begun yet.

I wonder if the hon. member has had any indication from the government what the total cost is going to be? Or has he been able to conclude a cost himself?

My second question refers to the \$32 million crime prevention initiative announced by the government, which a newspaper article cites as another \$32 million down the drain. It says that the minister's crime prevention initiative is more of the same mollycoddling that has made a joke out of the Young Offenders Act. I wonder if the hon. member agrees with that comment which appeared the Toronto *Sun*.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the cost of the firearms program, the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough asked the minister that very question when the minister appeared before the committee on April 20 of this year.

Of course the minister, with the deepest respect, mugwumped around that question and did not give us a clear and decisive answer as to the exact amount of money that had been spent up until that time, that is, April 1 of this year. What the minister did say was that they had spent \$66 million, but that also included the administra-

Supply

tion of Bill C-17. We do not know the cost of Bill C-17. Therefore, we do not know how much had been spent up until that time.

Mr. Valin, who was reported by Sean Durkan of the *Ottawa Sun*, claimed that we just did not ask the right question of the minister and that the total cost for this year was the figure that my hon. colleague mentioned, which is \$133.9 million.

It is such a confusing mess. We do not know if this is on top of the \$85 million or on top of the \$20 million that the estimates are going to send out to the provinces. We just do not know.

Mr. Speaker, if you are only going to give me 90 seconds on that question, then I will have to sit down and beg my hon. colleague's pardon for not getting to his second question.

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, many witnesses who testified at the standing committee on justice with regard to firearms registration said many times that a registry of firearms is certainly not going to prevent crime in any substantive way. The Conservative Party supports proper control of firearms and their proper use, but we think this expense of \$85 million referred to by the government is low. We hear rumours of a potential for maybe \$500 million.

• (1645)

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, if we are to believe what we are reading we will spend another \$133 million on top of whatever has been spent before a single firearm is registered.

If we look at the process to register a firearm or simply to get a licence to hold one, it is the same process or almost identical to the requirement for an FAC. The Toronto police board estimated the cost to process a single FAC requirement in 1994. I think it came to \$181 to do that.

If Ontario is high and we knock it down to \$100 and if there are three to six million firearm owners and we have to spend \$100 to process a licence application, we will spend \$300 million to \$600 million before we register a single firearm. The cost has never been honestly declared by the government, either because it does not know it or it does not want us to know it.

The former minister of justice is on record as saying that if it came anywhere near half a billion dollars he would withdraw and not proceed. The government is hiding the cost and I dare say for that very reason.

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Fanshawe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion of the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough if it is a serious motion. If the motion were to pass it would literally handcuff the Department of Justice and the important work it has to do.

It is quite clear to me as a member of parliament in my second term that Canadians want an improved system of justice. This is a priority concern of Canadians from coast to coast to coast. Obviously it will be necessary to invest some taxpayer dollars into priority areas. To pass a motion like this one would prevent the department from carrying out its existing duties and would certainly make it impossible for the Department of Justice to move into new priority areas of the Canadian public.

I will address the heavy responsibilities the department executes. There is service to the government itself. There is the matter of policy development and the administration of law, and there is general administration.

Regarding service to the government, we well know that the Department of Justice drafts all legislation and provides legal advice to all departments. The department has the lead role in criminal justice policy in the areas of family and youth law policy arising out of marriage and divorce and of human rights policy.

I have heard very clearly from my constituents in London—Fanshawe that they are looking for new initiatives from the government. The government is responding and I support those initiatives.

One that comes to mind very readily is the area of crime prevention strategy. The minister is embarking on a national strategy for community safety and crime prevention. These lofty words are not just words but are being backed up by an important expenditure of funds. There is an increase in funding from \$3 million a year to \$32 million a year. That is a very real commitment to the important area of crime prevention.

I well know from my conversations with the chief of police in London, Ontario, Chief Fantino, that the chiefs of police understand the importance of preventing crime in the first place. It is the old analogy of the Fram oil filter we have all seen on TV, pay me now or pay me later. For every crime we can prevent through investment in people, particularly young people and families, the savings later on will be much greater than the necessary investment. Chief Fantino and other police chiefs and social agencies across the country have made that point repeatedly.

• (1650)

I was a member of the municipal council of London, Ontario, for 11 years during which time I spent several years serving on the Children's Aid Society. Over those years we repeatedly heard of the need to invest in families and in children which leads directly to preventing youth crime. It is very simple. We know a very high percentage of young people in Canada who get into difficulty with the law or who break the law come from problem families described one way or another.

Such initiatives will also involve other levels of provincial and municipal governments, NGOs, community experts such as the

Supply

Children's Aid Society and the private sector in a very important partnership with this government to do much more in the area of crime prevention.

I know colleagues throughout the House heard the following concern from their constituents as I do from my constituents in London—Fanshawe. They are very worried about the issue of youth justice. They are concerned about youth crime, particularly the increase in violent youth crime. I share that concern as a Canadian and as a member of parliament. Mr. Speaker, I know you do as well.

The minister is trying to respond to those concerns. She proposed a justice strategy to replace the Young Offenders Act. It is clear to me and to most Canadians that the confidence of the Canadian public in the Young Offenders Act has been badly shaken.

It is important, however, to draw the important distinction between violent and non-violent youth crime. The input I have received from the people of London is that they have very little if any tolerance for violent youth crime, particularly by repeat young offenders. They expect the government to implement tougher penalties in this area.

We have done that since being elected in 1993 and we intend to go further in the area of violent youth crime particularly when we are dealing with repeat violent young offenders. In this instance public safety must and will come first.

I hear from social agencies, the chief of police and others in London that when we are dealing with non-violent youth crime incarceration is not a panacea. This is where the majority of my constituents and I as a member of parliament perhaps disagree with some colleagues in other parts of the House. Throwing these young people into institutions and thinking that will solve their problems and that they will not repeat these offences when they are let free is not realistic. It is incredibly expensive to put them in these institutions. More to the point, it is not an effective way to deal with non-violent criminals.

Mr. Myron Thompson: And we agree.

Mr. Pat O'Brien: I am very pleased to note the agreement of my colleague from Wild Rose. We draw a distinction between violent and non-violent criminals particularly when we are talking about young offenders. We could say that for any offender. I believe and my constituents recognize that when we are dealing with violent and non-violent crime we need two different strategies. The answer is not to lock them up and throw away the key. We have to be more analytical and realistic than that and try to take the best action in whichever situation we are dealing with, violence or non-violence.

Earlier I alluded to the well known fact that the vast majority of young offenders, a shockingly high proportion of young offenders or criminals of an age, come from families with serious problems

of one type or another. I know that is so from 22 years in the classroom in the field of education.

• (1655)

Perhaps there are more people from the field of education in this parliament than ever before in the history of the Canadian parliament. These educators know. They have seen it. When a young person acting out and getting in trouble at school unfortunately slides into youth crime, in a shockingly high percentage of cases we are dealing with a young person who comes from a "problem family".

It is extremely important as a government to support Canadian families more effectively. I am very proud of the fact the government has made several steps in that direction. It needs to go further and I hope it will. I for one intend to encourage that so that we will do even more to promote healthy family life as a way of preventing and minimizing the chances of young offenders being involved crime and crime in general.

I can speak specifically to several important initiatives undertaken in the past and previous budgets. One initiative was increasing the child tax credit for families that wish to have one of the parents stay at home with the children. They wish to exercise the option my wife and I exercised as a mutual decision. There ought to be recognition that those families are making a very important contribution to society and to raising good children.

The increase in the child tax credit and the increase in support for poor families by removing them from the tax rolls in the last budget are very real and tangible ways the government has tried to support families. We need to and will do more.

Another initiative is the increase in the child care expense deduction for families that choose not to have one of the parents at home or through whatever situation cannot have one of the parents at home with the children. There is also the case of a single parent family where the single parent must work to support the children. Increasing the child care expense deduction was a important improvement in supporting those families.

I may be considered old fashioned, but if so I proudly say I think many of the problems in Canada begin with problem families. That is not to be simplistic. To me it is quite obvious. I am proud of the initiatives the government has undertaken to improve support for Canadian families. I look forward to even further increases over the next three budgets during the time we intend to be in office and hopefully for many more thereafter.

A third area that has come to my attention repeatedly in the town hall meetings I have held on a regular basis with my constituents and in many calls and letters I receive as all members receive is the need to be more cognizant of justice to victims, better treatment for victims. Perhaps the pendulum has swung too much toward being

Supply

so concerned about the rights of the accused that we have failed to take proper care of victims and to respect their rights.

I am pleased to see the initiatives the minister is undertaking to begin to do more to improve the treatment of victims. Specifically what? Better access to information for victims. The notion that the minister has put forth for discussion with other governments of a central victims office for victims who are trying to obtain information so that they are not tied up in a bureaucratic maze. They could get the information and the legal protection they need much more quickly and much more readily and could deal with their situations much more effectively.

The whole idea needs to be explored. The minister is committed to exploring the necessity of having victim impact statements play a much greater role in court cases and in sentencing convicted persons. We have seen more of this in the last few years. There is much more room for it. I am pleased the minister has indicated she is moving in that direction.

I sensed a fair bit of support from some of my colleagues opposite of a number of my comments. I suspect at this point we may digress.

• (1700)

I want to move to the area of the firearms debate, the Bill C-68 debate we all lived through. I thought it had begun to wrap up, but I am hearing some points raised from hon. members opposite. I have a number of concerns about some of the statements I have heard. I do not purport to be an expert on this topic. I never did. I will simply state the following.

I know what the officials in my community think. I was pleased that the Reform Party held a convention in London, Ontario a couple of weeks ago. They were very welcome and they have been a nice economic boost to London, Ontario. I had a lot of good feedback from the Reform members of how impressed they were with our community. We were pleased to hear that.

Let me share with my colleagues opposite the views of the people of London, Ontario. They expressed them without any reservation to me and my colleagues in the past term.

First of all, the well-respected and nationally known chief of police in London, Ontario, Julian Fantiono, came on my monthly show which I hold on cable television for my constituents. He obviously was not going to be partisan supporting me, but in a very non-partisan, clear and effective statement he outlined why he as the chief of police of London, Ontario fully, totally and completely supported the registration of firearms. His explanation was not at all nebulous. Let me share the key point of it with my colleagues who question the value of this.

Chief Fantiono and other experts across this country have said that registration of firearms will improve the safety of the public,

particularly front line officers working for the chief who attend at a crime scene or a potential crime scene. Registration of firearms will lead to more effective police work in tracking down weapons used in the commission of crimes and in the conviction of criminals using those weapons.

This is interesting. As soon as we quote experts who disagree with some of the members, they do not want to hear those opinions. That may be the case. What I am putting forward are not my personal explanations about the necessity of registration of firearms. I am putting forward the views of Chief Julian Fantiono, that I have on tape and which I would be glad to share with my sceptical colleagues opposite. I have heard these views shared by chiefs of police coast to coast to coast.

There is a very real value in the minds of the chiefs of police and front line officers in the registration of legal firearms. To me it is nonsense to say that criminals are not going to register their firearms and therefore no one should have to. The chief simply said his word for that was "nonsense".

The member for Crowfoot has raised some very important points about the validity of this whole action by the government. Let me share with him some other facts from London, Ontario and my riding of London—Fanshawe. These are based on hundreds of inputs by phone calls, responses to a questionnaire that went to every household in my riding, meetings which I attended specifically on Bill C-68 and general meetings throughout the term where this topic came up. Seventy per cent of my constituents clearly supported the government in its action. Despite the heckling of the members opposite, those facts do not change.

Reference was made to election results somehow questioning the validity of Bill C-68. I would point out that in the province of Ontario in the last federal election certain colleagues of mine on our side of the House were targeted by the opponents to Bill C-68. They were targeted specifically for their support of that bill to try and have them lose the election. The reality is that every single one of those people who sought re-election is back here and where the people did not seek re-election, the Liberal replacement candidate is in this House now.

I would suggest to my friend from Wild Rose that you have to be careful when you draw results of elections, be they provincial or federal, highlighting one issue and drawing conclusions. There is evidence on this side that Bill C-68 did not defeat any Liberal MPs in the province of Ontario. I think that evidence is very clear for anyone to see.

• (1705)

Madam Speaker, subject to your ruling I have some facts on the estimates in terms of the economic performance of the government that I would be quite happy to move to if that is in order at this time. Could I ask for your guidance on that now? Could I move to

Supply

the area of economic performance of the government as it relates to the estimates?

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): At this point I am afraid that the debate must remain on Motion No. 1 on justice.

Mr. Pat O'Brien: Madam Speaker, at another time I will be pleased to highlight the outstanding economic performance of the government and remind Canadians and the members in the House of that.

In conclusion and I say this with respect, if it really is a seriously intended motion of the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, obviously I cannot support it. It would literally handcuff the Department of Justice in the duties it now has to carry out. It would also make impossible a number of very important initiatives that I have tried to outline today. With those remarks, I say I cannot support the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ): Madam Speaker, I have a few questions for my distinguished colleague, the hon. member for London—Fanshawe, who is also the president of the Canada-Ireland committee.

The hon. member introduced himself earlier as a teacher of 22 years and a councillor in his lovely town for 11 years. To become a teacher, one must have one essential quality and that is fairness.

Had he had favorites in his class, our colleague, the hon. member for London—Fanshawe would certainly not have had such a long career because, as he knows, there is nothing that students hate more than unfairness.

How can this member explain that Ontario and Quebec have their own police forces, namely the Sûreté du Québec in Quebec and the OPP in Ontario, while in the other provinces, police services are provided to municipalities by the RCMP?

The federal government bills the other provinces, or the RCMP, for only a fraction of the actual costs. As a result, with 60% of the population, Ontario and Quebec pay 60% of the costs incurred by municipalities and provinces served by the RCMP. That is one example of unfairness.

Had he been this unfair as a teacher or city councillor, he would have been kicked out. When hit with a claim from Ontario and Quebec, which pay for part of the police services provided outside these two provinces, his government refuses to pay up.

Douglas Young, who used to sit over there, did not care about poor people. He unilaterally abolished POWA, a program designed to help older laid-off workers. He abolished it unilaterally, without consulting any province, simply stating he would come up with

another program, a superior program of course, to replace it with. We are still waiting.

• (1710)

In my riding, the average age of the 305 workers who were laid off at the asbestos mine is over 52. A good number of these workers contributed to employment insurance for 25, 30 or 32 years. Now they are only being given 55% of their insurable earnings.

Worse still, Clermont Bégin, a 63-year-old former asbestos mine worker, has seen his EI benefits cut off by the human resources development office in Thetford because he did not tour the riding every day to look for a job. How can you expect the Liberal Party of Canada to instil a sense of justice in this country?

I now go back to my main question to the distinguished member for London—Fanshawe. Does he find it fair that Ontario and Quebec pay for 25% or 30% of the costs of police services in municipalities and other provinces without compensation from the federal government? Better yet, if the federal government charged municipalities and provinces for every dollar spent, then the money demanded from the Treasury Board for the justice budget would be much lower than the current \$193 million.

[*English*]

Mr. Pat O'Brien: Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from Frontenac—Mégantic for his important questions.

He has noted my involvement in the Canada-Ireland interparliamentary friendship group and I thank him for that commercial.

I will not belabour the point other than to simply say in the most serious way I can that if there is a country in the world perhaps where we can see the results of there being no control or very inadequate control over firearms and other dangerous weapons, I think that unfortunately the country of my ancestors is a very ready example of where the problem can lead to whatever the motivation is behind it.

The most relevant question my colleague asked was that the provinces of Quebec and Ontario have their own police forces whereas in other provinces those services are provided by the RCMP. That is quite true, but of course as we know, the other eight provinces contract for the services. They pay for the services by the RCMP.

La belle province du Quebec and the province of Ontario choose to have their own police forces. They would not have to have their own police forces if they did not choose to. They could apply for the same service to be contracted with the RCMP. I think it is a reflection of the size of the two provinces, Quebec and Ontario, that they wish to have their own police forces.

Supply

As for municipal forces, my friend again mentioned my involvement in municipal government. While I well know there is no requirement for my city of London, Ontario to have its own municipal force, it chooses to have it. The taxpayers of the city of London fund it and are prepared to do so on a priority basis. There are smaller communities near my riding such as the town of Exeter just to the north of London. A number of those communities are now saying that perhaps they cannot afford their own municipal force any more.

The decisions my colleague refers to really are choices in my view that the municipalities across Canada make, be they in Ontario or Quebec. In the example he cited, the choices of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario to have their own police forces are choices the people and their governments have made provincially.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member a couple of questions.

I understand the compassion he has for people who are suffering in our land. I understand the member quite clearly on those things. I know he is concerned about the poverty that exists in this country. He also suggested that a lot of these problems can lead to crime.

• (1715)

I agree that possibility exists.

In 1993 it was quoted in this House that there were approximately a million children starving, living in poverty in this land, and that we needed to do something. The latest figure I heard is a million. Evidently we are not making much progress.

When I look at the public accounts I do not want to support this motion either, but I have a fear that this money is going to go for a golf course or other ridiculous things. Are we going to spend money on transition to adulthood, \$105,00; sexual dissidence in historical context, \$23,000; infants understanding how people act, \$75,000; institutional change in household behaviour in rural China, \$55,000; sexual behaviour of senior citizens, \$116,000. I feel good about that being a senior. That is what this government has spent. Then we talk about the billions of dollars given to companies like Bombardier or a \$25 million free flag giveaway. This spending is going on.

Does the member agree that is good spending or should we redirect that money to those poverty ridden places and give a chunk of that money to the children's societies of Ottawa and Toronto and every city and stop this foolish spending that goes on? Believe me it exists. Sell the charter jets that these members in the front row fly around in. They should sell them and take economy flights like the rest of us try to. Save bucks and help these people. When is it going to stop on that side?

Mr. Pat O'Brien: Madam Speaker, they are important questions.

I agree with the member for Wild Rose that a priority of our government spending ought to be poorer families and children in poorer families, to assist them for a number of reasons, one of which is to reduce the likelihood that some of these young people would find themselves in a criminal situation.

I concede readily as an MP, and I am sure any colleague on my side would, that I do not support every single dollar spent by this government on every single project.

Madam Speaker, you ruled me out of order to tell the very good economic story, so I will have to wait for another time to do that. I know the member will be anxiously waiting for that.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on the Main Estimates, within this debate on supply.

As we know, the President of Treasury Board intends to allocate \$194 million to the Department of Justice for the coming fiscal year.

I have examined the estimates presented by the President of Treasury Board with great interest and great care. I have just recently discussed them with a few of my colleagues, including the hon. members for Châteaugay, Frontenac—Mégantic, Rosemont and Champlain. Unfortunately, the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve was unable to join in our discussion on this vital issue.

Looking at the government's proposal with great interest and great care, one can see that this \$194 million budget allocation to the Department of Justice shows just how much this government lives from day to day, without any road map or compass, and practically without giving its actions any thought.

They move from one slapdash policy to another without an overall plan, and this is unfortunate.

I could give numerous examples to illustrate this, the first being of course the reference to the Supreme Court. As we know, in 1980 the Government of Quebec and all the people of Quebec voted on a rather specific question concerning sovereignty-association. The federal government of the day, led by Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, accepted the rules for consultation of the people of Quebec. They said at the time that it was democratic and that it was accepted. Trudeau's participation implicitly validated the referendum process in Quebec.

Supply

• (1720)

Although at that time the question also concerned Quebec sovereignty, another consultation was held after 1992, again in accordance with the Quebec referendum legislation. Again the federal government took part, at Charlottetown, and validated the Quebec referendum act.

In 1995 there was a referendum campaign. The debate was fierce, fair, and intense, but it was always serene. This is the great quality that Quebecers have. They had a calm and peaceful debate on the future of a country to be, Quebec, and therefore of an existing one, Canada, which shows that the Quebec society is a perfect model of democracy.

Of course, the federal government took part in the process. The then Prime Minister, who is still the Prime Minister—although I do not know for how much longer—also got involved by organizing rallies and appearing on television to discuss the impact of sovereignty. The result of the vote was so close that neither side can really claim victory.

In light of this, the federal government said “Since I almost lost, I will change the rules of the game. I will deny Quebecers the right to decide their own future, as they did in 1980, 1992 and 1995”. What did the government do to achieve this? It asked the supreme court to rule on the issue.

This is like having a problem with the fence between our property and that of our neighbour and telling him “Listen, we have a problem with the fence. I will ask my best friend, whom I will pay, to make a decision”. This is what is happening with the supreme court. The judges are appointed by the federal government. They are paid by the federal government. Not only that, but they are interpreting a document, the Constitution of Canada, which was never recognized by any Quebec government, whether federalist or sovereignist. So, the decision is removed from the hands of the people of Quebec and handed over to an unelected authority, the supreme court.

It is sad to see that this unilateral action by the federal government takes us back 150 years. Back then, in the 1830s, the elected assembly, the people’s democratic representatives, wanted to wrest power from an oligarchy appointed by the Imperial government in London. It was this debate that led to the rebellion and that later, much later, led to responsible government.

By going back 150 years, this government is deciding to take away Quebecers’ right to decide on their own future and giving it to nine individuals it has appointed, who are interpreting a document it produced without Quebec’s consent.

As the current Minister of Justice herself has said, this reference will bring absolutely nothing new to the debate from a constitution-

al point of view. We can even tell you what the court’s ruling will be. It is a complete waste of taxpayers’ money, all for the purpose of hijacking democracy in Quebec.

I will give another example of how little the government—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I must interrupt the hon. member. All Speakers of the House have always considered references to magistrates and tribunals unparliamentary when they took the form of a personal attack or blame.

I will therefore ask the hon. member to choose his words carefully and to be careful about attacking the court.

• (1725)

Mr. Richard Marceau: Madam Speaker, on this point of order, members will recall the Reform Party motion of not so long ago in which they debated the position of the judicial arm vis-à-vis the legislative and executive. Numerous questions were asked about the nature of supreme court appointments. The Prime Minister even appointed some of his former law office colleagues to the supreme court. These debates were allowed by the Speaker of the House. As democratically elected representatives, we are therefore perfectly entitled to speak about appointments and the operation of the supreme court.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. You are right, we can speak of such things, but at some point there is a limit and we have to stop there.

Mr. Richard Marceau: Madam Speaker, on the same point of order—and I do hope this time will not be subtracted from my speaking time—I would like someone to tell me where I went overboard, because I have followed the rules of debate ever since I was elected to this House on June 2 last.

Its handling of the young offenders issue is another example of how completely out of touch with reality this government is. The Liberal government plans to spend huge amounts on reforming the Young Offenders Act. The intention is laudable; we are always in favour of fighting crime.

Unfortunately, as mentioned repeatedly by stakeholders from various communities, the problem with the Young Offenders Act is not the act itself, but rather its enforcement.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, who is unfortunately not in the House, even stated candidly on national television that the main purpose of this reform was to placate public opinion, especially in western Canada, and give the impression the government was taking charge in this matter. But the fact is no policy can be worse than a policy guided by petty politics and by the desire to court public opinion in any given part of the country.

Supply

Everyone in the community agrees that the enforcement of the Young Offenders Act by Quebec is exemplary. Many stakeholders in Quebec and even outside Quebec have said so.

Not only does the Quebec government understand and enforce this legislation designed to rehabilitate young offenders, but it has applied the provisions of this act better than anybody else.

The Bloc Québécois criticized this reform, because it is a reform for Reform's sake or worthy of Reform. The new bill on young offenders aims to brand young offenders. It thus runs counter to the objective of rehabilitation that is, that should be and that was at the very heart of the legislation on young offenders.

Rather than implement rehabilitation or education programs for young offenders, the Minister of Justice is capitulating to western pressure, in favour of sentences and their reinforcement and the hardening of the attitude to this problem, which affects us all.

In this regard, I must denounce in the strongest possible terms the attitude of this government, which penalizes the province, namely Quebec, applying its own legislation in the best way possible. The federal government owes \$77 million for the application of its law in Quebec, and it has yet to pay one cent.

I find that unspeakable, and there is no shortage of words to criticize this attitude, which is totally unacceptable on the part of this government. True to form, the federal government is refusing to pay and it is logical to think that this matter will drag on, proving once again that the federal government does not honour its commitments.

• (1730)

I have given an account of the useless reform to the Young Offenders Act. Once again, there are a lot of other things to talk about. Now, I would like to move on to discuss Bill C-37, the Judges Act.

Without Bill C-37, what is the status of judges' salaries? On April 1, 1997, judges were entitled to an increase of 2.08%. On April 1, 1998, they had another increase of 2.08%, which is pretty good, given that many officials and public sector employees did not get such an increase. So that is something already.

The government decided to give the judges, with Bill C-37, a 4.1% increase effective April 1, 1997, retroactively, and another 4.1% effective April 1, 1998, also retroactive. This means an increase of over 13% in the salary of this country's magistrates.

At the same time, there are cuts to health, forced hospital bed closings, cuts to transfer payments to the provinces, and a surplus of \$20 billion in the employment insurance fund. What happens? Instead of returning these funds to the most disadvantaged members of our society, to women and children living below the

poverty line, they decide to turn it over to people who, important as they may be, are not necessarily in need of a 13%-plus raise.

This is not to say that the judges do not deserve a raise in salary, nor that they do not do a good job. What we are saying is that, in today's economic and budgetary context, it is high time to make some enlightened choices, it is high time to make some fair choices. The duty of all parliamentarians, of all governments, is first of all to give priority to the most disadvantaged members of society, and this government has steadfastly refused to do so, ever since 1993, when they were first elected as a majority government.

It is a matter of societal choices. We have seen all this. What are this government's priorities? The money goes to the judges, rather than the disadvantaged. Money is spent on denying Quebeckers the right to determine their own future. Instead of respecting their commitments and the very logic of the Young Offenders Act, which is the rehabilitation of delinquent youth, it has been decided to brand them as criminals.

Those are three examples of the lack of direction, of the lack of wise choices, and the lack of judgment demonstrated by this government in the area of justice.

In closing, let me say that this is proof of how much this government is out of touch with reality. I hope that, when the time comes to make choices, and to vote on this, all of my colleagues in this House will realize that this request for appropriation absolutely must be turned down.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to speak when you are in the chair.

I thank my colleague, the member for Charlesbourg. I am sure you will not mind my pointing out that he is certainly one of our more talented members. I think my colleagues would give him a boisterous round of approval.

Two points must be made. As the member for Beauce is apparently not up to it, I will make them myself. First, there is a concern that must be noted, and that is the concern over organized crime. We have spoken about this on several occasions. The member for Berthier—Montcalm pointed out how, somewhere around 1995—you were already in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker—we fought for anti-gang legislation.

• (1735)

We got it, not only because of our perseverance and our powers of persuasion in those days, but because we convinced the government that it was not possible for us to win this war without the help of lawmakers.

I will tell you one thing that could be done, and I would like to hear what my colleague thinks of this. The Canadian Association

of Chiefs of Police, which is a fairly neutral group—the member for Beauce will agree that we are not talking about a pocket of sovereignists or a breeding ground for indépendantistes—has asked the government to take one thousand dollar bills out of circulation because this denomination encourages money laundering and is obviously of no use to the average citizen.

If I did an informal survey and asked those hon. members who have \$1,000 in their pockets to raise their hands, it seems to me I will find few Conservatives, no Bloc Québécois members and probably no government members either.

All this to say that we made a very reasonable suggestion to the government to fight organized crime and the underworld, but the government did not act on it. I think the hon. member for Charlesbourg, who is quite familiar with this issue, will agree that there are no concrete measures.

Why should we agree—and this is the real issue—to support the budget proposed for a department that did not have the courage to take the necessary measures to fight organized crime?

I want to ask my nice, attractive colleague from Charlesbourg whether he agrees that the government could, among other things, have acted on the proposal made for the past two years by the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police and withdraw the \$1,000 bank notes. If the hon. member has other ideas, I wonder if he could share them with us.

Mr. Richard Marceau: Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve for his question.

I would like to start by mentioning why the previous legislature passed anti-gang legislation. It was thanks to the perseverance and the initiative of the member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, who was one of the first to raise this important issue in this august Chamber. This is the perfect example, one of the examples, of the situation where a member decides to push an issue and succeeds in changing things.

As to the withdrawal of the \$1,000 bill, I am sorry to say I have never had one in my possession. A number of my colleagues opposite have no doubt had a few in their pocket, but this is unfortunately not true in my case.

Perhaps one reason the government is refusing to take \$1,000 bills out of circulation is that one day, in the quest for visibility, the Prime Minister might put his face on the bill.

That said, this question obviously warrants consideration. I take note of the proposal by the Association of Canadian Chiefs of Police and I am eager to meet with them to discuss the terms of such an operation.

Supply

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part in the debate on the Estimates, especially the \$193 million allocated to the Department of Justice. That is a lot of money.

It reminds me of the surplus in the EI fund, which will apparently top \$20 billion by the end of the 1998-99 fiscal year. I wonder whether we could not have the Department of Justice pay for itself, the way EI is expected to.

As my colleague so aptly pointed out earlier, in reference to young offenders, I have always thought that this was an investment that could yield dividends. If the government invested wisely and judiciously in solutions to the problem of juvenile delinquency, there would surely be fewer inmates being housed at government expense, for it apparently costs over \$80,000 to keep one inmate in jail.

● (1740)

I now come to my main question for my distinguished colleague, the member for Charlesbourg. How does he think the government is being fair when it penalizes those who must resort to EI, when fewer than 43% are eligible, but must still pay \$2.70 for every \$100 of insurable earnings?

Mr. Richard Marceau: Mr. Speaker, we can indeed talk about justice in general. It is incredibly wrong and unacceptable to be accumulating a \$20 billion surplus in the employment insurance fund while the justice department is making all sorts of wasteful expenditures like the ones I mentioned earlier, to the tune of \$194 million. The government will not use this surplus to help workers, the asbestos mine workers who are asking for a POWA assistance program, for instance, because we must realize that on average the 305 workers at the BC mine, which has closed down, are over 52 years old.

It is morally wrong for the government to accumulate billions of dollars in a surplus transferred into the consolidated revenue fund while refusing to provide the assistance they need to workers who have worked hard all their lives, working day and night in mines to put bread and butter on the table for their families.

It laughs in their face and says “We have a \$20 billion surplus in our coffers. Never mind you, workers over the age of 52 on average. You will not get any help from us. You can die, we don’t care”. That is what the government is saying. This shows that the government does not know the first thing about being fair.

[*English*]

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is quite interesting to me as we head into the marathon debate that

Supply

is going to 4 a.m. that I am sure the Canadian public will understand the importance of our staying in this place and debating until 4 a.m. I am sure we will be even more productive than we normally are as the midnight hour comes and we move on.

I would like to explain to the millions of viewers why we are actually going to be here until 4 a.m. This is the new brand of politics that we heard the leader of the Reform Party and all of his cohorts talk about during the campaign, how they were going to do things differently. In all the speeches earlier this afternoon leading up to this debate we heard—

Mr. Bill Casey: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is a justice discussion and we are not talking about elections and things like that. We are off track. We should bring the debate back to justice.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I bring to the attention of hon. members that we are discussing under main estimates Motion No. 1 which has to do with the justice department's operating expenditures.

As we have asked other members today to stay relevant and on topic, I also ask the hon. member for Mississauga West to stick to the subject at hand.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I got two sentences out and the member is up on a point of order. Certainly I intend to talk about the justice estimates. To prove there is in this situation very little justice I was explaining why we are here to this extent going on until 4 a.m. We are here because the members opposite seem to think they are the only ones in this place who have anything to put into the system of justice in the country. They come into town riding on their ponies with backs bowed because of the weight of the guns at their sides, shooting them up in the air. They are going to solve all of these problems. These people are just wonderful.

• (1745)

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has been illustrating the reason we are going to be here until four in the morning. We are actually going to be here until four in the morning because of a Liberal motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Okay, we are even. Let us start all over again.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, would you reset the clock. I would like a full, uninterrupted 20 minutes. I am sure that will be difficult. It is quite clear to me what the strategy is. The thin skinned members on the opposite benches simply rise every time a member says something they do not agree with. They interrupt the obvious wonderful flow of the speech in an attempt to throw the person off. What they fail to understand is that they simply add

ammunition. So, Mr. Speaker, allow them to carry on if that is what they want to do as we debate this very important issue of the justice estimates.

The member points out in this debate that we are here because of a Liberal motion. He is right. I think the people should know that earlier today, instead of debating the estimates of the justice department and every other department, we wasted hours of debate because of the members opposite. They are like the little kids in school who know the teacher has an apple in the drawer. They are all planning. They say "You divert their attention and when they are not looking, the member from White Rose is going to sneak up and steal the apple and he is going to run back to his seat".

An hon. member: White Rose?

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Well maybe he could not sneak up. There would not be much running and there would not be a lot of sneaking. But they are going to steal the teacher's apple. They think "Oh goody goody" and they run back. This is the new kind of politics the Reform Party has brought to Ottawa. Reform members are stealing apples. It is truly a remarkable thing to watch.

When Canadians watch the debate in this place they must wonder "What are these guys talking about? They are supposed to be debating estimates and spending". The government record is quite extensive. We are supposed to be talking about how we have managed the debt, about how when this government took office we inherited a \$42 billion deficit, get the size of that. Most people would look at that and say there is no hope, there is no opportunity, there is no chance for us to get out of this terrible hole.

That is not what this government did. We reduced the size of government by \$14 billion. It is a smaller government. It is more efficient.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to know what this member's speech has to do with the motion. It is supposed to be on justice and on the estimates. What in the world is he offering this House on this motion?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Earlier today I had the unfortunate responsibility of asking a member opposite to stay on topic because the hon. member was not on topic. It was a difficult time for me because she had friends watching. The hon. member for Crowfoot is quite right. If we are going to be here debating this, then let us stay on topic and debate Motion No. 1 which has to do with the estimate for the Department of Justice.

Resuming debate on Motion No. 1, the justice department estimates.

• (1750)

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, it is quite interesting. The members just simply get up and continue to raise the same issue.

There is no question this debate is on the motion and the justice estimates. It has to do with the entire estimate portfolio, indeed the entire reason we are in this place. Canadians need to know why we are here. That is my point. I think it is on topic. I know the member would not understand. I will send him over the written notes with some crayons if he would like, and he can follow the bouncing ball.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I want to point out to the member for Mississauga West that the Chair agrees with the member for Crowfoot that the member for Mississauga West should stay on topic. I do not really care whether you think the opposition thinks you are on topic, it is whether the Chair thinks you are on topic. The Chair would ask that you stay on topic.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that I will be on topic. I would not want to lose your confidence. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you could refrain if I might respectfully suggest from accepting frivolous points of order.

In any kind of speech in this place, one must talk about the broad range of issues as they affect the Canadian taxpayers and the justice system.

We saw a motion in this place on the Reform Party's idea of what justice should be in this country. Reformers think they should have the control over the judges. Of course that would have a tremendous impact I might add on the estimates, on the spending. I would suggest that in the Reform Party's attitude toward justice—and I do not know how many times you want me to mention the word justice but I am quite prepared to do it for the next 10 or 15 minutes just to prove to you that there is indeed justice in what I am trying to say—there is no justice in what the Reform Party is putting forward.

Justice I might add is a subjective perspective depending on your definition of justice. My definition of justice in this country is a parliamentary democracy with a separate judiciary that is not influenced by the kind of nonsense we have seen being perpetrated and which results in a lack of fairness and justice to the Canadian taxpayer.

The reality is that members of the Reform Party would bring a new way of doing justice to the Canadian parliament. One of their ideas was that they thought it was just and the leader of the Reform Party thought it was just which thereby would imply a certain amount of justice, if he were not to occupy Stornoway. He said "If I am elected I will not occupy Stornoway". Where is the justice?

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is the fourth time the member has been asked to speak to the motion. If he has nothing to say to this motion, then he ought to be ruled out of order and go on to the—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Crowfoot has made his point.

Supply

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I suspect members opposite do not like what I am saying. I am sure they will not like what I am about to say.

The whole aspect of delivering justice to the Canadian people is one where this party would strongly disagree with anything that the justice critic opposite or any of his colleagues would have to say. Their solution to providing justice in this country is to change the way the government works in terms of the relationship with the provinces and municipalities.

The member might not think it is on topic but it clearly is because everything that goes on in the estimates debate has to do with what this government is spending. If there is too much spent in one area, it cannot be spent in another. That is fairly fundamental and simple for the Canadian people to understand.

What the Reform would do is totally turn our Confederation upside down. I do not see the justice in that. Let me share an example. This is from the so-called new Canada act that Reform has brought forward. For the member's comfort I will relate it back to the issue at hand here.

• (1755)

The Reform Party's suggestion is that the Government of Canada hereby recognize municipal governments as the first level of government and agrees to ensure municipal government representation at federal-provincial conferences.

I was a councillor for almost 10 years. My wife sits on municipal council in Mississauga in the region of Peel. I have very strong roots in municipal government.

When we look at the impact of policing, at the impact of clogged up courts, at the backlog that exists in our community and we look at the cost of crime in our community, our municipal governments are very much impacted by the justice estimates and by the entire justice system. The Reform Party suggests it will recognize them in some sort of special category.

What Reform does not say is that it is going to transfer all powers in this federation to the provinces. Guess what happens when that is done? Guess who takes it in the end? It is the municipalities because they are creatures of the provincial governments. They indeed rely on the fairness of provincial governments to redistribute and pass on assistance in the form of transfer payments for social services, education, health care and justice. Municipalities rely on the provinces. Yet Reform would give with one hand and take away with the other hand and put all of the pressure on the property tax.

What we would have I would argue is a justice system under the Reform Party that simply would not have the strength of the national system. It would not have the backing of the national

Supply

taxpayer and the strength of a united Canada. Indeed it would be put out to the provincial level which in turn would foist it off on the municipalities and they would wind up putting it on to the property taxpayer.

I do not care what estimates we want to talk about or debate in this place. I would remind members opposite that there is only one taxpayer and that taxpayer pays property tax, sales tax, provincial taxes and federal taxes. People just do not buy the rejigging that sounds like wonderful stuff by the Reform Party. It is a matter of trust.

If we want to talk about who should be responsible for spending the justice dollar, because that is what we are talking about here, should it be the federal government?

Would the Canadian taxpayers trust someone, and those members might not like this example, who said "I am not going to do this," and then got elected and immediately did it. "I am not going to accept the limo," and now rides around in a limo. "I am not going to live in Stornoway," and now lives in Stornoway.

Would the Canadian people trust a party with the estimates in the justice department that was actually entering into negotiations with the party that wants to destroy the country? They would form what was it called, the Re-Bloc party. Imagine a justice system that was run by some coalition, separatists yanking power away from the central federation, trying to take everything back into their hands so they can do it their way, and another party bent on regional disparities. Imagine what kind of a justice system that would be. I was asked to speak about justice issues and I am doing that.

I see the hon. member for Saint John who I was going to suggest should indeed be the leader of the united right. There might then at least be some type of tempering, instead of the extremists, instead of this particular leader of this particular party.

The question is what are the average Canadians' views of politicians and what they stand for and what they say they will do?

• (1800)

We are talking about things that are as critical and as important as the administration of justice in this country. This country was built on democratic principles that are envied all over the world. We are not only envied for our justice system, we are also envied for the success that we have had with our fiscal programs since 1993.

In fact, the deputy minister of finance, Mr. Scott, appeared before the public accounts committee earlier today. This certainly impacts on justice estimates because there is only so much money to go around in every department. Every department must get its allocation and we would say that our justice system and our justice department should indeed have clear access to a fair allocation of the national revenue.

The deputy minister talked about what a job this government has done since 1993. It has put the justice department and every other department on firm, sound financial footing. There is no question that without fiscal responsibility there would be no justice. There is no question that without strong leadership there would be no justice.

It is absolutely clear to me that the policies that are espoused by the Reform politicians to totally denigrate the Canadian institution, to totally denigrate the justice system and to turn it over to the hands of pork-barrel politicians is wrong. It is not justice. It is not something this government or the Canadian people will tolerate, no matter how much they get up with their puffery and their nonsense. The Canadian people know that in Reform's policies there is clearly no justice.

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we endured the rantings of the member opposite for the last 20 minutes. It seemed like a lifetime. However, he did make two very interesting and truthful points in his last statement.

First, he said that the justice system cannot survive without strong leadership. We agree with that. That is why we have been encouraging the Liberals to take some leadership and put some justice back into the legal system that they created for their lawyer friends out there in legal land.

The other thing the hon. member said was that there is no justice and then he went on to rant about something else. But I caught that phrase and he is absolutely right. There is no justice in this country.

If he believes that we have a workable justice system in this country, then why on earth are we hearing this huge outcry from Canadians from coast to coast to coast, railing against the justice system at every opportunity, at every town hall meeting, at every rally where they can possibly make their voices heard? Why do we have that all across this country if, in his opinion, we have a justice system that works?

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, with the extreme view that this group wants to take of the justice system, we get the feeling that there is a lynch mob walking down the street with a noose. They are tightening the knot and they are banging on the sheriff's door saying "Let me have that person out here. We are going to string him up".

• (1805)

They want to give that impression. It is just not the truth. I will admit that there are problems in the justice system, but any system with people in it will have problems. There is no question. There are good guys and bad guys. There is no question that there are difficulties.

This government is committed to ensuring that there is stability. That is the key, bringing stability into the justice system. Do not

subject it to the possibility of having a judge run for election or giving a parliamentarian the power to overturn a judge's decision.

Appeal it, yes; repeal it, no. Stability will maintain good justice in this country.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonnette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, listening to my hon. colleague, I am reminded of this old Jesuit proverb "Those whose thinking lacks depth make up for it with length". We have seen a lot of that today.

What I want to ask my hon. colleague, in a very friendly way, is this. Does he not think that, beyond the statement he made in this House in praise of the justice system, there are serious flaws in the Canadian judicial system, particularly with respect to human rights?

Does my hon. colleague agree with the Prime Minister, his government and party leader, who said earlier this week that one of the differences between the Reform Party and the Liberal Party was the fact that the Liberals were in favour of recognizing same sex couples while the Reformers took a more traditional view of the family? Does he agree with recognizing same sex couples, which is basically a human rights issue?

[English]

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite proves that some thoughts are neither long nor deep. However, I would suggest that the question is a fair question. In fact, the Reform Party put the issue under some disguise yesterday when it put its motion forward. It tried to wrap it in the justice system.

If the member wants, he could look at my remarks in *Hansard*. It is my view that one should neither get rights nor lose rights because of their sexual orientation. I have no difficulty with that. It is important that both of those are taken in context: one should neither get rights nor lose rights because of their choice of sexual orientation.

I do not much care what anyone does with their own private life. I do not think it drives a political agenda. We should not discriminate against anyone in this country. It is unfair.

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my hon. colleague about gun registration. According to the government, when it started out it would cost \$85 million over five years. It has ballooned to \$133.9 million and counting.

Why would those members not put \$133.9 million into front-line police officers? We need them in Saint John, New Brunswick. We need them in every municipality. Why are we wasting this money?

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Saint John, I believe that we probably do need some assistance in the form of policing. I know we do in Peel. In fact, the region of Peel police force recently took over the policing of Pearson International Airport. It has to find the money to hire an entire

Supply

division, 101 officers, in the region of Peel. They will be contracted out to run the policing system at Pearson, a facility that I am sure members use.

The member's question was about gun control. I think the Canadian people have spoken very clearly on that issue. We do not want to see what we tragically see every day in the news in the United States of America.

My goodness, we register our dogs in this country. We register our cars. We register our boats. Why in the world would anyone object to registering a weapon like a gun that could kill if it fell into the wrong hands?

• (1810)

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I do not even know where to start with a guy like this. I do know one thing. He talked about Reformers wanting to string somebody up. The last thing I strung up was a balloon for my grandson that was full of hot air, and he certainly qualifies for that job.

The member did not address the previous question at all concerning the registration of firearms. There are tonnes of dollars being spent on the registration of firearms as if criminals are going to line up to register their guns immediately. It is not going to save one life.

I have challenged the ministers of the past and the present that if they could prove to me that it will save one life then I would support it today. However, they cannot because it will not. It is a big waste of money.

How can a person like this get up and constantly talk about the problems we are having in our country, starving families, children in poverty and unbelievably high unemployment in regions of our land, and still be willing to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on a program that will not work?

Stick to the question on registration and answer the question.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I feel I have accomplished something in a day if I can get the member from White Rose a little agitated.

Some hon. members: Wild Rose.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: My apologies, Wild Rose. He is wild, I must say.

I am happy to talk about this because it is such a simple issue. Although maybe it is not. If it was, maybe they would understand it. The reality is that I am not willing to stand here and take this member's challenge. His challenge is for me to prove that this will save one life. Does that require a death? Does it require that kind of activity?

The common sense of this is so clear. We have hundreds of thousands of weapons that are not registered and, in many cases, not cared for in this country and nobody should be adverse to registering them. No one should object to this. As I said before, we

Supply

register our vehicles. We register ourselves. We register most of our animals, at least the four-legged kind.

I do not understand where these people come from when they say we should not register guns. We absolutely must follow through with this. It is a commitment to the people of Canada and the people of Canada spoke in the last election on this issue very clearly.

Ms. Maria Minna: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Speaker made comments earlier concerning debate. In debate the first person up is the person who is recognized. The rules that apply in question period are not the same rules that apply in debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In debate it goes back and forth. In questions and comments the Chair will see members on the opposition benches before the Chair will see members from the same party in debate. It just makes sense and that has always been the case and will continue to be the case.

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Obviously the House was really enjoying the question and answer session with the hon. member for Mississauga West, so I would like to seek the unanimous consent of the House to continue the question and answer session with the hon. member for five or 10 minutes, whatever the Chair sees fit.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Saskatoon—Humboldt has asked for the unanimous consent of the House to extend the question and comment period up to 10 minutes. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

• (1815)

Ms. Angela Vautour (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, NDP): Mr. Speaker, speaking on justice, the member on the government side was asking what the definition of justice is. My first reaction was getting rid of the Liberal government. We are working on that.

[*Translation*]

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Ms. Angela Vautour: How interesting, we get a reaction once in a while. They appear to feel threatened, and they have every reason to.

I welcome this opportunity today to speak on justice. There are problems in this respect. We often disagree with the Reform Party,

which claims that this country's judicial system is a mess. This seems to be a very serious problem out west, where the Reform Party got many members elected. I cannot help but wonder if there is connection there.

In Atlantic Canada, we know that the top priority, especially in New Brunswick, is job creation.

There are certainly serious problems with justice. As a woman, I must also point out that women may have particular grounds for concern about justice. Many women are involved in violent situations and our system does not respond properly to their needs.

I speak about women because of my own experiences. But men have the same experiences sometimes, and children often do. I shall speak mainly of women, however, because we know that there is a serious problem of violence against women, whether physical, mental or sexual.

What is sad is that the process a woman has to go through to try to get the abuser stopped is a very long one and one that can cost her her life.

For instance, a woman takes her partner before a judge and there it is acknowledged that violence took place, that he stabbed or shot her, if she is still around to testify. Sometimes it is a matter of threats. If threats are involved, the judge issues a restraining order. This is just a piece of paper. The judge signs it, and hands it over, saying "Don't try to kill her next week".

There is a problem here. There should be a system in place for when a woman is in acknowledged danger, a process of counselling for these individuals. Just handing over a piece of paper saying "Don't try to kill her next week" does not solve the problem. The person who wants to do harm to this woman feels justified in doing so. This must be acknowledged and efforts must be made to determine why he thinks that way and convince him that he is not justified.

There is no justification for attacking someone. There is no justification for raping someone.

When judges have these people before them, there ought to be laws forcing them into therapy. As things stand now, once they leave the courthouse, there is no follow up.

• (1820)

That is what happened about two years ago in Toronto, and there have certainly been other incidents since then. Every week, we hear stories on the news about domestic violence resulting in death. Often, children are involved and are also victims. We must work and make resources available to try to stop this vicious cycle. It is a cycle that is costing people their lives, a cycle in which children learn from what they see, and our institutions end up full of criminals, and people wonder why.

Supply

I must say that I was pleased to learn that our solicitor general had announced funding for prevention. That is a start. I must congratulate him. We will see how the \$32 million is used, because there are serious problems. And throwing everyone into jail will not solve the problem. Locking them up is not the answer. The majority of inmates in our institutions will eventually be released and an effort must be made to see that these people are better and not worse when they get out.

The solution to the problem is prevention with our young people and assistance to families that need it. That is how we will lower the crime rate in this country. We must make sure that the government's decisions do not make the problem worse. I am not prepared to say that the increase in the poverty rate will help, because when people are poor and have nothing to eat, they will perhaps rob the corner store. They lack the necessary resources and perhaps did not have the access they should have had to post-secondary education. All this adds to crime in this country.

It is a crime there is poverty in this country. There should be none. So long as we do not try to eliminate poverty here, we will not be dealing with prevention. First we need good, healthy people. We need people who are comfortable with themselves to make good choices.

To return to the judges, they too need education. I was reading in the paper this morning or yesterday about a man who may have raped his partner because he did not understand that no meant no. He thought she did not mean it, because he had already had sexual relations with her. He was found not guilty, because he did not know the difference. I did not hear the case, I have reported what I read, but it is food for thought. Even if we said yes yesterday, it does not mean we will say yes tomorrow. No is no, yesterday, today or tomorrow. We cannot have judges in this country who think it is all right for the accused to think the other person said yes.

For sure there are big problems in rural communities, where the level of unemployment is even higher. The solicitor general announced the appointment of 1,000 more prison guards in the country. We could call that positive right off, but we might ask ourselves why. No doubt the guards already on the job in institutions are happy to have help, because with the cuts in this area, help will certainly improve things. Poverty is on the rise in this country, the number of prison guards is on the rise. Is anyone looking at the whole picture? This worries me, because I see many decisions being taken.

• (1825)

If I look in my riding, the family crisis resource centre in Shediac is working very hard to eliminate family violence and family crime in general. They are all volunteers who work very hard. These centres are well organized, offer good service and help people in trouble. They will find sources of assistance for people.

Money is not pouring into these organizations and yet, they should have more assistance.

Many volunteers get involved in putting together a half-way house, a family crisis centre or a crime prevention centre, but it takes assistance and money. Yet the will is there. There are many volunteers raising money here and there. Where I come from, people may not have a lot of money, but they give generously. They deserve to be congratulated. But the government must not rely on these resources alone.

I think it is too bad that there are such capable people, willing to do something, very dedicated to the cause, who are always scrambling for money. There are many of them. The riding of Kent apparently needs a half-way house. All ridings need them. There is a need for a very safe place where people can go. The vicious cycles must be stopped. This is only possible through prevention and resources.

I needed a half-way house a number of years ago. There was one in my area in those days. I was able to stay there for three weeks. I was able to get therapy. My son was well treated because the resources were available. Had they not been, I would probably not be here today, because I would not have been able to get out of the situation I was in, without the necessary help.

So, when I speak of family violence, I know what I am talking about, believe me. I know how important it is for these women to get help free of charge, because not everybody has money set aside in case they have to get out of the house. Services have to be there for these people.

They can be teenagers too. There are lots of young people who turn up every Tuesday. It is nearly always the same ones we see in court. But they are salvageable. Priority must be given to this, because no child is born bad. Society makes them bad, the society we as a government create.

If we create a society, an environment that is not good for our youth, we must accept the responsibility and go back in time to see what we did that had a bad outcome. This must be dealt with, or we will create a world that will not be a nice one.

That is a pity, in my opinion, because often, the resources are not available. I have often spoken to people in schools, to teachers and principals. They say "We have loads of kids who need help, but no resources". These are young people that can be helped.

It is very rare for a 6, 7 or 8 year old to have decided to be bad for life. There are reasons, and often we need to really get inside these children to find out where the problem lies. Having a part-time counsellor in a school with 500 students is not the way to find out the child's problems. Not in the least. There must be people in the schools who have the time and the expertise to work with these young people and their parents.

Supply

• (1830)

The governments of this country will one day have to establish the priority. Is it to ensure that major corporations continue to make profits? Is it to believe things are going well because the economy has improved, while neglecting social programs? Poverty and stress are increasing. Think of the stress with the cutting of 45,000 federal jobs.

Not only are the poor affected, so is the middle class. There is violence in the middle class. There is violence everywhere. Family violence is not limited to the poor. Violence can be found at all levels.

It is the same with young offenders. They do not come just from poor families. They come from all walks of life. Work needs to be done with them. Until it is, we are missing the boat and by a long shot.

I would also like to talk about registration of firearms. Our constituents are wondering about this too. There is a need to control firearms. But we should not forget that people who kill their partners do not always use guns. Controlling firearms will not resolve all the problems in the world. It will worsen things in certain situations.

In a rural riding, no price is set for registering firearms. It keeps going up and up. In the regions, cuts continue to be made. That means that hunters have a problem. Things are out of balance. It is a problem for the people in our ridings.

I do not want to put all my eggs in one basket and say that everyone is safe in the country because the Liberals passed a bill on registering firearms. That is not true. There are a lot of disturbing factors there. Responsibilities must be assumed.

[*English*]

It is very important that we look at the justice system, at what works and at what does not work. It can put someone in jail. If people commit crimes that is their punishment, but have to look at why they are there and what brought them to that. What is the percentage of people in jail today who had a terrible past, who never worked out their past? It is a very large majority. If we had caught on to that before they committed crimes we would not be paying \$75,000 or \$85,000 a year for one person in jail. It is a lot of money.

That is why we have to look at prevention, not only prevention once they are 16. We have to look at the whole picture: the family environment and the policies of governments that perhaps make it more difficult, and many policies make it very difficult.

We have to make prevention a top priority and provide funds for it. It should begin in the schools starting at kindergarten. All kinds of children may be physically abused or sexually abused. It

does not only start at the age of 10 years. We need resources available for them if we want to make sure they become a benefit to the society. Until we do that I have no doubt that crime will increase.

• (1835)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the speech by the member for Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, which gets us thinking about domestic violence.

It is true that there are many volunteers doing some really good work right now. They have the expertise and often work long hours during the day and even late into the night to prevent suicides and help people in our society, in Abitibi, in her riding and in many areas of Canada.

I raise my hat to the member and say to her that we took due note when she said that prevention is really necessary and that there must be more family-oriented policies. Much work must be done, even though the Minister of Justice has introduced a multi-million dollar plan for Canadians and families. I congratulate the member. The speech she gave this evening has made us think about Canada as a whole.

Ms. Angela Vautour: Mr. Speaker, I thank my Liberal colleague. When one has experienced difficulties oneself, one understands.

As I said, I have a 12-year-old son who went through some difficult times and he had access to resources. My son will do well in life, I have no doubt, because he had access to resources, as did I. That is the key to success. That is why this deserves our attention.

I thank the member for his comments.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are talking at this point about Motion No. 1 in relation to spending in the area of justice. I will try to relate to how much society and government resources are committed to the area of justice and then relate that to our lack of satisfaction.

I did a quick addition of how much we will be spending under the justice and the solicitor general ministries. My addition might be incorrect but I came up with \$2,889,701,564 that we are about to vote on. That is a tremendous amount of money. Yet it does not represent the money that may be hidden incidentally in other departments such as defence, foreign affairs, the environment and whatnot.

That justice spending does not reflect all the provincial or municipal budgets for crime prevention and other service programs or all volunteer organizations that do fundraising to provide general

justice services. That is a tremendous commitment of the resources of Canadian society to justice, peace and public order. Yet we have tremendous dissatisfaction and discomfort with all the services that are delivered.

I would like the member to respond to this inequity, to respond to how we can have greater value for the dollar and greater accountability for what we commit as a society to the judicial area so that the public can have a renewed sense of confidence that all the resources we spend in this area could not be spent wisely in other areas.

Ms. Angela Vautour: Mr. Speaker, Canadians are happy with the money we spend on justice when we are spending it the right way. Spending it only once a crime has been committed is not spending it the right way. It is not by taking funds away that we will fix it. It is not by privatizing the institutions as I know the Reform Party wants to do that we will fix it.

• (1840)

What we need is prevention. We need to give the dollars necessary to make sure we have the resources available when someone is in need, when we think someone needs counselling and there is a need for a teacher to say "I believe this child is having problems". We need counsellors in the schools and places for the kids to go in the evening to play a game or something where it is healthy, where there are no cigarettes or alcohol.

That is all part of crime prevention. How many communities do not have a community centre and if they do have one cannot afford to pay a co-ordinator for the centre? Those are important factors in our daily lives and our children's daily lives. It is important they have a healthy place to go to instead of just hanging around a nice place that may not be nice to hang around.

I believe the Canadian public will not mind that its tax dollars being spent like that because they are being spent in the right way.

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is a success story when it comes to the economy and how we as a government handle the finances of the nation. This success is not only recognized as such within Canada but is certainly recognized in international circles as well.

To achieve this there had to be and has to be balance between federal services, deficit control, debt management, economic growth and other factors. I was quite amazed to note the motion of the opposition member to reduce justice estimates.

The hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough proposes to vote down the operating expenditures of the Department of Justice. If the House approves that motion it would prevent the Department of Justice from conducting its statutory responsibilities.

Supply

The \$193.8 million in operating expenditures required in 1998-99 will allow the department to carry out its responsibility for the legal affairs of the government as a whole and to provide legal services to individual departments and agencies. More specifically these funds will enable the department to continue to meet its responsibilities under three lines. The first is the provision of services to the government. The second is the policy development and administration of the law and the third is administration.

There are three main areas where the Department of Justice has lead responsibility. They are criminal justice policy, family and youth law policy arising out of marriage and divorce, and human rights policy. The department also has a lead role in constitutional law, administrative law, aboriginal justice, access to information and privacy law, official languages law and the government's mandate for courts and judges.

The Minister of Justice and her department are responsible for more than 40 statutes, many of them with major policy ramifications. The department must anticipate future legal and societal trends in order to provide timely strategic and effective responses, to provide leadership both to the government and the public in understanding the changing legal world, and to provide guidance in achieving governmental objectives in a manner consistent with fundamental rights and freedoms, fairness, equality, accessibility, and effective and efficient legal policy.

The justice department provides a range of services relating to the planning, co-ordination, development, promotion and implementation of justice related policies. The justice department is moving forward with a balanced and focused policy agenda which responds to the issues Canadians have identified as being important to them.

Some of the areas the department is working on includes the crime prevention strategy, youth justice, victims and the rights of victims, conditional sentencing, firearms control and many others. I will elaborate on firearms control. I want to point out that effective implementation of the firearms control program is among the Department of Justice's highest priorities. The regulations required to implement the system have been made following scrutiny of both houses of parliament and the system will be functional by October 1, 1998.

• (1845)

Registration together with licensing and the other aspects of the Firearms Act is aimed at facilitating the continued enjoyment of sport by responsible owners using safe practices. This will decrease the risk of gratuitous violence and will promote a culture which recognizes safety and responsibility.

The new firearms legislation is a positive and effective contributor to the range of criminal and social measures put in place by the government to further a safe and secure society. The gun control legislation has the support of a large majority of Canadians as we

Supply

all know and is a reflection of a country of peaceful communities, safe streets and fairness.

The Firearms Act is legislation which its opponents seem determined to distort and misrepresent in addition to denying its many benefits. Certainly that is most unfortunate. The law imposes tough criminal penalties on those who choose to use firearms in the commission of crimes. Even the opponents of the legislation endorse its strong crime prevention aspects. The minimum penalties, four years in most cases, inserted into the Criminal Code for offences committed with firearms send a strong deterrent message, a message which has been upheld at every state to date by the courts.

This statute is all about regulating lethal instruments, articles designed for the most part to kill. This legislation is not about confiscation. It recognizes that the vast majority of firearms owners and users are responsible and prudent people. The practices embodied in the statute reflect the prudent practices of those responsible people.

The statute strives to encourage a culture of safety in Canada, a culture which is well ingrained in the activities and responsibilities of firearm owners.

The legitimate practices of those responsible owners can all be continued under this statute. Hunters can continue to hunt, target shooters can continue to shoot targets, buyers and sellers can continue their activities, collectors and museums can continue to function and thrive, and responsible owners who carry out their activities safely have certainly nothing to fear in the new gun control legislation.

Many of our opponents advocate a situation representing and respecting firearms such as that which exists in the United States. It is worthy to note there are 30 times more firearms in the United States than in Canada. A much higher proportion of homicides in the United States involves firearms. On average 65% of homicides in the United States involve firearms as opposed to 33% in Canada.

Firearm homicide rates per capita in the United States are 7.6 times higher than in Canada. This is unacceptable. The United States environment respecting guns does not correspond to the vision of Canadians.

The Firearms Act addresses another crucial social situation, domestic violence. The Firearms Act requires licensing and screening of gun owners and will result in specific checking of probation orders and prohibition orders before licences are granted.

When fully implemented, all firearms owners will be licensed. They will have taken a course emphasizing the safety and safe handling aspects of their sport. The guns they use will be registered

and this will assist the police in enforcement functions and in tracing the illegal movement or transfer of firearms. It will encourage owners to store their guns carefully and it will assist in the recovery of lost and stolen firearms.

The new system will reduce by half the paper work and administrative tasks which are today performed by police, and this will put police back on the streets where they belong.

The Firearms Act embraces all these things and is a positive and effective contributor to the range of criminal and social measures put in place by our government to further a safe and secure society. The Firearms Act has the support of a large majority of Canadians and is reflective of a country of peaceful communities, safe streets and fairness.

By way of conclusion, I believe the department is managing its resources responsibly and the department's policy will have an impact on Canadians' confidence in their justice system.

• (1850)

In addition, the role of the Department of Justice in advising the government on legal issues and in conducting litigation on behalf of the crown is vital to the proper functioning of the Canadian government and Canadian society as a whole.

The department therefore should be given the means to conduct its responsibilities and I urge all members of the House to vote accordingly on this measure.

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the hon. member speak on the merits of the government's gun control Bill C-68 I have a question. We are going to speak shortly on our own party's position so I do not want to get into that. It is obvious to me the hon. member has a certain amount of information in front of him but I do not think he understands any of the differences between Bill C-17 and Bill C-68.

The effective and important measures and the measures that will work in this country to prevent crime were all incorporated in Bill C-17. When this government brought in Bill C-68 it was simply a tax on ownership of firearms. It had nothing to do with gun control.

I would like to ask the hon. member how a responsible member of parliament can consider for a moment that registration of firearms of law-abiding owners of this country is going to prevent crime. I would like to know that.

There are literally thousands of guns on the streets. It is obvious that not one criminal in Canada is going to stand up to register their firearms, so how do we go to the people who are not abusing the firearm? Bill C-17 looked after anyone abusing firearms. There is

Supply

no sympathy from the Canadian public for anyone abusing firearms. There is not one iota of sympathy for that person.

The only people who are going to pay the tax on ownership of firearms are the honest people who admit they have the firearms to begin with. How is that going to prevent crime?

Mr. Lynn Myers: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the question.

I understand only too well the issue with respect to firearms and the Firearms Act. I sat for 10 years as a member of the Waterloo regional police commission. As chairman of the Waterloo regional police we were very much in favour of having this type of legislation in place which would prevent and assist in terms of prevention of crime throughout not only our community with approximately 500,000 people but across Ontario and across Canada.

What amazed me was that the member's party during the last election would try to out reform the Reform Party on this very contentious issue. Instead it should have been leading with us in the vanguard to ensure that the streets were safe, criminals were put away and firearms were protected in a manner consistent with the values and norms of society.

The Canadian people do not like that, do not want that and do not respect that. What the Canadian people would rather see is our society as a safe and caring one with caring communities in a manner consistent with what we as Canadians value.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the question from the member for South Shore. I noticed there was not an answer given to that question. I think it deserves an answer.

We have had hand gun registration in Canada since 1935. We have a long gun or rifle and shotgun registration system based very much on that same principle. We know there are more hand guns used in the commission of crimes than ever.

Looking at that model I am wondering if the member for Waterloo—Wellington can tell us how registering rifles and shotguns will improve that situation based on the knowledge we have that it has not improved the situation by having hand guns registered all this time. I think the member for South Shore made a very important point.

● (1855)

We know criminals are not going to register their long guns. They did not register their handguns either, we know that. In rural areas like I represent, it is a real inconvenience. It is a high cost for people to register their guns.

It is not going to be as simple as some member suggested, a postcard style registration mailed back in. We know over 20% of

guns do not have proper serial numbers or duplicates. It is going to be much more expensive.

The question bears repeating. How is Bill C-68 going to cut down on crime by causing the registration of riffles and shotguns?

Mr. Lynn Myers: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question.

Anything we as a society, anything we as a government, anything we as a country can do to ensure there are not firearms on the streets in whatever form will make our society a safer place. I and most Canadians do not want to go down the path of the Americans in this regard. We do not want the kind of crime that exists in the United States. Our values and system of norms and what we hold dear as a society are very strong.

As a society we need to ensure we take weapons out of the hands of people who commit crime. In doing that we have put in place the kind of laws which enable us to do that. They ensure Canada remains distinct in this area, rightfully so, and in the process allows police to do the kind of work they are best charged to do, to get back on the streets and make sure our communities are safe and sound for everyone. Canadians deserve that and we owe that to our young people.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, once again the member has not answered the question. He said he wants to take weapons out of the hands of people who commit crimes. The people who are registering these guns are law-abiding Canadian citizens. They are not committing crimes with these guns.

Why can the member not understand the question? It is put about as simply as we can possibly put it. The question is how will this expensive registry get weapons off the streets and make Canada safer.

This program originally was to cost \$85 million or \$87 million, whatever the magic number was that the justice minister of the day happened to invent. We now know that it is going to be at least double that number just for the registration program itself.

There is terminology. It is called GIGO, garbage in equals garbage out. It is a terminology of slang used in information systems. If you put in garbage, you get garbage out. If you go with an imperfect registration system such as proposed by this minister and by this government, there is no way the registration system will work.

Furthermore, in my constituency the RCMP has had to try to impose fees in order to cover its cost of doing the extra work caused by Bill C-68. These are realities and facts. We are talking about millions of dollars, much inconvenience. The question remains specifically can the member tell this House how we will have safer streets and fewer guns on the streets as a result of this very expensive multimillion dollar registration system?

Supply

Mr. Lynn Myers: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the question.

I reject outright the premise that the registration system will not work. It will work. It will be a very effective one which will be for the benefit of all Canadians.

Perhaps the hon. member was not listening when I said this in direct answer to his question. We are not about to penalize legitimate people in terms of gun ownership, farmers, hunters and others.

• (1900)

For example, I live on the family farm. We have those kind of things that are required from time to time. We are not after those kinds of people. They will be licensed and we will keep track of what they have. That is a reasonable thing to do. From an overall macro point of view what we are doing as a government is ensuring that the streets will be safer and police will have the capability to do their work. Ultimately, we as a caring community and by extension a caring society will have a far, far better place and a far, far better Canada.

Mr. Dick Harris: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In view of the fact that the hon. member was asked a specific question on three occasions and was not able to respond, I would like to ask for unanimous consent that we extend this question and comment period for another three minutes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley has asked for the unanimous consent to extend the period of questions and comments for three minutes. Is there unanimous consent?

An hon. member: No.

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

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to take a moment to point out that the question was very explicitly asked three times and no answer was forthcoming.

I want to take a different turn on the justice discussion. Quite often the justice system seems so gigantic, so distant and so impregnable that people feel there is nothing they can do or that it might not have an impact on them. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is nothing more personal than the justice system if you have been involved in it or have had to deal with it. The example I will use shows the lack of direction and the wrong focus we have in our proposed spending estimates that we are talking about today.

Justice is about people and how it affects them. I want to talk about how the justice system has failed a family in my riding, a family that has gone through a great deal of suffering from three

arms of the justice system. They have all failed to some degree to recognize the situation and to take the appropriate steps to help this family.

I am talking about James Mills who was murdered on July 24, 1991 while in custody of Corrections Canada. He was murdered while under an arm of the justice system in Canada. At the time and since then, suggestions have been made that there were serious errors made at the time of the murder on behalf of Corrections Canada. I do not know if that is true, but the accusations have been made about the disruption of the crime scene. Perhaps it was a shortage of training. Perhaps it was a shortage of staff. In any case there was a deficiency that caused an awful problem.

Eventually the RCMP were called to the scene of the crime, another arm of the justice system. The RCMP have investigated this. It still tells us that there is an ongoing investigation but there are still no results. Again, the third arm of the justice system, the crown prosecutor, was involved. Even though charges were recommended on two previous occasions, they have never been laid.

The family of Mr. James Mills has waited seven years for an answer. There is no answer. There is no explanation of what happened at the crime scene. There is no explanation of how he was murdered. There is no explanation of how it could happen right under the nose of the justice system in Canada.

The family, especially the father Mr. Robert Mills, has been haunted for years and years. All he wants is an answer. He wants to have an explanation of what happened, why his son was murdered, how he was murdered and why nothing was ever done about it. The solicitor general still says and maintains to this time that the case is still under investigation.

Looking for answers, Mr. Mills and sometimes Mr. Mills and myself have met with top level senior RCMP officials. We are trying to get answers. The commissioner of corrections came to Amherst to meet with Mr. Mills. We were hopeful that he would bring information with him. That did not arrive. It did not happen. We did not get any new information, even though the commissioner came to Amherst and we appreciated that.

We have brought up questions in the House of Commons month after month. We have been in the media. We have even used the access to information office to try to get information on what happened. Where was the deficiency? Where did the system fail? How can the Mills family be let down so badly when their son was murdered right under the nose of the justice system? How did the other parts of the justice system fail? Was it lack of training? Was it—

• (1905)

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. First of all, I apologize to the hon. member for having cut him off in midstream, but I think that there is now consent for the following

Supply

motion, and I would invite colleagues to verify if they are unsure. The motion would be the following:

That, notwithstanding any standing order or usual practice, the business to be considered under Government Orders on Wednesday, June 10, 1998 shall be the report stage of Bill C-25; a motion relating to the appointment of the information commissioner; the third reading of Bill C-30; and the consideration of Senate amendments stage of Bill C-4;

That, no later than 5 p.m. on all questions necessary to dispose of the report stage of Bill C-25, all questions shall be put and a division or divisions thereon deemed requested, provided that the said division or divisions may not be deferred;

In other words, we will vote at 5 p.m. tomorrow on Bill C-25.

That during the remainder of the sitting on that day, no quorum calls, requests for unanimous consent or dilatory motions may be received by the Chair, provided, for greater clarity, that it is confirmed that an amendment proposed to a motion under Government Orders is not a dilatory motion and is therefore admissible under the terms of this order and provided that, when debate concludes on Bill C-4, the question then under consideration shall be deemed to have been put, a division thereon requested and deferred to 1 p.m. on Thursday, June 11, 1998; and

That the House shall then adjourn and shall meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, June 11, 1998 and the ordinary daily routine of business shall be taken up at that time.

Mr. Paul Forseth: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It was my impression that the wording of the motion that was agreed to did not include any reference to quorum calls.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I would put it to the hon. House leader that this perchance is something that could be debated behind the curtains and we will come back.

I would like to catch the mood of the House. Does the hon. the government House leader have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Bill Casey: Mr. Speaker, I have been reminded during that little interruption that I am dividing my time with the hon. member for South Shore. I neglected to say that at the beginning.

In any case, we are back to the Mills family who have lost their son who was in the custody of Corrections Canada, the justice system in effect, investigated by the RCMP, the justice system in effect again, and the crown prosecutor of New Brunswick, again the justice system. It has now been seven years that they have been waiting for answers, explanations, anything at all, any scrap of information, but there has been nothing.

We asked for a final report from Corrections Canada. We were promised that we would get a final report on November 20 and we were to get a report of the investigation and all aspects surrounding the death.

• (1910)

On November 20 we were presented with a report that was mostly all blank pages, not an ounce of new information, nothing more for the Mills family, nothing to give them a little peace or contentment or any information that would allow them to let this go away. In fact three arms of the justice system have failed the Mills family: the RCMP, Corrections Canada and the crown attorney.

Meanwhile, it has not got enough money to provide the training at Corrections Canada or whatever the problem is, or it does not have enough officers to investigate the situation properly, the government is talking about spending anywhere from \$85 million for this gun registry process and now it is talking about \$133.9 million this year alone. In any case, it is going to be hundreds of millions of dollars and this money could be spent in adding training, equipment, facilities and officers to the police forces and Corrections Canada which could really serve a purpose and do some good.

The recently announced \$32 million crime prevention initiative is the same thing. It is public relations and there is nothing in it for the police. I read in the *Toronto Sun* on June 7 "another \$32 million down the drain". The article went on to state "The minister's crime prevention initiative is more of the same molly-coddling that has made a joke of the Young Offenders Act and if Liberalism at its worst may be defined as public boondoggles premised on good intention, then this justice minister is a true Liberal having a bad day".

The fact of the matter is that the latest report from the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics states that 1994 had the largest decline in police strength since 1962, the year when statistics were first kept. It goes on to state that in 1962 there were 20 criminal infractions per police officer. But in 1994 there were 47, far more than double the number of infractions or criminal offences per police officer. That indicates where the money should be going. It should be going to these issues and not the issues where the government has focused the money.

We now have the fewest number of police officers since 1972. In addition to that, the police officers we do have are now preoccupied with the long gun registration, the Young Offenders Act and all the things the government has brought in.

We think a better plan would be to take the long gun registration money, put more officers on the street and give them more tools to work with.

No wonder people like the Mills family wonder how our justice dollars are being spent. The large amount of money in the justice department estimates should be redirected to be useful, functional and directed where it is most needed.

Supply

Mr. Speaker, I will now turn my time over to the hon. member for South Shore.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member will have to endure the possibility of questions and comments first.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the hon. member would like to explain to the House who administers and hires and fires policemen. As far as I know it is the municipal authorities and not the federal government.

I fail to see why he is referring to our crime prevention initiative. It is a collaborative effort of the federal, provincial and municipal authorities in order to prevent crimes and ensure that we do not need more policemen in the long run. We can start preventing crime at the age of zero instead of at the age of 17 when it is too late. We want to prevent crime from the very beginning to ensure that eventually there will never be crime again in this country.

The \$32 million will be a shared responsibility between the federal, provincial and municipal authorities.

How does the member explain the fact that the hiring and firing of policemen is a municipal responsibility, not a federal one?

Mr. Bill Casey: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question. Certainly our municipal police are hired but some of the things the government is doing, such as the gun registry, are going to take so much of their time. Instead of being on the street they are going to be registering firearms, implementing the Young Offenders Act and all the other aspects the government is downloading. The government is supposed to pay half of the costs of the implementation of the Young Offenders Act and it is only paying 30%. The municipalities and the local police forces are also supposed to implement the gun registry.

As an aside, not all police officers are hired by the municipalities. The RCMP certainly play a big role in my part of the country. It is a federal agency, federally funded and federally paid.

• (1915)

Some of the \$133.9 million already spent on the gun registry could supply police officers with better tools to work with or to put more policemen on the street. That is where I think the money should be going instead of to these programs.

Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member has considered that there are more parts to the country than Cumberland—Colchester. In a city like Windsor, Ontario, which abuts on the great city of Detroit, Michigan, we see the impact every day of having no gun control and having no gun registry. Every night when we watch the news on television we see shootings in schools being treated as though they are car accidents. I do not want Canada to turn out that way. I want Canada to be a distinct and different culture from that of the United States.

Does the hon. member think by having people wear sidearms and by not taking care of things such as crime prevention and our children that this will be a better place? Does he believe that municipalities do not pay for the services of the RCMP? I think he is on a stretch here.

Mr. Bill Casey: Mr. Speaker, I would say the opposite is true. The hon. member asked whether I was aware there were other areas than Cumberland—Colchester like Windsor. I think the government is not aware that there are other areas such as Toronto, Mississauga, Windsor and maybe even Ottawa. There is also a vast part of Canada that is rural and we do not see the need for a gun registry.

The member also asked whether I believed in gun control. I certainly believe in gun control. My government, the government I was a part of between 1988 and 1993, brought in very good gun control that emphasized safe storage of weapons, training and elimination of dangerous weapons. We did not bring in a gun registry.

This is all about a gun registry, not gun control. Yes, I believe in gun control. We put it in and put it in well.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I almost hate to interrupt.

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. members are getting excited in the debate, but we have another matter before us. The government House leader is rising on a point of order which no doubt is important and which all hon. members would want to hear.

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, some four or five minutes ago I read a motion and sought unanimous consent which at that time still needed further review by some hon. members. I will put it that way.

If you were to seek consent to adopt the motion I put earlier I believe you would perhaps receive it. I will dispense with reading it again because the table already has the text and it has been read into the record.

The Deputy Speaker: The government House leader has asked me to put a motion that was read some time ago. Does the hon. government House leader have unanimous consent of the House to put the motion?

Some hon. members: Read it again, please.

The Deputy Speaker: I will read the motion in a minute. Is there consent to put it?

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: There is no consent.

Business of the House

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly with much interest that I rise to speak to the motion to fund the continued business of the government in power today. I would specifically like to speak to gun control and to the justice issue which I think are interesting points.

• (1920)

I have been sitting here listening to the debate and have been extremely interested in a lot of the comments coming from the government benches. It is obvious that they have totally mixed up gun control. They do not understand the difference between Bill C-17 and Bill C-68.

It is time we had a little lesson in history. I am going to use an analogy. If anybody in the House happens to be a fly fisherman, I would like him to listen to this analogy. We had a situation in 1993 where we had just gone through a major debate in the country on gun control and an election. What ensued from that debate was Bill C-17 which at the time was a very responsible bill on gun control.

What happened? We ran a federal election and we elected, much to the chagrin of many Canadians, a disjointed and separated parliament. We did not have an opposition that was interested in being an opposition. We had a government with a huge majority. It was bereft of ideas—

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There

were what I would describe as further consultations and I think you would find consent to put the motion now and that the motion would be carried. It has already be read into the record and I think members have had time to consider it.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. government House leader have unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Don Boudria: I move:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice, the business to be considered under Government Orders on Wednesday, June 10, 1998 shall be the report stage of Bill C-25, a motion relating to the appointment of the Information Commissioner, the third reading stage of Bill C-30 and the consideration of Senate amendments stage of Bill C-4;

That, no later than 5 p.m. on all questions necessary to dispose of the report stage of Bill C-25 shall be put and a division or divisions thereon deemed requested, provided that the said division or divisions may not be deferred;

That during the remainder of the sitting on that day, no quorum calls, requests for unanimous consent or dilatory motions may be received by the Chair, provided, for greater clarity, that it is confirmed that an amendment proposed to a motion under Government Orders is not a dilatory motion and is therefore admissible under the terms of this Order and provided that, when debate concludes on Bill C-4, the question then under consideration shall be deemed to have been put, a division thereon requested and deferred to 1 p.m. on Thursday, June 11, 1998; and

That the House shall then adjourn and shall meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, June 11, 1998 and the ordinary daily routine of business shall be taken up at that time.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to pass the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

[*Editor's Note: For continuation of proceedings see Volume B*]

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Points of Order

Business of the House

Mr. Boudria	7773
Motion	7773
Mr. Laurin	7773

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Adams	7773
-----------------	------

Interparliamentary Delegations

Mrs. Finestone	7773
----------------------	------

Committees of the House

Agriculture and Agri-Food

Mr. McGuire	7773
-------------------	------

Business of the House

Mr. Boudria	7774
Motion	7774
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	7774
Mr. Boudria	7774
Mr. MacKay	7774
The Speaker	7774
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	7774
Mr. Epp	7774
(Motion withdrawn)	7774
Mr. Boudria	7775
Motion	7775
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	7775
Mr. Kenney	7776
Mrs. Jennings	7776
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	7776
Mr. Marchand	7776
Mr. Blaikie	7776
Mr. Pankiw	7777
Mr. Blaikie	7778
Mr. Coderre	7778
Mr. Blaikie	7778
Mr. Kenney	7778
Mr. Blaikie	7778
Mr. MacKay	7779
Mr. Blaikie	7779
Mr. Strahl	7780
Mr. MacKay	7780
Mr. Strahl	7782
Mr. MacKay	7783
Mr. Coderre	7784
Mr. Harris	7784
Mr. Coderre	7784
Mr. Blaikie	7784
Mr. Coderre	7784
Ms. Vautour	7785
Mr. Coderre	7785
Mr. Pankiw	7785
Mr. Coderre	7785
Mr. Epp	7785
Mr. Coderre	7785
Mr. Harris	7785

Mr. Coderre	7786
Mr. Harris	7786
Mr. Coderre	7786
Mr. Schmidt	7787
Mr. Coderre	7787
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	7787
Mr. Coderre	7788
Mrs. Jennings	7788
Mr. Coderre	7788
Mr. Johnston	7788
Mr. Coderre	7788
Mr. MacKay	7788
Mr. Coderre	7788
Mr. Harris	7789
Mr. Kenney	7789
Mr. Harris	7789
Ms. Catterall	7791
Mr. Harris	7791
Mr. Pankiw	7791
Mr. Pankiw	7791
Mr. Harris	7791
Mr. Peterson	7791
Mr. Harris	7792
Mr. Pankiw	7792
Mr. Harris	7792
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	7792
Mr. Saada	7792
Mr. Harris	7792
(Motion agreed to)	7793

Petitions

Marriage

Mr. Epp	7793
---------------	------

Criminal Code

Mr. Epp	7793
---------------	------

Multilateral Agreement on Investment

Mr. Riis	7794
----------------	------

Pensions

Mr. Riis	7794
----------------	------

Taxation

Mr. Riis	7794
----------------	------

Multilateral Agreement on Investment

Mr. Blaikie	7794
-------------------	------

Mr. MacKay	7794
------------------	------

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Pagtakhan	7794
---------------------	------

Mr. MacKay	7794
------------------	------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply

Main Estimates, 1998-99

Motion for concurrence	7794
------------------------------	------

Mr. Gagliano	7794
--------------------	------

Mr. Strahl	7795
------------------	------

Concurrence in Vote 1—Justice

Mr. Gagliano	7795
--------------------	------

Motion No. 1	7795
--------------------	------

Mr. Jackson	7795
-------------------	------

Mr. MacKay	7797
------------------	------

Mr. Jackson	7797
Mr. Johnston	7797
Mr. Jackson	7797
Ms. Catterall	7797
Mr. Jackson	7798
Mr. Borotsik	7798
Mr. Jackson	7798
Mr. Elley	7798
Mr. Jackson	7798
Mr. MacKay	7798
Amendment	7801
Mr. Harvey	7801
Mr. MacKay	7802
Mr. Hilstrom	7802
Mr. MacKay	7802
Mrs. Wayne	7803
Mr. MacKay	7803
Mr. Jordan	7803
Mr. MacKay	7803
Mr. Williams	7803

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Teaching Excellence Awards	
Ms. Caplan	7803
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	
Mr. Hoepfner	7803
Optimist Club of Brampton	
Ms. Beaumier	7804
Schizophrenia	
Mr. Graham	7804
Richard Ivey Family	
Mrs. Barnes	7804
The Senate	
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	7804
National Capital Commission	
Mr. Bellemare	7804
Drummondville	
Mrs. Picard	7805
Member for Rosemont	
Ms. Bakopanos	7805
Values	
Mr. Schmidt	7805
Education	
Mrs. Finestone	7805
Aboriginal Affairs	
Ms. Desjarlais	7806
Quebec–Japan Relations	
Mrs. Debien	7806
Calgary Declaration	
Mr. Coderre	7806
National Defence	
Mr. Price	7806
Accueil Bonneau	
Mr. Duceppe	7807

International Federation for Parent Education	
Mr. Saada	7807

ORAL QUESTIONS

Hepatitis C	
Mr. Manning	7807
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	7807
Mr. Manning	7807
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	7807
Mr. Manning	7807
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	7808
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	7808
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	7808
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	7808
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	7808
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	7808
Health	
Mr. Duceppe	7808
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	7808
Mr. Duceppe	7808
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	7808
Mr. Gauthier	7809
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	7809
Mr. Gauthier	7809
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	7809
Hepatitis C	
Ms. McDonough	7809
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	7809
Ms. McDonough	7809
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	7809
Mrs. Wayne	7809
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	7810
Mrs. Wayne	7810
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	7810
Miss Grey	7810
Mr. Rock	7810
Miss Grey	7810
Mr. Rock	7810
Mr. Rock	7810
Air Transport	
Mr. Mercier	7810
Mr. Collenette	7810
Mr. Mercier	7811
Mr. Collenette	7811
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	7811
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	7811
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	7811
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	7811
Air Transport	
Mr. Guimond	7811
Mr. Collenette	7811
Mr. Guimond	7811
Mr. Collenette	7811
British Columbia	
Ms. Meredith	7812
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	7812
Ms. Meredith	7812
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	7812
Atlantic Groundfish Strategy	
Mr. Bernier	7812

Mr. Pettigrew	7812
Nuclear Technology	
Mr. Assadourian	7812
Mr. Goodale	7812
British Columbia	
Mr. Stinson	7812
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	7813
Mr. Harris	7813
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	7813
Railways	
Mr. Solomon	7813
Mr. Collette	7813
Mr. Solomon	7813
Mr. Collette	7813
Health	
Mr. Thompson (Charlotte)	7813
Mr. Rock	7813
Mr. Thompson (Charlotte)	7814
Mr. Rock	7814
National Defence	
Mr. Clouthier	7814
Mr. Eggleton	7814
British Columbia	
Mr. Solberg	7814
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	7814
Dredging of St. Lawrence	
Mr. Bigras	7814
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland)	7815
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Earle	7815
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	7815
Ice Storm	
Ms. St-Jacques	7815
Mr. Pettigrew	7815
Point of Order	
Member for Ahuntsic	
Mr. Bergeron	7815
The Speaker	7815

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply	
Main Estimates, 1998-99	
Mr. Williams	7816
Mr. Bellehumeur	7817
Mr. Muise	7819
Mr. Bellehumeur	7819
Mr. Bellehumeur	7820
Mr. Jackson	7820
Mr. Bellehumeur	7821
Mr. Ménard	7821
Mr. Bellehumeur	7821
Mr. Ménard	7822
Mr. Bellehumeur	7822
Message from the Senate	
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland)	7822

Supply	
Main Estimates, 1998-99	
Ms. Lill	7822
Ms. Bakopanos	7822
Mr. Ramsay	7825
Ms. Bakopanos	7825
Mr. Ménard	7825
Ms. Bakopanos	7826
Mr. Ménard	7826
Ms. Bakopanos	7826
Mr. Ramsay	7826
Ms. Bakopanos	7829
Mr. Ramsay	7829
Mr. Casey	7829
Mr. Ramsay	7829
Mr. Muise	7830
Mr. Ramsay	7830
Mr. O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	7830
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	7831
Mr. O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	7831
Mr. O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	7833
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	7833
Mr. O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	7833
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	7834
Mr. O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	7834
Mr. Marceau	7834
Mr. Marceau	7835
Mr. Ménard	7836
Mr. Marceau	7837
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	7837
Mr. Marceau	7837
Mr. Mahoney	7837
Mr. Casey	7838
Mr. Mahoney	7838
Mr. Pankiw	7838
Mr. Mahoney	7838
Mr. Ramsay	7838
Mr. Mahoney	7838
Mr. Mahoney	7839
Mr. Ramsay	7839
Mr. Mahoney	7839
Mr. Harris	7840
Mr. Mahoney	7840
Mr. Ménard	7841
Mr. Mahoney	7841
Mrs. Wayne	7841
Mr. Mahoney	7841
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	7841
Mr. Mahoney	7841
Ms. Minna	7842
Mr. Pankiw	7842
Ms. Vautour	7842
Mr. St-Julien	7844
Ms. Vautour	7844
Mr. Forseth	7844
Ms. Vautour	7845
Mr. Myers	7845
Mr. Keddy	7846
Mr. Myers	7847
Mr. Penson	7847
Mr. Myers	7847
Mr. Abbott	7847
Mr. Myers	7848
Mr. Harris	7848

Mr. Casey	7848
Mr. Boudria	7848
Motion	7849
Mr. Forseth	7849
Mr. Casey	7849
Ms. Bakopanos	7850
Mr. Casey	7850
Ms. Cohen	7850

Mr. Casey	7850
Mr. Boudria	7850
Mr. Keddy	7851
Business of the House	
Mr. Boudria	7851
Motion	7851
(Motion agreed to)	7851

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :

<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada – Édition, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9.



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 118B • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

[Editor's Note: Continuation of proceedings from Volume A]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

MAIN ESTIMATES, 1998-99

The House resumed consideration of the business of supply.

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, I will continue with the little lesson in history. It is obvious a great many members of the government need to hear this history lesson.

It is quite simple. In 1993 we had a government elected with a huge majority. We did not have an effective opposition. We were in a situation where we had a government that got elected on a couple of items. I followed that election very closely and I can say with some authority that gun control was not one of those items. Gun registration was not even discussed. It was not an issue.

What were the issues in the federal election of 1993 that elected many of the members sitting opposite? The first issue was the GST. These guys were elected on the GST. They were elected on kicking free trade out of the country.

What did we get in return for that? In the first 11 months the government took power we discussed gun control in the House of Commons. We never discussed the GST. We never discussed getting rid of free trade. We never discussed any of the substantive issues they were elected on.

• (1925)

I want to go back to my fly fishing analogy. Someone who is fly fishing knows there is nothing like laying a nice dry fly out, letting the line go a couple of times, laying that fly on a little ripple and watching a fish come up and snap it.

That is what happened with gun control. A group of individuals could not believe this was to be rammed down their throats. They could not believe they would see this type of registration from honest citizens. They snapped that fly. The hon. minister of justice of the day played that fish for everything it was worth. He surely did.

Was it important? Was it substantive? Did it help the country? No, it did not. We ended up with 11 months of argument, 11 months of discussion. We did not gain one thing. We obtained a bill that was defective, to say the least. We have a major supreme court challenge against it. We have four provinces and two territories that have no intention of abiding by the rules.

We have gone further than that. We have made a totally separate set of rules under Bill C-68 for first nations. It is not a problem. We can do that. We can have a separate set of rules just by snapping our fingers.

I will back up because these guys lump everything together. They say that somehow if we are against registration we are against gun control. I separate the two. I am all for gun control. I am a gun owner. I am a hunter. I am a farmer. I am someone who actually uses a firearm in a safe and responsible manner. I have zero sympathy for everyone out there who abuses the rights and the privileges of owning and using a firearm. I have no sympathy for them at all. They should be slapped with the full force of the law.

However, we are not willing to do that. It is much easier to tell all law-abiding citizens of Canada that they have not broken the law or done anything wrong and if they register their guns somehow it will make things safer. It does not work like that. We have rules, laws and regulations for the people of the country and it is extremely important that they follow them.

The greatest insult was under a criminal bill. It was a criminal bill. Do members know what it is now? Now it is a safety bill. Excuse me if I cannot quite swallow that. I have swallowed a lot of stories in my life but I cannot quite swallow that one.

At the end of the day what will we have accomplished? What good will it do? Under Bill C-17 we had responsible gun control. We said to firearm owners, long gun owners, shotgunners and hunters that if they wanted to own firearms they had to store them in a responsible manner. They have to prove they are responsible enough to own them to begin with. We do want a lot of firearms sold to people with criminal records.

A number of issues were raised today such as domestic violence. Nobody in the House is so wrongheaded that they would somehow try to justify domestic violence. What have we actually done to avoid it? Will registration avoid it? I suggest that it will not. Is there a better way? Is there another way?

Supply

We had Bill C-17. We had responsible gun control. It was never given a chance to work. We had a justice minister who wanted to make a name for himself. We had a government that did not want to talk about what it was elected to talk about. It did not want to go down that road. It did not want to govern on what it was elected to do. It was elected to do a number of things and gun control was not in the equation. GST was in the equation. Free trade was in the equation. Somehow we got off track. If we want to talk about smoke and mirrors, there was never a better smoke and mirror act than this whole deal on gun control. That is exactly what it was. It was wrong-headed, it was ill thought out and it is not going to make any difference.

• (1930)

Now we are telling the people of Canada to register the guns themselves. They are being told to send their cards in. I thought it was Sunday morning and I was watching TV. Just send money. It does not work like that. There is a lot of confusion out there. There are a number of people who did not understand Bill C-17. They certainly do not have the first idea about Bill C-68. What we are going to have is a lot of people who will not register their guns. A lot of them will be taken into the black market.

I need some clarification. I will ask for assistance. How does that prevent crime? The government is forcing a bunch of people to do something when they do not understand the rules and regulations. It had a law that would have worked, but it did not give it a chance. It is mixing that up with registration and now it is saying it is kicking out registration, it is kicking out responsible storage and the safe handling of firearms. That is just not so.

That is not what was discussed to begin with. Registration is not going to change that one iota and members opposite know it. We cannot afford it. People will not do it. More guns will be put on the black market, which will end up in the hands of criminals. I cannot understand how government members can sit there and continue to mix up the two.

If government members want to talk about registration separately, fine. But tell me what they have done in their bill to prevent domestic violence and the use of firearms by irresponsible persons. That was in Bill C-17, but it is not in Bill C-68.

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough Southwest, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to my hon. colleague. I am sure the House will know that one of the problems with people who tell stories about fish is the reputation that these stories have, because of course with each telling the tale gets taller, the tale gets longer, and the tale gets further and further away from the truth.

Of course the very interesting thing about the hon. member's remarks was that he was talking about the fly being cast and back in 1993 the fish grabbed the bait. What the fisherman forgets is that there was an election in 1997.

All of these issues were mentioned. I am sure my hon. colleague mentioned them when he was running. The people of Canada spoke. The people of Canada said that, over all, the Liberal government was doing a good job and it deserved another mandate to continue doing what it had promised to do.

It is all well and good to talk about fishing, but let us remember that he was talking about history. Let us go back and give these people on the other side a history lesson. Obviously my friend over there needs a history lesson because he forgot that just one year ago the people of Canada gave us a second majority mandate.

Let us talk about facts. We cannot see into the future. We do not know whether or not the dire predictions are going to be correct with respect to gun control. All we know is that we are going to give it—and I hate to use the phrase—a shot to see what happens.

I ask my hon. friend, is it not true, notwithstanding his wonderful analogy about fly fishing, that there was an election in 1997 and that the people of Canada gave the Liberal government a second majority mandate? Is that not true?

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for this opportunity because in Nova Scotia the people of Canada spoke. There were 11 Liberals from Nova Scotia prior to the election. There are zero today.

As far as the fishing analogy goes, yes, quite often the tale does not get blurred, it gets longer. That is what I am hearing from the government side. It is getting longer.

• (1935)

The government has blurred Bill C-17 and Bill C-68 together. The hon. member does not even know the difference between the two bills.

I am willing to do anything in the name of responsible gun ownership and gun control that will actually help to correct the issues we are talking about and that will be a positive step toward preventing violence.

I have heard nothing, and I am willing to listen, to convince me that registration and the spending of millions of dollars of Canadians' money is going to make a difference.

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the member's intervention. I understand the fishing analogy but, unfortunately, where I live there are no fish left thanks to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, so I cannot use that analogy. I think the member might have the same problem in his province.

I would like to ask the member, does he believe that the reason the Liberals brought Bill C-68 into this House and passed it had

Supply

nothing to do with the safety of Canadians? They knew that full well when they brought it in.

It was nothing more than a deliberate Machiavellian attempt to conceal from Canadians the failure of their justice system, the failure of their inability to deal with the shortcomings in the criminal justice system. This was a way to try to persuade Canadians that the government was actually doing something, when nothing could be further from the truth.

We have a justice minister who has for over a year promised changes to the YOA and no changes have been made to date.

We have a criminal justice system that lets convicted rapists walk the streets without serving any time in jail.

Is that not the reason they brought this so-called gun control legislation in? Does it not have more to do with trying to hide their own failure?

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, there was a serious lack of direction on the government's part. There was a serious lack of alternatives, of new ideas. They came down an old, worn out path and they walked and walked back and forth on it.

Unfortunately, they are not accomplishing a lot. The justice minister and the government did not have any new ideas. They were not willing to listen to people. They were not willing to look at alternatives. Here we have this half-baked idea and a half-baked system with no hope of it ever working.

Personally, when I eat my apple pie, I like to have it completely baked, not half baked.

Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to speak on this debate.

Recently a constituent of mine forwarded a column by Diane Francis contained in the May 18 issue of *Maclean's* magazine. The constituent was commenting favourably upon the article and requested a detailed response. I thought I should respond with some detail.

The column unfortunately betrays a woeful lack of understanding of Canadian history and an appalling ignorance of government finances, which is what we are debating tonight.

I could forgive Ms. Francis for her lack of Canadian historical knowledge, as she was originally an American citizen, however, I am unable to forgive her for her limited grasp of the federal government's finances and the role of the federal government vis-à-vis its citizens in this country.

She states "The federal government is in need of serious downsizing. It need not be involved in health, education, welfare, mining, forestry, culture or the fisheries. They are adequately handled by the provinces and the federal role should only be one of

co-ordination. On the other hand, Ottawa should remain in charge of justice, economic management, international diplomacy, defence, internal security and communications policy".

Ms. Francis seems not to understand that the government is not involved in health, education, welfare and has entered into management agreements with the provinces in the areas of mining and forestry.

• (1940)

For a nationally syndicated columnist this is a woeful misunderstanding of the jurisdictions involved in this country. The federal government is still involved in culture and fisheries because those endeavours do not recognize provincial boundaries.

Ottawa still remains in other areas of government approved by Ms. Francis, although its role in the daily delivery of justice services is quite limited. All in all Ottawa is pretty well out of everything that Ms. Francis thinks it should be out of and is in everything that Ms. Francis thinks it should be in. Never one to let facts get in the way of a fixed religious belief, Ms. Francis goes on to chastise the government for its enormous duplication and says that downsizing is not in the lexicon of the Liberal government.

Ms. Francis is the editor of the *Financial Post*. As such, she should have a working familiarity with the budget of the federal government. For hon. members present and for Ms. Francis I will go over some fundamentals of the federal budget.

The federal government has a budget of approximately \$150 billion to \$160 billion annually. In fiscal year 1996-97, 30% of that money went to service the national debt. The next 15% was transferred to the provinces and a further 23% was transferred to other organizations, such as the OAS, ET, et cetera. That amounts to 68% before Ottawa spends a dime on its own programs.

I am assuming that Ms. Francis does not want the federal government to default on its debts. That is possibly not true in the province which I come from, however, I am assuming that Ms. Francis wants that. I am also assuming that she does not want the amount of moneys allocated under the CHST to be reduced, especially to her favourite little buddy Mike Harris, and does not feel that the old age benefits or employment insurers are overly generous.

Ms. Francis approves of the federal government having a role in defence. That accounts for \$9 billion to \$10 billion. In gross numbers on a budget of \$161 billion, the federal government transferred \$41.6 billion to persons, \$22 billion to provinces and paid \$44.9 billion in interest on the national debt. That leaves approximately \$50 billion or 33% on which to run all the federal programs which Ms. Francis finds so burdensome. This is essentially the only money over which the federal government has any real control.

Supply

Ms. Francis apparently approves of Ottawa being involved in defence and apparently approves that this is—

Mr. Jim Jones: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Are we not supposed to be debating Motion No. 1 which is on justice and not on the overall budget?

The Deputy Speaker: Yes. The hon. member is quite right. We are debating Motion No. 1 which deals with the estimates of the Department of Justice. I know the hon. member for Scarborough East will get to the point of the motion in due course.

Mr. John McKay: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the intervention of the hon. member, but you will note that Motion No. 1 accounts for \$193 million worth of spending in areas of justice. In my riding that is an area of extreme significance.

These are areas of spending with which we have already dealt. We are down to 33% of the balance of the federal government's moneys, and in those moneys, of course, are justice moneys.

I am assuming that Ms. Francis approves of our spending in areas of veterans affairs. I assume she does not wish to cut off veterans from their benefits. I also assume that she does not want to cut aboriginal expenditures. She neglected to mention anything with respect to those issues, out of oversight rather than any intention on her part.

• (1945)

I do not wish to get too detailed for fear that the essential point will be lost on hon. members opposite.

The federal government has gone to great lengths to remove itself from overlapping jurisdiction and wasteful expenditures particularly in the area of justice. The hon. member should be aware that the justice system is largely administered by the provinces. Not only is the federal government far leaner than it was before, it is now arguably one of the most efficient governments in the world.

When you read the overblown rhetoric of this particular columnist and members opposite it sounds like sound bite journalism. One has to wonder whether members opposite and this journalist have been in a coma since 1993.

Far from being one of the most overgoverned jurisdictions in the world, just the opposite is true. Sixty-seven per cent of government revenues require virtually no bureaucracy at all. We collect it and then we ship it out.

Again I quote Ms. Francis "We have too many layers of bureaucracy doing too many of the same things. We have too many municipalities and school boards complicating our lives and adding

to costs. We have too many provinces. We have too big a federal government".

The facts point in exactly the opposite direction. To the extent that the federal government is able to remove itself from overlapping jurisdictions, it has. In some respects and arguably it has become somewhat too remote from the daily lives of Canadians. Absence of a strong federal government to provide a sense of being Canadian, Canada will degenerate into a bunch of separatist entities which plays into the agenda of the Lucien Bouchards of this world, and the Glen Clarks of this world. This is the world they—

Mr. Mike Scott: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Following up on the earlier point of order, members opposite have been waiting with bated breath to hear the relevance in the member's intervention. We have not heard that. I would ask that we have the speaker speak to the motion rather than going off on a rant about Diane Francis.

The Deputy Speaker: I am sure that the hon. member for Scarborough East will want to direct his remarks to the issue of the estimates of the Department of Justice which are after all the subject matter of the motion now before the House.

If members have run out of things to say on the justice issue we can move on to one of the other motions. Heaven knows there are enough of them.

Mr. John McKay: Mr. Speaker, one hesitates to say that one will get to it in a timely fashion. It is difficult to determine relevance for members opposite since one has to speak so slowly to get to the point.

Having elucidated that in fact only about 33% is available for federal government program spending and in that program spending are justice issues, I would say that is a matter of relevance and concern to all members.

As I pointed out, absent a strong federal government to provide a role of leadership in this issue, we play into the hands of the Lucien Bouchards, the Mike HARRISES and the Glen Clarks of this world who fervently desire the little flag sur le hood exercise.

Ms. Francis is a great admirer of California. If we follow her suggestion, that is exactly how we will end up, one of the states governed by Washington. That is exactly where some members opposite would wish us to go. I would put a number of members in the category of fervently desiring to be nothing other than a state of the United States.

It has been a 150-year struggle to continue to identify Canada as a nation and we are by and large, in spite of members opposite, doing rather well in accordance with the United Nations identifications. By any UN standards we are doing very well.

Supply

• (1950)

I would recommend to members opposite as they peruse the justice estimates that they also refer to the *Fraser Forum* for bedtime reading. That in and of itself identifies Canada as a foremost country in this issue.

Ms. Francis and her political front, the Reform Party, do not understand Canadian history and government finances.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we have been complaining for the longest time that we have been speaking to empty seats. This member's speech has indicated it really does not make any difference if they are here or not.

I really do not understand what this man has against Diane Francis. This rant that was supposed to be going on about justice had absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with justice.

Let me ask him a question. He is flanked on either side by members who do not seem to understand the meaning of the word how. The question is, how will Bill C-68 and the registration make the streets of Canada any safer? How?

Mr. John McKay: Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to speak to empty seats and it is another thing to speak to empty heads. The issue that was raised was the fronting of the Reform Party by this particular columnist.

To go to the member's question, it reminds me of the election and particularly of a constituent on whose door I was knocking. I was getting quite a beating about this particular piece of legislation of interest to the member opposite. As I was getting beaten up I could see that his wife was coming to the door. She had a tea towel over her arm. She slapped him and said "Don't listen to that idiot, he doesn't know anything about gun control". That was the response of many of my constituents in Scarborough East.

Any piece of legislation, and this is under the how part, which removes guns, which makes guns less accessible to the citizens of this country is a good piece of legislation by definition. During this past election we had a terrible incident involving long guns which I know the member opposite is quite interested in, resulting in the death of a spouse and four children.

I do not care how the legislation is drafted. I do not care how the regulations are drafted. In my community of Scarborough East this is good legislation and it gets guns inaccessible to more and more citizens. Anything that does that, I am in favour of.

Mr. Paul Bonwick (Simcoe—Grey, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. colleague for his background on the budget and the importance this government has shown toward justice issues.

I too would like to direct a comment and a question to the hon. member on Bill C-68 as well. Bill C-68 is nothing more than a record or an accountability of all the weapons or long arms, guns

that are out there in Canada. It is not dissimilar to refrigerators, automobiles, cars and animals.

Does the hon. member believe that if we create this data bank of weapons, that the police deserve to have access to the knowledge of whether or not weapons are located in a house when they go to a domestic call? Does the member think that is a good idea?

Mr. John McKay: Mr. Speaker, I would point out that statistically most offences involving firearms are committed by people who are known to the victim. It is something in the order of 80% or 90%. Anytime a piece of legislation is being passed which makes guns and weapons generally inaccessible to those kinds of classes of people, we are ahead of the game.

• (1955)

This is a matter of registration. As loath as I am to adopt the remarks of my colleague sitting with me here from Mississauga West, I am of the view that this is a simple form of registration. It is a registration that is easily filled out. It is similar to a car registration. It is similar to birth registration. It is similar to other forms of registration which a civilized society requires.

What we are trying to fashion in this country is a civilized society which is distinct from Ms. Francis' favourite country, the one to the south of us.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand the infatuation with Diane Francis but I suggest that he might want to give her a call sometime and talk to her. I can assure the hon. member that he would probably get an education.

My friend across the way suggests that a strong, big, bloated, fat central government somehow will serve Canadians much better than a decentralized government that is better able to respond to the needs of constituents.

I want to point out to my friend that it was the federal Liberal government that broke the contract it made with Canadians with respect to how much money it would put into health care and higher education. In the 1993 election this big, bloated, fat central government and the Prime Minister said "Oh, no. We are going to continue to spend the same amount of money on health care and higher education. In fact, we will probably increase it". The Liberals blatantly broke that promise, cutting transfers to the provinces by \$6 billion. That is an unbelievably abrogation of a contract.

I would suggest to my friend across the way that history does not bear out his rosy view of federalism. In fact, if federalism worked so well, then why do we have a separatist movement in this country today that is threatening to rip the country right apart? It is because of their vision of federalism that tries to suck all the power into the middle. That is why the separatists in Quebec want to leave.

Supply

I suggest to my friend, instead of worrying about the provinces becoming another state, I am concerned about him becoming a ward of the state after that nonsensical speech he gave. I say to him the provinces were the ones that led when it came to balancing budgets. The provinces are the ones who lead when it comes to social responsibility.

When is my friend going to wake up over there and understand that all the power in the country does not belong just in Ottawa? People at the local level know how to make their own decisions and they do not need the nanny state in Ottawa deciding those things for them.

Mr. John McKay: Mr. Speaker, it is appalling to the extreme that one of the leading members of the Reform Party should speak in this fashion. The two parties that would like to lead us into separation sit opposite. Those are the two parties that degenerate this country and make it a very difficult country to govern.

The hon. member's infatuation with Diane Francis, who is nothing other than a mouthpiece for the Reform Party, fails to understand in its essence the point of my speech. I can see that the hon. member has missed the point of the answers that he has been getting from the finance minister in the House of Commons as well. He is obviously not listening.

He is not listening that the CHST was in fact raised from \$11 billion up to \$12.5 billion. He obviously does not understand the point of tax room. He does not understand that tax room has in fact created more money in the hands of the Mike Harrises and the Lucien Bouchards of this world. He just simply does not get it.

It is typical of the Reform Party members. They do not get it. If we continue to downsize the federal government there will be no Canada as we know it.

Mr. Joe Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the issue of gun registration. There seems to be a common thread going through the Reform Party's criticism of the justice estimates.

We have seen a lot of letters being waved around with various dates. In the United States confronted with the increase in children killing children, to the tune of about every two hours an American child is killed because of a firearm, the NRA proposes they send a great big fuzzy bird into the schools, Eddy the Eagle they call it. It is almost like Tommy the Tooth. This is their solution. They are going to go into the schools and they are going to teach kids that if they see a gun they should run to their parents. In other words, the responsibility is the child's. That is absolutely ridiculous.

But I do want to refer to the how with a letter here from Scott Newark. Members quote him all the time, except when it does not suit them.

• (2000)

On June 3, 1998 he said: "Having now seen the registration system demonstrated, it is clear it will live up to the claims originally made in relation to supply of important safety information for both the public and police. Further, it should be an extremely valuable tool in the detection and prosecution of stolen or smuggled firearms". They listen to the CPA, listen to CAVEAT even when it does not suit their agenda. What would the member say about that?

Mr. John McKay: Mr. Speaker, that was a very fine question.

As far as I know Eddie the Eagle was a ski jumper with Great Britain in one of the Olympics. I suspect that Eddie the Eagle as a ski jumper was not terribly successful, as will this not be very successful.

The simple fact is that in this justice system, as imperfect as it is, it is working. I argue that crime is down. The perception of crime is up but the fact of crime is down. That is a good message. That means this government is working properly.

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the business of supply of the main estimates at this time is on Motion No. 1 on the justice. I will confine my comments to the administration of justice. Although there is much that I would like to talk about concerning this rather weak government.

In respect of the motion of the expenditure of funds in the general areas of public safety and the administration of justice, the justice minister and the solicitor general spend a considerable amount of our precious resources. Specifically I want to talk about what is happening with this government in the administration of jails. It is associated with the correctional services that it administers. The history has been a long one but it has not been without problems and failures. Considering the difficult and problematic people correctional services deal with on behalf Canadians we owe a thank you to the honourable record of custodial staff across this country who work in jails.

I received with satisfaction the government's announcement several weeks ago that it was going to hire more jail guards. The government has a labour contract in place. I do not believe that it has been fulfilling it in recent years concerning staffing strength and being able to meet the standards that it has agreed to.

The government has an obligation to all Canadians and to the world community to operate prisons according to the standards of basic decency and human rights. Canada has been rather judgmental and condescending about human rights in other countries but how about how we operate our jails. Canada may believe that we are so much better than others. There are standards that we have committed to and that we must fulfill.

Supply

Correctional Service Canada has an awesome mandate. The average Canadian has no idea what it is like in our major prisons. I have visited a number of those prisons. I have observed that we have our problems but some progress is being made. We can do so much better.

Canadians need confidence in the ability of the government to take care of the people's business and to administer prisons in full accordance with the commitments and the labour agreements made which are well within the bounds of the international standards. A measure of a nation's stature and its civilization, among so many other things, is how it administers its prisons and treats the basic rights of even the most objectionable heinous offenders.

A budget is being put forward tonight. Canadians want to be assured that this Liberal government, which has been so poor in managing its other departments, this weak government through these requests and appropriations is fulfilling its mandate of public protection and basic decency both for the humane environment for the workers who work in jails and for their charges. We must do a comprehensive job of duly considering the keepers and the kept.

Will this government assure this House that the funds requested fulfill completely all its labour contracts and the manuals of standards of operations that it has outlined for itself? Will the funds requested permit the speedy resolution of all outstanding union grievances? Is it appropriately taking into account the dynamics of stress and administrative pressure? The best riot prevention program in a jail is a system that meets all standards, that is fully staffed wherein there are no corners cut on required staff levels, bed loads and living up to the commitments it has made. We need more capacity to provide a greater range of facilities and operations to more innovatively respond to the challenges presented by some of these very problematic individuals.

• (2005)

Canadians have a right to expect better of than we have been getting so far from this weak government. Canadians need to be assured that the money requested fully meets the public constituents' needs. On checking the details the government's administration of departments lately falls short of its press releases. The Liberals who smile and pronounce it repeatedly have been shown to fail to deliver. So please say it isn't so with corrections Canada or the Ministry of Justice.

I call on these ministers to place themselves on the record in this House that the administration of the federal corrections for instance meets all standards and commitments. I need not remind the minister of what it means to mislead this House. We have had many instances of the government saying one thing but in reality it finally turns out to be quite different upon examination. I challenge the Minister of Justice and the solicitor general to say it clearly,

place it on the line and tell it like it is. Let the average rank and file guard on the tier or the control centre personnel read what the minister says. May what the minister says match up to the real experience of staff on the line behind the walls. They are paying attention.

Can it be described how the money is asked for, will be spent and that there will be value for dollar? Will the government fulfill its commitments? It makes its obligations to follow the rules. The shortcomings of the government in its administration of justice are well known across the country but the resources asked for under the general area we are talking about tonight in the estimates are considerable. Built into that area are the mandates of the solicitor general and the justice minister.

Let us first review what is contemplated under justice and then we will recount what the solicitor general wants. We should put what is being asked for specifically on the public record. Under the Minister of Justice and operating expenditures, the grants listed in the estimates in contributions are \$477,456,000. Related to that are the human rights commission with \$12,874,000; the commissioner for federal judicial affairs with \$4,354,000; the Federal Court of Canada with \$27,002,000; the human rights tribunal with \$2,076,000; the Law Commission of Canada with \$2,791,000; offices of the information and privacy commissioner of Canada with \$5,760,000; the Supreme Court of Canada with \$10,090,000; the Tax Court of Canada with \$9,304,000; the Security Intelligence Review Committee with \$1,239,000.

Then there is the solicitor general and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police with \$900,459,880; the Royal Canadian Mounted Police external review committee with \$718,000; the Royal Canadian Mounted Police public complaints commission with \$3,123,000. It continues in the justice area.

We will be voting on every one of these tonight. For the Department of Justice operating expenditures, the grants listed in the estimates and contributions total \$115,248,185. There is also the solicitor general, Canadian Security Intelligence Service with \$5,580,000.

It is up to the government to respond based on what it has requested. Will it give value for money? Will the reality fulfill its rhetoric and its press releases?

The opposition is watching. Canadians are watching. What is being expended is an astounding amount of money in the general area of justice, yet the dissatisfaction about the government's justice and public safety agenda has never been worse. There is little public confidence in the justice system and Liberals are responsible. They are accountable. I challenge the Minister of Justice and the solicitor general to justify their spending requests to this House.

Supply

• (2010)

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to the member and his remarks. Quite frankly, I felt it was a Liberal speech. He talked about the mandate to make sure that the administration of our prison system kept basic standards, kept confidence with our labour agreements. He talked about making sure the keepers and the kept are treated with a basic decency.

I support the member's remarks. I think our prison system should be an environment that can foster rehabilitation and renewal and not one where people are treated in a way that we see in movies where prisons are like dungeons.

The problem I have is that for the last 10 years I have been listening to members of the Reform Party and their chant constantly about cut, cut, cut, its obsession with the deficit, the debt and the fiscal framework.

Here we have a member from the Reform Party tonight pleading the prison system of Canada be properly funded. Is this a change of gears from the member for New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby? Does this reflect the position of the party where all of a sudden it comes full circle and is now saying the cuts have gone too far, which I personally believe, and we are now going to begin, which I would celebrate, with the correctional service system of Canada and make sure that it is properly funded so that the management there, the keepers and the kept, are treated in a way that they have a decent shot at rehabilitation and renewal. Which pathway are we to choose?

Mr. Paul Forseth: Mr. Speaker, it was not too long ago when we brought attention to this House about how certain prisons were about ready to blow as far as riots are concerned and the management-staff relations were right on the edge. That has to do with funding. It has to do with administrative attitude and it has to do with care of how the government administers its prisons.

I was quite pleased to hear that the solicitor general a few weeks ago announced something in the order of 1,000 new staff across the country would be hired. We applaud that.

There is no change in message from the Reform Party. We have always advocated we needed more facilities, not just brick and mortar in building more jails. We need more of a broader set of complex facilities. Some of them may be without locked doors, but a range of facilities to respond to the challenges if we are to have a justice system to respond more resolutely to crime. That means there will be perhaps some type of custodial facilities. But that does not necessarily mean the old-fashioned high tiers with a dome and bars.

Certainly it does mean the kind of facility that may respond to the treatment needs of individuals and also adequately separates different offenders from each other, specializes in programs but

also controls their access to the community. We also consider the protection of the community first.

Remember, the Reform Party is bringing the message to the country of fiscal responsibility so that we can generate the wealth to pay for the social programs that Canadians want, for the people's agenda we might say is to provide more facilities in Correctional Service Canada. That has been the people's agenda but it certainly has not been the bureaucratic top down agenda that we have from governments for the last 15 years.

It has squeezed Correctional Service Canada. Yet the public has been asking Correctional Service Canada to do things when it really never had the resources to do. Because of the fiscal irresponsibility in other areas and the failure to set appropriate priorities, Correctional Service Canada has really been in a tough situation.

• (2015)

The more the government is fiscally responsible, the more it is able to generate wealth and reorder its priorities to respond to a people accountable agenda rather than a top down agenda. That is what we are looking for.

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot of criticism from the Reform Party today directed toward the government's Bill C-68 on the registration of firearms.

I am a little confused. I have a titbit of information that I would like to share and I would like my hon. colleague from the Reform Party to answer.

I am reading from *Hansard*, November 6, 1991, the comments of the hon. member for Edmonton North who was referring to a Canadian Police Association survey. She said that over 90% of the respondents believed that guns of all kinds should be registered. She agreed with that and went on to say that she thought every Canadian would agree with that.

Just what message is the Reform Party giving? We hear it criticizing the government and now we hear the comments of the member for Edmonton North. I would like the hon. member to speak to that.

Mr. Paul Forseth: Mr. Speaker, I do not know which member he was talking about. We had no Reform Party members from Edmonton North in the House of Commons in 1991. We had one member from Beaver River and that was it until 1993 when we had the Reform wave.

We have always been consistent in saying that if the gun registration program could clearly be demonstrated to be efficacious for public safety we would support it. In view of a lack of evidence it clearly appeared to be a misappropriation of public money and should be reassigned to other areas of the justice system.

Supply

We are supportive of gun control. We have had handgun control in Canada since 1934 or something like that and we never objected to Bill C-17. However, it was escalated to the final level of wasting money on a program which the government has failed to demonstrate will accomplish its stated objectives.

Money is laid aside for a program and it has stated objectives, but it has failed to justify that it will deliver the stated program objectives. We are predicting at some point in the light of day after we spend several hundred million dollars down this blind alley that it will in retrospect be seen to be misappropriated money.

Why do we not spend that money on the Young Offenders Act and other facilities rather than waste it on gun registration?

Mr. Mark Muise: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not want to name the member, but I found out that at the time the member was representing the riding of Beaver River.

The Deputy Speaker: I think that clears it up.

Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my hon. colleague opposite and two things caught my attention: weak government and history.

I am just wondering what he is referring to. Is he referring to the government of 1993 that swept in with a majority? Is he referring to the government of 1997 that swept in with a majority? Which part of history does he not understand? There were two mandates and two majorities, but I will put that aside.

I listened with great interest that he wants more jail guards, rights of offenders and on and on. I did not hear anything about treatment. Is the Reform agenda more jails and more jail guards? Does Reform not have compassion? Does Reform not understand the need for treatment?

First, what history is my hon. colleague talking about? If he wants to give us a history lesson, by all means let us talk about 1993 and 1997. Second, what about treatment?

Mr. Paul Forseth: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. We are talking about who is accountable and who is responsible. We believe we have had very poor administration of public business since 1993.

• (2020)

I will refer also to his comment about treatment. Anybody involved in corrections has long abandoned the medical model of prisoner care. We got rid of that years ago. It is not someone who has a disease and therefore some kind of treatment or medicine is applied.

When we administer prisons or programs we must provide options and we must provide consequences. We can provide opportunities for offenders to rehabilitate themselves. In some

cases these individuals were never habilitated in the first place and were the walking wounded in the psychological sense and/or physical sense. We must provide some types of programming, but to say that we can just write out a prescription in the medical model ideology is a long outdated notion in corrections.

First we must have fiscal responsibility. Then we are able to generate wealth to pay for the social programs we need.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Kitchener—Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this debate. Let me start by saying that in the last election there were two particular issues relating to justice and justice estimates on which I campaigned. One was gun registration.

During the election campaign I ended every debate with these concluding remarks: "If you in this audience do not want gun registration, do not vote for me. Rather, if you are against it, you want to vote for the New Democratic Party, you want to vote for the Conservative Party or you want to vote for the Reform Party". In every debate that was one of my concluding remarks and the results were 28 points ahead of the Reform Party, 28 points ahead of the Conservative and the New Democrats were much further back.

My constituents fundamentally feel that it is not too much to register guns in many ways like is done in Europe. We do not want to have the gun culture in this country that exists south of the border where all too often we see the tragedy of innocent victims being gunned down ruthlessly and needlessly. More and more we are seeing young children killing other young children and their teachers.

I make absolutely no apologies for it. I stand with the chiefs of police and with victims groups. I think our party, the governing party, recognizes the need to be dealt with. We definitely do not want to adopt the culture south of our border.

Let me get on to another very important part of the justice agenda that we will be implementing. Let me ask members of all parties, all members of parliament, to play a role in this challenge.

We have put together a \$32 million community safety crime prevention program which will afford opportunity to each riding across the country to join in the crusade, to join in the project to prevent crime. We will do that by working with people at the community level: police forces, service clubs, school boards, recreational and planning departments of municipalities and various neighbourhood groups. Our challenge is how we as a country can improve our record of crime prevention and have safer streets and homes.

• (2025)

Prior to being elected to parliament I was executive director of an organization called Youth in Conflict with the Law from 1976 to 1993. For some who might recall, Youth in Conflict with the Law

Supply

was to be under the youth in conflict with the law act. It was changed to the Young Offenders Act in 1984.

I had occasion to observe the workings of the criminal justice system firsthand at the criminal courts. I also had the opportunity to work with other organizations involved in community justice and community corrections. I can say that much pioneering work was done in my community.

David Worth, head of the Mennonite Central Committee, worked with communities right across the country trying to look at alternative ways of dealing with crime and conflict resolution.

I worked with John Bilton of the John Howard Society. His organization was also very much involved in preventive work. It had anti-shoplifting campaigns which involved young people. Young people would be diverted from the court system and would go through alternative measures. Not only did this lessen the strain on the courts. It also provided a much more meaningful resolutions to the problem.

Dean Peachey pioneered community mediation in our community where disputants were brought together to see if with a trained facilitator they could reach a successful resolution. While originally there was a great deal of resistance to that program eventually it was embraced by the courts and the municipalities and now a system of conflict resolution exists in schools.

Ken Motts pioneered the first halfway house for provincially sentenced inmates in Ontario called Kitchener House. Unfortunately that program was closed a couple of years ago by Mike Harris and his agenda.

Another important program pioneered in my community through community justice initiatives and the Mennonite Central Committee was the victim-offender reconciliation program. Let me tell some of my colleagues how that program works. It is fundamental to the whole issue of preventing crime and creating safer and more secure communities. It also deals with the rights of victims.

• (2030)

A typical victim-offender reconciliation case would involve a young person who broke into a business establishment or a private dwelling. We all know people who have been victimized through break and entry. We all know the sense of violation the victim of that offence feels. Somebody has come into their home, which is their castle, invaded their private space, caused damage and committed theft. Many people who are victims of crime feel a personal sense of violation.

I recall one of the cases that I worked on under the victim-offender reconciliation model. It involved a 17 year old who was under the supervision of our organization, Youth in Conflict with the Law. During the course of the pretrial hearing before that

person was sentenced for the offence we met with the individual whose store he had broken into.

There was a humorous side to the break and enter because the two young people broke into a restaurant and somehow managed to lock themselves inside. It took them a great deal of effort to break out. Mind you, they rifled the cash register and took \$20. Ultimately they were caught because when the police came to investigate they followed their footprints which led to the house where they lived.

The first impact of bringing the two people together, the victim and the offender, was that the restaurant owner felt a sense of relief. He was looking upon a young person of 17 years of age who was not a scholar, who was not particularly accomplished in any area. Some could say that he had some tough knocks in life. There was a sense of relief that the person he was dealing with was not a Clifford Olson, a Paul Bernardo or whatever one's worst nightmare might be.

After we went through that exercise, the resolution we arrived at was that this young person would pay back something like \$300 to fix the cash register and to make restitution for the damage caused as well as the money taken. In this case and in most cases of victim-offender reconciliation the money was paid back and the young person learned from the experience. The court made sure it was part of the sentence that the money was paid back. As well, the court made sure that the young person did community service.

At the end of the day, under our Criminal Code, break and enter is liable for life imprisonment. That really does not happen, but that is what the law allows. Any time of incarceration in this case would have been a waste of taxpayers' money. This young person would have been sent into an environment where he would have been exposed to more negative influences and probably would have come out a much more accomplished criminal.

One of the people who played a very key role in our justice efforts was Henry Bloos who was a teacher at Kitchener Collegiate. Henry Bloos used to teach law. He started a law day at KCI that eventually involved the whole regional municipality of Waterloo. Within a few years of its establishment it became the single biggest extra curricular day for students in the Waterloo region.

• (2035)

Once a year, starting in 1978, in order to educate the community and get people involved in community justice and crime prevention, we established what was fondly known as justice dinners. Our 20th justice dinner took place this past April and we were fortunate to have the Minister of Justice attend.

It is no longer the people I referred to previously who are putting on this justice dinner. The justice dinner is now being put on by the community safety crime prevention council of Waterloo region. That council is a project of my community, funded by regional

council to the tune of \$75,000 a year in cash as well as the provision of office space and other resources.

I am very happy to say that we have two members of this parliament on this side of the House, the member for Kitchener Centre and the member for Waterloo—Wellington, who were members of the regional council that gave funding to this project.

This project initially was headed by the chief of police for Waterloo region. The council includes people from justice agencies. It includes people from probation and parole. It includes people from community social services, people from the school boards, people from the planning departments and the commissioner of social services. It has fairly heavy representation from the provincial police. It includes the now mayor of the city of Waterloo, Joan McKinnon, the commissioner and director of family and children services, as well as the executive director of the Children's Aid Society. The list goes on. There are 33 members.

These people have taken up the challenge of co-ordinating in our community the services of the various governments, be they the school board, social services, children's aid, the police, the planning departments or the voluntary sector.

They produced numerous planning documents and strategies to deal with prevention in our community.

The first report came out in November 1996. The second report came out in 1997. The third report came out in 1998. They came up with a proposal to have a unified community response to deal with the issue of crime.

The province of Quebec deals with crime much more effectively than we do in the rest of the country. Crime is very expensive. The federal and provincial governments spend \$9.6 billion a year on crime. If we include the victims and other costs associated with crime we are talking about \$46 billion.

What we are talking about in the first year of this crime prevention effort is \$32 million. It is a little more than \$1 per capita. The money that we spend, the \$9.6 billion, is more than \$300 per capita. Clearly what we are trying to do is to start diverting some of the money at prevention so we do not have the victims, we do not have the shattered lives. Then we will have contributing members of society, as well as safe homes and safe streets.

• (2040)

When we deal with the the Young Offenders Act and with the people who exploit it, be it for economic or political considerations, let me say that we imprison 15 times as many young offenders as they do in Australia or in New Zealand. We imprison 10 times as many young offenders as they do in the western European countries. But to our shame, we incarcerate two and a half times as many young offenders as they do in the United States

Supply

of America. That is a shame. That is not the perception that the Canadian public has.

The perception that the Canadian public has, if they watch the proceedings of this House or if they watch the media which likes to exploit crime, is that we have a system which is in disarray and we have a society that is not as safe as it really is. The perception has been driving the agenda and it is time for us to get together and make sure that the reality drives the agenda and that we work on realistic solutions to make Canada one of the safest countries in the world.

Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my hon. colleague with great interest and I was delighted to hear what he had to say with respect to all the work that has been done in the region of Kitchener—Waterloo. I was impressed with everybody who is concerned. I was really impressed with the effort that is going on in his community to make it a better community. I congratulate him for being there 20 years for his constituents.

I want to share with him an instance that occurred in my riding right after the Young Offenders Act was implemented. A young offender committed a multiple killing and unfortunately received only a three year sentence. It is in those instances that I agree with my colleague, who I hope will find it in his heart to agree that moving toward publishing the names of the young offenders and bringing them to adult court is something that is definitely needed. If these measures were in place in our communities this killing might not have happened.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his intervention. First, let me say that there is a need for prisons to house people who are a danger to the community. There is no question about that.

I agree with my colleague that a three year sentence was not adequate. That has been changed. Under the changes that will be tabled in the House that will be changed again.

But I point out to my colleague that attempted murder and homicide make up one-tenth of 1% of crime. So we are talking about a very small number.

Most of the offences occurring under the Young Offenders Act are property offences, law and order offences.

Let me tell my colleague that his point is very correct. We have to assure the public that for those offenders, and there are not as many as people would have us believe, lengthy jail terms are appropriate.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening very intently to the hon. member for Kitchener—Waterloo and I have a great deal of respect for the work that he did within the justice system prior to becoming a member of the House. He has displayed at the justice committee a great depth of knowledge in the area of victims'

Supply

rights. I know he has made a personal commitment and has been a part of various systems within his riding. He encourages restorative justice. He has spoken very eloquently with respect to victims.

• (2045)

On balance, given a choice of priorities, would the hon. member prefer to see astronomical and staggering amounts of money set aside by his government to further this ill-conceived gun registry? We are talking money in excess of \$133 million thus far and the amount is still accumulating as we speak. It will go up to the half a billion dollar mark before this is up and running.

It is not going to impact in any significant way on violent crime. It has been stated time and time again and I think the hon. member will also agree that for crimes committed in fits of passion it will not matter whether a serial number is stamped on the butt of a rifle. Violent criminals are going to be loath to register their guns.

I ask the hon. member this question in a very non-partisan way and on an intellectual level. Would he not prefer to see his government's commitment to justice result in moneys spent in the area of furthering the cause of victims or furthering the cause of front line police officers, to beef up our justice system in that regard? Would he not prefer putting the money into some of the more innovative approaches to justice that he speaks of, some of the preventative programs he has initiated in his own constituency? Would this not further the cause of justice as opposed to this priority decision that has been made on this ill-fated ill-conceived gun registry?

Mr. Andrew Telegdi: Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his question. I note that he is a former crown attorney. He certainly has some knowledge of the criminal justice system. I very much enjoy working with him. Unfortunately he missed my opening comments where I actually talked about gun control, the position I took in the last election campaign and why I supported it. To recap, victims wanted us to pass it and they supported it. My community virtually demanded it.

There is the issue that law-abiding people will register guns and criminals will not. As a crown attorney, the member will know that at some point this week there will be a raid on a motorcycle club some place. Chances are there will be all sorts of guns around. When a police officer is able to say "This gun is not registered and you have committed an offence," then we have done something good.

I also mentioned that it is too easy to obtain guns in this country. We do not want to repeat some of the mistakes made south of the border where children are killing children and their teachers. We must have control of firearms. During the election campaign I was very up front. At the conclusion of my remarks I said if you do not

support Bill C-68, if you do not believe we should have gun control, do not vote for me, vote for the New Democrats, the Conservatives or the Reform Party. There was a lot of support for it in my community which was attested to by the results.

The member talked about the expensive cost of crime. He knows that the cost of crime in Canada is \$46 billion. What we spend at the government level is \$9.6 billion. What we are talking about in terms of crime prevention is really a small amount of money. We are talking \$32 million.

The member will know that I have lobbied the justice minister that we should reallocate some of the money that we have now allocated under the federal government budget. Thirty-two million dollars represents 1% of the federal budget for justice and the solicitor general. Let us reallocate something like 5% over the coming years. Let us help communities to come up with the plans, the strategies and the projects to battle crime and to work on crime prevention.

• (2050)

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this matter. I notice the member for Wild Rose is lamenting the fact that he has not been recognized by the Chair to speak, but I would simply ask him to be patient.

I and other Canadians would like to think that what we are debating and discussing here tonight is somehow relevant to ordinary Canadians from coast to coast. Yesterday in the House what became crystal clear to all Canadians from coast to coast and to every member in the House, if they already were not aware, is that this House of Commons for all intents and purposes is irrelevant. It does not mean anything. Decisions are not taken in this Chamber. Decisions are taken behind closed doors, in the Prime Minister's office and in the House leader's office. Five men get together and decide what the business of the House will be.

Yesterday while this House was sitting, not a single, solitary government member was present during debate. As a result of the total and complete abdication of its responsibility to govern, the opposition parties passed a motion which carried unanimously. That motion would prevent the government from introducing any form of closure.

What is more important is that because of the abdication of responsibility of the Government of Canada, and we are talking about the Government of Canada. Think of what could have happened yesterday in this House because of the fact that there was not a single Liberal member present. The opposition could have declared war yesterday.

Supply

Members laugh and chuckle but as a result of the absence of the Government of Canada, the opposition could have completely abolished the Department of Foreign Affairs. The opposition could have defeated the government on a vote of confidence. That is the respect the government has for this Chamber, for the House of Commons. Not a single, solitary member was present.

I do not think Canadians recognize how totally irrelevant the House is. That action yesterday crystallized for Canadians how irrelevant this place is.

In an hour or so the government wants to pass through this House some 70-odd votes. It wants authorization to spend billions of taxpayers' dollars. It expects, as a result of a backroom deal by five House leaders, that this House will totally expedite all the business of the House this evening. I think not.

The people of York—South Weston put their trust in me. They voted for me in the last election campaign not to be a party to backroom deals.

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There were a few points of order today about the relevance of speeches. We are dealing with justice. I do not hear the word justice mentioned and I do not see any relevance in this speech to the topic at hand.

The Deputy Speaker: I think the hon. member for York—South Weston knows that the motion we are debating before the House is a motion to concur in the estimates of the Department of Justice and that the speeches are to be on the subject of justice. I know that he is coming to that subject very shortly in his remarks.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, what I am speaking about is justice. It is democratic justice. It is criminal justice.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member knows that the estimates of the Department of Justice are a different thing from the abstract notion of justice. They are rather concrete and deal with dollars and cents. That is what the subject of the debate is this evening. I invite the hon. member to direct his comments to that.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I started by saying that the debate is irrelevant.

• (2055)

We are talking about the justice department and the allocation of sufficient funds, some \$193 million to fund justice. What I am saying is that it is irrelevant what we are talking about. But I will speak about justice and how unjust it is to put the House through this debate to talk about the criminal justice system. If members want me to talk about the criminal justice system, I will talk about it, but it is irrelevant because decisions have already been taken in the backrooms.

I had a bill before the last parliament to repeal section 745 of the Criminal Code. That bill, to repeal section 745 of the Criminal Code which allows convicted killers to apply to have their release date reduced from 25 years down to 15 years, was passed by the House of Commons at second reading. It was passed by the House of Commons with some 80 Liberals, and I was part of that caucus, supporting that motion.

Let me give another example of how irrelevant the House is. The House passed the legislation in principle to repeal section 745. That was the intent of parliament. It expressed its will, each member in a free vote. What did the government do? It killed the bill at committee. That is what it did. It pretends to be democratic. It pretends that the private members process is important. It pretends that somehow what we do in the House is relevant, but it is irrelevant.

Until and unless members of the House take a stand, our parliamentary system will continue to degenerate. Canadians will continue to lose confidence and have contempt for this institution.

Is it any wonder that collectively we are looked down upon by Canadians? Collectively as politicians we are told day in day out, justifiably so by Canadians, that they have no confidence in this institution of parliament. They see things like the government abandoning its responsibility yesterday and not a single member being present. They see the House of Commons passing a bill to ameliorate the criminal justice system with respect to 745. There is the hepatitis C issue, and the list goes on and on. Is it any wonder that we have to hang our heads in shame?

The government with the complicity of the opposition parties wants to pass a bill in less than a day to increase the pay and benefits for members of parliament. Think about it. When it comes to our own collective pockets we are prepared to pass a bill—we are not, the backroom boys are—and members are not objecting. They come to me. I have had maybe a dozen or 15 members ask me as an independent member to please hold up consent. Please do not give unanimous consent to this. They are afraid to speak out because they will be reprimanded by the powers that be, by those unelected people in the Prime Minister's office who have control.

I have said time and time again that we do not live in a democracy. We say this sometimes frivolously, but the reality is we do not live in a democracy. This is nothing short of a glorified dictatorship. This country is run by half a dozen people, half of whom are unelected, as some hon. members have said and I have repeated many times. Unelected people make decisions with respect to the public interest.

Where is the public interest? Who is watching for the public interest? I am not setting myself up as some saviour for the public interest but I have been given a voice as a result of the people's mandate in York—South Weston.

Supply

Pay and benefits, run it through in a day. Why is that bill dealing with remuneration, pensions, salaries of members of parliament not being referred to a parliamentary committee? Why is it that witnesses are not being called?

• (2100)

Why can members of parliament, the political parties, not serve the public interests as opposed to serving themselves? I would like to attend an open meeting and give my views on pay and benefits. There has to be in the process some transparency.

The House leaders met, all the political parties in this chamber, and took a decision with respect to pay and benefits. They expect everyone in this House, including me, to support it. I think not. I do not intend to. I am going to insist we not participate in these votes these evening and that we, as a parliament, sit down and find ways to make this parliament more democratic. That is the only way to do it.

When I woke up this morning I expected three votes at 5.30 p.m. today. I was in Toronto. Then I get word that there are 70 some votes taking place today. Most members did not know. They were told to hurry back. Is that any way to run the Government of Canada, by having no members present when the House of Commons is sitting and then pile up these votes? Two weeks ago we had about 100 votes in this House. I will say without equivocation that the majority of members—

Mr. Roy Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not sure I grasp the relevancy of this debate to the justice estimates. I do not see the connection.

The Deputy Speaker: I have already indicated to the hon. member for York South—Weston the need for relevance in his remarks to the justice estimates. I know he will go back to those estimates very quickly.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, it appears the government does not like listening to what I am saying. Well, tough. I was given voice to speak and I will speak.

He wants me to speak about justice. Let us talk about criminal justice. The member was elected in Etobicoke. He was given a mandate to represent the people of Etobicoke, not to be a trained seal. He was elected, as I was elected, to speak out on their behalf, not to defer to some unelected people. I want to tell the hon. member what the people of Etobicoke are saying to him and what they expect of him as their member of parliament. They expect him to come into this House, to go to caucus and to speak out about criminal law reform.

I ask the hon. member what has he said about criminal law reform in the House of Commons. Has he simply deferred. The member laughs. Let him laugh. I hope his constituents recognize how ill served they are in the House of Commons. If I can help in any way to inform his constituents I intend to do that.

Let me get back to justice. It relates directly to the comments I made about the relevancy of parliament. If this parliament were relevant it would be passing laws to ameliorate, to fix, to reform a criminal justice system in this country that is broken. It is a criminal justice system that allows an individual who raped and murdered 11 children to make a mockery out of the criminal justice system by applying and exercising his rights.

Had the government not stopped and blocked my bill, Clifford Olson would not have had the opportunity last summer to make a mockery of the criminal justice system. He forced the families to relive the trauma, the feelings of total devastation of learning their children were raped and murdered. This government decided that Clifford Olson, not the public, could have a say. I use Clifford Olson because he is probably the most notorious example. The member from Etobicoke agreed with the position of the Government of Canada.

Section 745 is a travesty.

• (2105)

This government supports a criminal justice system that caters to the accused, to the convicted, to inmates and to prisoners and sets aside the public interest, the interest of victims. Is it any wonder Canadians have lost faith in the criminal justice system, in parliament?

I can go on about the Young Offenders Act. The minister kept repeating in due course she would bring in amendments. What has she brought in? Absolutely nothing.

This government has been in office for five years and it has done nothing meaningful when it comes to reforming the Young Offenders Act which invites 16 and 17-year olds to break the law. It treats 16 and 17-year olds like children.

If you are 16 or 17 you are old enough to drive a car, you are old enough to get married, you are old enough to leave home, but the criminal justice system in this country says you do not know the difference between right and wrong and we are not going to treat you like an adult. What pure nonsense. They know the difference between right and wrong and they ought to be dealt with in adult court.

That is the line the Liberals continue to throw back, that we want to lock up children. That is a crock. Subject the 16 and 17-year olds to the criminal justice system. Age will always be a mitigating factor at sentencing, not with respect to culpability.

If a 16-year old murders or rapes or robs or commits any serious offence, once there is a finding of guilt, let the defence make an argument for leniency because of age. This government says they are to be treated more leniently. Is it any wonder that the police and those involved with the criminal justice system have no confidence in it?

Supply

We all know who Paul Bernardo is. He is rotting in a jail somewhere in Kingston, but he is going to have the same right that Clifford Olson had. What about his accomplice? Paul Bernardo will be able to apply in about 10 or 11 years to chop the families of the victims after the crimes he committed. What about his accomplice? She is eligible for parole today as we speak because of the criminal justice system. Talk about justice. She will be released from prison and there is nothing the system can do in less than eight years I think it is.

An hon. member: She can vote.

Mr. John Nunziata: She can vote. She can even have her sex changed, believe it or not. Cable television in their cells, computers, photocopiers. Clifford Olson had access to computers, photocopiers. He was entering poetry contests in the United States. He had pornography in his cell. He was sending pornography.

This is the criminal justice system we are talking about. This is the criminal justice system crafted by Liberals, by bleeding hearts in the sixties and seventies, and it continues to be protected. This criminal justice system continues to be protected by the government. Is it serving the interests of Canadians? No. If you ask Canadians what they want done, they want a fair criminal justice system. They want a criminal justice system that puts the rights of citizens before the rights of criminals.

What action has this government taken? Very little. The government is big on photo ops whether it is in Naples or Rome or Havana or other parts of the world, but when it comes to concrete action here in the House of Commons, the government deserves an *F*. We are talking about the criminal justice system here and I could speak for hours about the deficiencies of the system and how the public is not served.

We have two penitentiary systems. Who is serving the public interest? We have a provincial system. If you are sentenced to two years less a day, you go into the provincial penitentiary system, provincial parole board. If it is two years plus a day, you go into the federal penitentiary system. Who is being served by that? It is because of turf wars between the provinces and the federal government.

• (2110)

We have a system that does not work. Is the government prepared to fix the system? No. We have a criminal justice system that provides for concurrent sentencing. Someone can walk out of this place, kill one person, plan in a very deliberate way the murder of two, three, five, ten, fifteen, twenty, commit an act of terrorism, kill two hundred people and the penalty is the same.

One would think if we had a fairer system of justice, consecutive sentencing would be provided for. In the case of Paul Bernardo who was convicted of murdering two innocent young women, instead of

being eligible for parole after 25 years at the very least, if we had consecutive sentencing he would not be eligible for 50 years.

No, the Liberals do not want to change that. They do not want to change that because the backroom boys have said no. I know individual members of parliament, if there were free votes in this place, if this place were relevant, could correct the criminal justice system. We could correct a lot of the deficiencies within the system.

Before we do that we have to correct this place. We have to make the Parliament of Canada relevant. It is time for electoral reform. It is time for parliamentary reform. I know there is considerable support for it.

I was recently in British Columbia where I gave a speech about the lack of democracy in this country. When I speak to people in other countries or in Canada, when I point out to them some of the realities of Ottawa, they become very disturbed. They become very concerned and ask what they can do.

Let me give an example in the minute that remains. We call Canada a democracy. In the last election campaign more than six out of ten people who went to vote did not vote Liberal. They did not vote for the Prime Minister. They voted for other political parties. They voted for other individuals. They rejected the government, over 60%. Only 38% of those who voted voted for the Liberal government.

As a result of our electoral system, one man is given virtual dictatorial power with the support of 38% of the electorate in Canada. Is that democracy? I think not.

Mr. Nick Discepola (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member referred I believe six times to the absence of members of parliament. I thought while we were participating in debate we were not supposed to refer to the presence or absence. Since Mr. Speaker let it go six times, I decided I would ask the member—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is going to have to ask questions about justice issues since we are discussing the justice estimates. On two occasions I had to intervene to deal with the hon. member for York South—Weston because he was going off on other topics.

I know my correction may not have been as efficacious as the parliamentary secretary would have hoped, but I am sure he would not want to provoke further difficulty for the Chair and that he will want to ask about the justice estimates.

Mr. Nick Discepola: Mr. Speaker, in essence, I would like to maybe correct the claim of the member for York South—Weston that had we removed section 745, Clifford Olson would not have been able to apply.

Supply

The member knows full well that even rescinding section 745 of the Criminal Code would be retroactive and therefore the likes of Bernardo or Clifford Olson would not have been taken care of.

The changes we made will prevent Paul Bernardo from applying because he has to be able to prove with a certain amount of cause that he will be able to succeed.

I would like to ask the member one question. He refers to the relevancy of parliament. Is it relevant that he attends the House of Commons only on Tuesdays, especially when there are a lot of votes, to make his record better? Is relevancy only for members on this side? Is it maybe relevant for independent members to attend parliament on days other than Tuesdays?

• (2115)

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, the member is mistaken and I would expect the member to at least be honest. To suggest that I am only here on Tuesdays is erroneous and he knows it. If he wants to make those statements outside the House of Commons where he is subject to slander laws then I challenge him to make those statements outside.

I can tell the hon. member that I will not hesitate for a moment to issue a writ against the member. He has a responsibility as an officer, as a parliamentary secretary, not only to be honest to the House—

The Deputy Speaker: I am sure the hon. member knows that all hon. members are always considered to be honest in their dealings in the House. I do not think he would want to suggest otherwise.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I will simply consider the source. He speaks of Clifford Olson. He says that his application could not have been denied. That is not true. I suggest he get an opinion from the Department of Justice. He has access to the Department of Justice.

He might have someone's opinion that it might have somehow contravened the right of Clifford Olson to apply under section 745. I would like the member to address the point that the House of Commons passed a bill to repeal section 745. Notwithstanding the argument he is putting forward that Clifford Olson could have applied in any event, which is not true, and even if it were true that Clifford Olson's constitutional rights would have somehow been affected, the House had the authority to use the notwithstanding clause to say we in parliament make laws, not the courts of Canada.

We believe that Clifford Olson and others like him should not be permitted to apply for early release. We could have invoked the notwithstanding clause. The member knows that.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, what a pleasure it was to hear somebody say exactly some of the things I

have been saying for quite some time about the way this place operates. I agree fully with what the member said.

It is a little discouraging. I have been on duty all day. It is past 9 p.m. It could be 4 a.m. We will go through a pile of votes that there is no point in anybody voting on because the government has already made up its mind how it will turn out. It has done that behind closed doors. It will boldly say that is how democracy works. That is hog manure. I am tired of hearing that baloney.

During the years 1984 to 1993 did the Conservative Party under Mulroney do anything different? The GST people who were kicked out, was that an accident or was there an error? What was the difference back then? What is the difference between the Conservatives and the Liberals in the last 20 years?

The Deputy Speaker: I know the hon. member for York South—Weston will seek to make the answer relevant to the justice estimates, as I am sure the hon. member for Wild Rose was doing his best to do with that question.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I could be cynical and say there is no difference between the Mulroney government and the Chrétien government. It is not the government—

The Deputy Speaker: Once again, the hon. member of York South—Weston cannot refer to members of the House by name. He is an experienced member and he knows that. I invite him to comply with the rules in that regard.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, we ought not to look at the problem from a partisan perspective. Regardless of who forms the government and given the present way we conduct business in Ottawa, it will be no different if the Reform Party forms the government or the Conservative Party or the NDP. We have to change the system.

Winston Churchill, perhaps the most learned student of parliamentary democracy, often said that in order for parliamentary democracy to survive it must continually evolve. It must continually be made better and more sensitive to the people that it purports to serve.

We are not ameliorating the parliamentary system. If anything we are going backward. That is the reason public opinion poll after public opinion poll rates parliamentarians, MPs, almost at the bottom in terms of public respect and integrity. That is why Canadians have so very little confidence in the parliamentary system.

• (2120)

The only people that could make a difference—and I believe parliament could do it—are individual members of parliament who will take a stand and say “Enough is enough. We are going to take control. We are going to democratize the House of Commons”. I intend to do that in approximately 40 minutes because I do not

Supply

intend to give my consent to any motion that requires unanimous consent to expedite the business of the government.

The government showed its contempt for the people of Canada, for the Parliament of Canada—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth—Burlington on a question or comment.

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the member for York South—Weston knows and the member for Wild Rose ought to know, the issues we are debating tonight are considered and deliberated on in committee, either the finance committee or the justice committee.

I would like to ask a direct question of the member for York South—Weston. Does he have the courage to tell the House whether in this current session of parliament he has attended a single committee meeting and if—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. We are on a debate on the justice estimates and I urge hon. members to be relevant in their questions and in their comments. I cut off the hon. member for York South—Weston in his reply because in my view it was not relevant to the debate before us.

I know hon. members want to debate the justice estimates. That is why we are here. I invite the question to be relevant to the justice estimates. It will be a very short question.

Mr. John Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I hope I was not out of order but the member for York South—Weston keeps alluding to the fact that the rest of us do not work. My role is not just in the House of Commons. My role is also to work in the standing committees, to listen to witnesses and to discuss issues like the estimates and the justice issues the member is talking about.

Could the member for York South—Weston give us a sense of his involvement in this type of activity of parliament? Does he concede that it is an important activity?

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, as those who are listening have noticed and as other Canadians have noticed, the only thing Liberal members can do is to attack me personally as they did during the election campaign.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. John Nunziata: Let them carry on, Mr. Speaker. In the election campaign of a year ago they levelled personal attacks instead of speaking to the merits of what I was talking about. I did not attack any individual personally other than the member from Etobicoke.

I was speaking to some fundamental issues that all Canadians wanted to see addressed. If all the Liberals can resort to is name

calling and personal attacks, let them do it because their candidate lost in the riding of York South—Weston.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, following the member for York South—Weston is an honour. I certainly agree with everything he said. I hope members of the House do not think for a moment I am trying to reflect on the way things are today by referring to what happened in the past.

We do need changes with regard to justice, the way we do business in the House and the way we spend money. To use a phrase from my colleague from Edmonton North, it is not a matter of uniting the right. It is a matter of uniting the bright and there are no bright lights on that side of the House. That is why we are looking over here. We need someone who has vision that will work in the justice system and in the country as a whole.

Justice is a very high priority on our list. Therefore I would not want to see any reduction in spending. There are a lot of ways we could handle this kind of situation. All we need to do is look at some things that are going on within government in terms of spending and come up with some good ideas.

I appreciate the waste report we get from our colleague from St. Albert. I wonder how many members of the House would like to see some of the following money going to justice or to some other good cause like feeding hungry children.

• (2125)

On transition to adulthood research we spent \$105,000. On sexual dissidence, historical content, we spent \$23,000. On institutional change and household behaviour in rural China we spent \$55,000. On infants and understanding how people act we spent \$75,000. On limited editions of Spanish golden age plays we spent \$44,000. I really liked what happened about two years ago. We spent \$116,000 on a committee to study seniors and sexuality. Being a senior I cannot say how good it makes me feel that the government could find \$116,000 to spend on this. The list goes on and on.

We are talking about spending millions and pretty soon it will be billions. The government spent close to \$2 million on Angus Reid, Createc and Ekos Research doing polls in just one year. Hopefully it made the government feel good.

According to the auditor general we are probably spending \$1 billion on registering the guns of duck hunters, deer hunters, trophy hunters and trap shooters. How can anyone support spending that kind of money on a project that will just not do the job? It will not solve a thing.

When we go through all this waste we wonder how long it has been going on. Is that why we are \$600 billion in the hole? I hate to refer to the past but I have to be reminded of why I became so disillusioned with the Conservative Party and tore up my card a few years back. I only have to walk down to the museum and look at a

Supply

little red line on a board that costs \$6 million to remember why. The same kind of crazy spending was going on at that time, much to the objection of many of us in the country.

When will it stop? The government has to get its priorities straight. We could do lots of valuable things with all that money. We have a health system and an education system that are crumbling. We have a justice system that could use help.

I want to take a look at these misplaced priorities. I have been analysing the solicitor general's department for over a year now. Let me give an example. Last October 1, a guard from Joyceville came to see me who had been pricked by a tattoo needle and could have potentially contracted the AIDS virus. He asked the commissioner of corrections to provide guards with puncture resistant gloves. Nine months have now passed and there are no gloves.

Correctional Service of Canada will say that it is still researching to find the best possible equipment when the guards themselves found appropriate gloves many months ago.

I learned yesterday that an officer in Joyceville in the visits and correspondence unit was stabbed with a needle while he was opening mail. The least we could provide these frontline workers with is a pair of puncture resistant gloves. We could spend some money protecting our guards who put their very lives on the line day in and day out. We could do a lot about that.

A thousand new guards are to be hired. That is great. That is important. It is a good decision. However I hope they do not advertise, pull people off the street and spend thousands of millions of dollars training them when we have casual workers who are already trained and well prepared to fill these positions. I understand that will not necessarily be the case, that it will be open advertising. They will pull them off the street and retrain a whole pile of people when they already have trained casual workers. Money should not be wasted doing that.

I have looked at the spending to keep inmates comfortable during the past four years of touring prisons throughout the country. I have been in every one with the exception of one or two. The facilities provide convicts with three square meals a day, complete medical and dental care, big screen TVs, rumpus rooms and now in Ferndale a golf course and probably a golf range. Is it good to see that a convicted murderer can reduce his handicap while he is behind bars?

• (2130)

In the real world I have met hundreds of people, and I know all the members have met hundreds of people, who cannot even meet the bare necessities for their own kids let alone have a golf game or a pool game or watch anything on a big screen TV. But this is readily available.

It has been a while since I was at the Drumheller Institution. I met six inmates that day in the little apartment they have which they call a prison. They were marinating beautiful Alberta rib eye steaks, one each.

I would like the government members to explain to the needy children that we hear about from them all the time, the people in this country who are starving and suffering. I would like them to explain to all Canadians why it is that convicts can eat steaks when a lot of people, including seniors, cannot even afford macaroni. I would like that explained.

Why do inmates get free education? The poor have to wait in line for a draw. They call it the millennium scholarship lottery. Why can a low income family not take their children to a dentist? Because they cannot afford it, yet there is a dentist who makes house calls to Millhaven. They do not have to worry about their teeth.

People in my own hometown have come to me asking what can they do. They have four and five year old kids with rotten teeth and they cannot afford to pay the dentist. They cannot get help from social services and they cannot afford a dentist. Yet this is done openly in the penitentiaries.

Seniors suffer from poor health. Convicts can have a sex change on demand, but seniors are suffering without health programs.

It is really sad that the veterans of the world wars and the Korean war are living in absolute poverty. Some have called me saying "I do not understand what is happening. I have been on the veterans pension. Now my wife has reached 65 years of age and she has gone on the old age pension and they have taken all my veterans benefits away. We are trying to get by on \$600 or \$700 a month".

I visited the home of one of these veterans. He had a medal of honour and a medal of bravery for World War II which he once was very proud of. He wanted me to bring those medals back here and I do not want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, where he wanted me to put them. The kind of language he used to tell me where to put them would not be fitting for these kind ladies and gentlemen in this place. These are our veterans from the wars.

I defy any member in the House to stand up and say he does not know of a veteran who fought for this country, for the very freedoms we try to enjoy, who is not in the same kind of a predicament because they are out there. We just do not pay attention to that. We have too many more important things to do. That attitude has to change.

Take a look at our military. Compare that to our justice system. Over the past several months the standing committee on defence has heard about the living conditions and the quality of life of our military personnel and what they are experiencing. The only real reason for this is that successive governments have overworked

and underequipped the members of our forces and have left them grossly underpaid. The underfunding of defence has led to a debate whether to buy essential equipment for the survival of our soldiers in the field or to compensate our soldiers with the salaries and benefits they deserve. In trying to do both, the equipment is falling apart and our service personnel are suffering beyond belief.

At the same time we heard the solicitor general praise our prison system as being one of the best in the world. This system provides our federal inmates with the use of miniature golf courses, tennis courts, basketball courts, softball diamonds, jogging tracks, cable television, big screen TV, racquetball, all other kinds of entertainment, weight lifting and automatic gyms which cost thousands of dollars, all at taxpayers' expense.

Most of our soldiers only dream about all of those activities. The possibility of getting involved in these activities is nil. The soldiers who are serving in Somalia, Rwanda and Bosnia get relatively few if any of these things, let alone a conjugal visit. Even those personnel posted in Canada cannot afford to enjoy the range of goodies afforded to our prison inmates. Our soldiers now have to pay recreation fees for the use of the gyms and the ice rinks on the bases. Our soldiers.

• (2135)

On Monday, April 27, Colonel Jim Calvin appeared before the standing committee on defence. He reported that a fully trained private, married with two children, after three years of service takes home \$49 of disposable income per month. This compares to our inmates who receive in the same case a monthly disposable amount of \$157.50, three times more than what the military personnel are forced to get by on. Only a Liberal could smile about that. Only a Liberal could laugh about that.

The bottom line is that our convicts are given more consideration by our government than our soldiers, sailors and air crew, an attitude that has to change. How can we ever hope to recruit young people into our services to serve our country knowing that those in jail are treated better? Some of these soldiers have to stand in line at a food bank in order to get enough to feed their families. It is absolutely ridiculous. They do not enjoy the luxuries that many of the inmates do.

Look at the parole system. Over the past month the solicitor general and the commissioner of Correctional Service Canada have been quoted at length listing the reasons why imprisonment is so debilitating and that parole is the answer. They claim that there is no link between incarceration and public safety.

The commissioner was at a loss to understand how the federal inmate population has gone up by 23% over the past five years and the crime rate has fallen by 13%. It never entered these two

Supply

expert's minds that maybe if we put the criminals behind bars, then the crime rate may fall.

Lo and behold, it reminds me of a study which the New York mayor did before he implemented the brick, broke and pain philosophy to try to improve the situation. He did a big study. He wanted to know the causes of crime. He spent lots of money going into the causes of crime. Eureka, he found out the number one cause of crime. Do you know what it was, Mr. Speaker? Criminals. Is that not hard to understand.

The alternative the government is promoting to keeping them in is that it only costs \$9,000 a year to supervise an inmate on parole. That is well and fine when public safety is guaranteed. But when the National Parole Board's record of releasing dangerous offenders who go on to commit murder while on parole is questionable because of what has happened in the past, it is not a valid solution.

According to the government's own statistics which it provided to my office, from 1986 to 1997, 2,292 people were murdered, assaulted, taken as hostage, forcibly confined or robbed by offenders on parole. Of those 2,292 people, 217 were murdered. We never hear these statistics from these masterminds.

When we look at those kinds of figures, it simply is too big a price to ask society to continue to support that kind of result. What kind of sacrifice do we expect of Canadians? Accept the parole system where there are only 2,200 victims every 10 years and 200 or so murdered. Accept it as good because after all only about 10% of those who were on parole did that. The other 90% were all good. That kind of figure is too big a sacrifice to ask Canadians to pay.

• (2140)

If we need to spend more money, let us look at where we waste it. Let us look at what we are doing in other areas like defence. Let us see what we can do about changing some things, see what we can do about where we spend our money.

Maybe the seniors do not need a sexuality study. Maybe we do not. It would have been nice if the government had asked me. I could have told it right at the beginning and it would have saved \$100,000. Seniors and sexuality. The sad part about it is I did not get a copy of the report.

It is nice to be here tonight. There are a few things I need to get off my chest.

Look at "The Waste Report" and look at the public accounts to see where some of this money is going. Look at the whole scenario. Almost every day in the House of Commons for the last five years government members have talked about the suffering in the cities, families who need help, starving children, people who are suffering and who need help. The Liberals stand in this House saying we

Supply

have got to do something about it and then miraculously the government finds some billions of dollars to give to Bombardier. It finds \$25 million to give away free flags. It finds \$116,000 to form a committee on seniors and sexuality.

These decisions are coming from the Liberal Party of Canada, the governing body of this country. The people of this land need to know that. I hope that in the next election they kick them right out of here.

Mr. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe you will find unanimous consent to deem the question to have been put, a division requested and an order deferred until 10.00 p.m. so that we might spend more time debating the next item on the Order Paper. I believe there is unanimous consent, if the Speaker would request it.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the proposition put forward by the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough?

An hon. member: No.

The Deputy Speaker: There is not consent.

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe what I have been hearing. My colleague from Wild Rose has been complaining about his sexuality. I want to say that there is some quick help on the way. Viagra is just about to hit the waves here. He may have an opportunity to re-examine this issue. We heard a lot of rubbish from him tonight.

There is a great difference between this party on this side of the House and his party on the other side. We are a party that looks toward the future with optimism. That party on the other side looks to the future with pessimism. It lives in the past. It does not look forward, it looks backward. It has absolutely no vision. Every time we hear one of these guys speak, we get depressed. We feel absolutely terrible.

The member for Wild Rose is the same guy who wanted to tie 10-year old children upside down and beat them to discipline them. That is his definition of law and order. It did not matter what the child did. He wanted to put the child behind bars. That is his way of disciplining. His way of dealing with law and order is to jail them.

For the Reform Party there are two classes of people. They are either law-abiding citizens or they are criminals. It does not matter. The Reform Party views all who are accused as criminals. Look at its famous bill of rights which clearly states that. Look at its opposition to the charter of rights and freedoms. It opposed the charter of rights and freedoms because it gives the people the right to be protected by law in Canada. The member for Wild Rose stood up over and over again in the House of Commons to attack the government on issues of law and order and the protection of victims. When the Minister of Justice introduced legislation in the House—

• (2145)

Mr. Ken Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if there is anything we can do to get this member to stay somewhere near the truth.

The Deputy Speaker: I think the hon. member for Elk Island knows that is not a point of order.

Mr. Mac Harb: Mr. Speaker, the member has nothing to say on the issue. Every time the Minister of Justice has introduced a measure to protect victims, members of his party voted against it.

Why is he against gun control as a measure to protect communities? Why is he against the initiatives of the government which deal with the protection of our society and with the prevention of crimes in our society? Why is it that I only hear doom from this member and his colleagues over and over again and about the terrible things that happen in our society? Never once have they proposed something that is tangible, that is positive, to deal with the problems at hand.

Our society is in good hands. For four years in a row crime has decreased. What does he have to say to that?

Mr. Myron Thompson: Mr. Speaker, that member is a perfect illustration of why it is so difficult to be here. This is the only place I know of where you can stand and lie and it is okay.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: I am sure the hon. member for Wild Rose wants to give a response.

Mr. Myron Thompson: Mr. Speaker, if we use the *L* word, then we are out of here. Is that correct? I do not know any other way to say it, except I never saw more people who are strangers to the truth than the members across the way. It is a shame that it has to be that way.

I loudly and clearly said that \$1 billion for the registration of rifles and shotguns of duck hunters and deer hunters is a waste of money. It will not be effective.

I have challenged the government: show me where it will save lives and I will support it tonight. Show me where the registration of a shotgun or a rifle will save lives and I will support it tonight. I have challenged the government for four years. It has not been done. It cannot be done because, number one, criminals do not register their guns. They do a lot of things with their guns, but they do not register them. It is pure and simple. To spend \$1 billion under the umbrella of what the government thinks is protecting society is just not the answer, but the government does not listen.

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, I was listening to what the member for Wild Rose was saying and I have a question for him.

I think this is part of the problem with the total disrespect for the justice system and the lack of faith which Canadians have in the justice system.

• (2150)

We must understand when we deal with Bill C-68 and a lot of other legislation that we cannot keep drugs out of our prisons in Canada. We cannot keep heroin out, we cannot keep methadone out, we cannot keep marijuana out, we cannot keep LSD out, we cannot keep anything out of our prisons. They are not ordinary buildings. They are buildings that are surrounded by barbed wire and great big walls. That is relevant. That is part of the reason the Canadian public has no faith in the justice system. I would like the member's comments on that.

Mr. Myron Thompson: Mr. Speaker, it is easy to determine why prisons are full of drugs. It is not that we cannot, it is that we will not. The reason we will not is because we do not have people on that side of the House with the intestinal fortitude to implement that kind of measure. They would rather sit back and not get too intrusive with the inmates in the penitentiaries. I am sure they would find some way to say that it offends the charter of rights. They would want to check that out very carefully. Would it be a right to be a heroin addict in the pen?

The sad part about it is that about 80% of those people are there because of drugs. That is what put them there in the first place. In prison it is more plentiful than you could ever imagine. I might as well sentence my Uncle Henry who is an alcoholic to the wine cellar for the rest of his life. It does not make a bit of sense. That is the problem with the entire group over there. Most of the things that happen just do not make sense.

When drugs are the cause of putting a person in a penitentiary, then why do we not work hard to get it out of the penitentiary and save these people from their own fate?

Mr. Nick Discepola (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Wild Rose was cited as saying that if we put more criminals behind bars the crime rate may fall. I think I am quoting him exactly. I would like him to explain why the American theory does not apply. They have the highest number of penitentiaries, yet they also have the highest number of criminals.

Mr. Myron Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have a hard time trying to understand the stats we get from these guys. It usually takes a little interpretation. They are difficult to understand.

In California we have learned that the crime rate is down by a huge percentage. In New York City it has gone down even further, simply by starting the broken pain theory. That is the picture in

Supply

those two areas. The only reason I know about them is because I read the reports in the newspapers. I try to keep track—

Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to enter the debate on the justice estimates. I find it strangely ironic that the member for York South—Weston, who is not in the House at the moment, would come into this House, someone who has championed, as he would put it, the rules and regulations of the House, to speak on a topic totally unrelated to the justice estimates. I will not do that. I will immediately proceed to the justice estimates because that is what we are here to debate.

I will get into two areas with respect to the justice estimates. One is gun control. The other is the question of drinking and driving that has come up in the House over the last little while.

The House should support the justice estimates. With the budget that the justice department will have, if it passes the House, it will be able to get on with implementing a number of very important initiatives. Gun control is but one of them.

We have seen that this is a very useful, efficient and effective program and it is supported by Canadians very broadly.

• (2155)

We can see the effects of it already. The police in my riding in Etobicoke are already reporting some of the very positive effects of some of the early measures that were implemented and I am confident that more will come. I am totally convinced of that. We register pets and we register bicycles. I do not know why in the heck we should not register guns. They are lethal weapons.

There are other very important initiatives like the changes we are making to the youth justice system that this budget will allow our government to implement. With the changes now before us, youth 14 years and older who are repeat and violent offenders, who are convicted of murder, attempted murder, manslaughter or aggravated sexual assault will receive an adult sentence unless a judge can be persuaded otherwise.

I know in my riding of Etobicoke North that people are concerned about repeat young offenders. I think the justice minister and the department have come forward with very pragmatic and excellent solutions to this very serious problem.

The changes will also permit the publication of the names upon conviction of all young offenders who qualify for an adult sentence. Publication of the names of 14 to 17 year olds who are given a youth sentence for murder, attempted murder, manslaughter, aggravated sexual assault or repeat violent offences could also be permitted.

I think these are very important measures and this House should support them.

Supply

I would like to turn briefly to the question of drinking and driving. It is a very topical subject and I am sure it will be before the justice committee in the not too distant future.

Everyone in this House I am sure is very concerned, very saddened and shocked when they see individuals who are injured or who die as a result of being hit by a car driven by a drunk driver. We should be concerned about that. It is a very serious issue.

In the ensuing months when we debate these changes, I think that we should avoid simplistic solutions. Moving the tolerance level from .08 to .05 or to zero does not really address the problem. The problem is the repeat offender, the chronic drinker, the drinker who drinks and drives repeatedly.

The drinker who drives and gets into serious accidents is sanctioned by society through either a criminal sentence, a serious fine, or through the repeal of their licence. Immediately they jump back into their car, go down to the local bar, gets drunk, go out and maybe injure or kill someone.

That is the problem. It is not the casual responsible drinker. If the level were dropped to .05 or to .00 it would mean that people could not even have a beer and get in their car. Why should we be designing laws in this country to deal with the 5% or the 3% of society who are irresponsible? Why do we not use tougher sanctions on them?

I am amazed when I see drivers who drink and who get into serious accidents. Their licence is revoked, but they are caught a few months later in a car without a valid licence. Why do we not put people like that into jail? To me that is the solution. Why do we have to penalize people for having one drink responsibly in an evening, getting in their car and driving home in a very safe and cautious manner?

We should be thinking about those kinds of solutions. If we went with no risk policies it would mean that people would always leave their cars at home. They would not get into an aircraft. They would not cross the street. We cannot design policies to deal with every single risk in life. I think we need to have pragmatic policies that deal with serious problems, but they have to deal with the offenders of the problems.

In my mind, the problem is not the responsible drinker, it is the repeat offender who just turns their nose up at the justice system. They have been convicted of an offence, they have had their licence revoked, and they get back into a car, go out and drink and drive, and behave irresponsibly.

I understand that a coalition has been formed which includes MADD, Mothers Against Drinking and Driving.

• (2200)

I am sure it will present to the justice committee. It is saying that moving tolerance to .05 will not work either.

The Speaker: It being 10 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

• (2230)

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

(Division No. 192)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Abлонczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Blaikie
Borosik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brisson	Cadman
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan	Earle
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Harris	Hart
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kennedy (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Konrad
Laliberte	Lill
Lowther	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Manning
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Nystrom	Obhrai
Pankiw	Penson
Power	Price
Proctor	Ramsay
Reynolds	Riis
Ritz	Robinson
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Solomon
Stinson	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Strahl
Thompson (Charlotte)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vautour	Vellacott

Wasylycia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—89

Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Boudria
Brien
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Copp
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dion
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis)
Dumas
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hanno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Leung
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marceau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Ménard
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pratt
Provenzano

Alarie
Anderson
Assadourian
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
de Savoye
DeVillers
Discepola
Drouin
Duhamel
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fournier
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Hubbard
Ifody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Knutson
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Lincoln
Loubier
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mercier
Milliken
Minna
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Plamondon
Proud

Supply

Redman
Richardson
Rock
Sauvageau
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
Szabo
Thibeault
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Venne
Wappel
Wilfert

Reed
Robillard
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Turp
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—184

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Crête	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Duceppe
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	MacAulay
Marchand	Marleau
Mitchell	Perron
Rocheleau	Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2240)

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

(Division No. 193)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette

Supply

Comuzzi	Copps	Earle	Elley
Cullen	DeVillers	Epp	Forseth
Dion	Discepola	Fournier	Gagnon
Dromisky	Drouin	Gauthier	Gilmour
Duhamel	Easter	Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Eggleton	Finestone	Goldring	Gouk
Finlay	Folco	Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Fontana	Fry	Guimond	Hanger
Gagliano	Galloway	Harris	Hart
Godfrey	Goodale	Harvey	Herron
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)	Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Grose	Guarnieri	Hilstrom	Hoeppner
Harb	Harvard	Jaffer	Johnston
Hubbard	Ianno	Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Iftody	Jackson	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Konrad
Jennings	Jordan	Laliberte	Lalonde
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis	Laurin	Lebel
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Lefebvre	Lill
Knutson	Kraft Sloan	Loubier	Lowther
Lastewka	Lavigne	Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Lee	Leung	Manning	Marceau
Lincoln	Longfield	Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mahoney	Malhi	Matthews	Mayfield
Maloney	Manley	McDonough	McNally
Marchi	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Ménard	Mercier
Massé	McCormick	Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)	Morrison	Muise
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague	Nystrom	Obhrai
McWhinney	Mifflin	Pankiw	Penson
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Minna	Murray	Power	Price
Myers	Nault	Proctor	Ramsay
Normand	Nunziata	Reynolds	Riis
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Ritz	Robinson
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan	Sauvageau	Schmidt
Paradis	Parrish	Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Patry	Peric	Solomon	St-Hilaire
Peterson	Pettigrew	Stinson	St-Jacques
Phinney	Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Stoffer	Strahl
Pillitteri	Pratt	Thompson (Charlotte)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Proud	Provenzano	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Redman	Reed	Vautour	Vellacott
Richardson	Robillard	Venne	Wasylcia-Leis
Rock	Saada	Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora	White (North Vancouver)	Williams—124
Serré	Shepherd		
Speller	St. Denis		
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)		
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien		
Szabo	Telegdi		
Thibeault	Torsney		
Ur	Valeri		
Volpe	Wappel		
Whelan	Wilfert		
Wood—149			

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Crête	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Duceppe
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	MacAulay
Marchand	Marleau
Mitchell	Perron
Rocheleau	Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$82,636,000, under Human Resources Development—Department—Corporate Services Program—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Blaikie	Brien
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Cadman
Brisson	Casson
Casey	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chatters	Dalphond-Guiral
Cummins	Debien
de Savoye	Dockrill
Desjarlais	Dubé (Lévis)
Doyle	Dumas
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	
Duncan	

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2250)

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

(Division No. 194)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (Labrador)

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Coppes
DeVillers
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)

O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—149

Supply

Pagtkhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brisson
Casey
Chatters
Cummins
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guay
Hanger
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lebel
Lill
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Muise
Obhrai
Penson
Plamondon
Price
Ramsay
Riis
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Hilaire
St-Jacques
Strahl
Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Borotsik
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis)
Dumas
Earle
Epp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Harris
Harvey
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Laliberte
Laurin
Lefebvre
Loubier
Lunn
Manning
Mark
Matthews
McDonough
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Power
Proctor
Reynolds
Ritz
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
Stinson
Stoffer

Supply

Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vautour
Venne
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp
Vellacott
Wasylcia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—124

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Crête
Dhaliwal
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Marchand
Mitchell
Rocheleau

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Desrochers
Duceppe
MacAulay
Marleau
Perron
Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 3.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—INDUSTRY

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 3

That, Vote 1, in the amount of \$426,162,000, under INDUSTRY—Department—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 3. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2305)

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 195)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin—Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan

Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Miliken
Minna
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patri
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—149

Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Coppes
DeVillers
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison
Casey
Chatters
Cummins
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bigras
Borotsik
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien

Supply

Dockrill
 Dubé (Lévis)
 Dumas
 Earle
 Epp
 Fournier
 Gauthier
 Girard-Bujold
 Goldring
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Guimond
 Harris
 Harvey
 Hill (Macleod)
 Hilstrom
 Jaffer
 Jones
 Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
 Laliberte
 Laurin
 Lefebvre
 Loubier
 Lunn
 Manning
 Mark
 Matthews
 McDonough
 Ménard
 Meredith
 Morrison
 Nystrom
 Pankiw
 Picard (Drummond)
 Power
 Proctor
 Reynolds
 Ritz
 Sauvageau
 Scott (Skeena)
 Solomon
 Stinson
 Stoffer
 Thompson (Charlotte)
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
 Vautour
 Venne
 Wayne
 White (North Vancouver)

Doyle
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Duncan
 Elley
 Forseth
 Gagnon
 Gilmour
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 Gouk
 Guay
 Hanger
 Hart
 Herron
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Hoepfner
 Johnston
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Konrad
 Lalonde
 Lebel
 Lill
 Lowther
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Marceau
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Mayfield
 McNally
 Mercier
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Muise
 Obhrai
 Penson
 Plamondon
 Price
 Ramsay
 Riis
 Robinson
 Schmidt
 Solberg
 St-Hilaire
 St-Jacques
 Strahl
 Thompson (Wild Rose)
 Turp
 Vellacott
 Wasylcia-Leis
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)
 Williams—124

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
 Crête
 Dhaliwal
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
 Marchand
 Mitchell
 Rocheleau

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
 Desrochers
 Duceppe
 MacAulay
 Marleau
 Perron
 Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 4.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—SOLICITOR GENERAL

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 4

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$17,544,000, under SOLICITOR GENERAL—Department—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 4 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 5.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 15—SOLICITOR GENERAL

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Vote 15, in the amount of \$907,704,000, under SOLICITOR GENERAL—Correctional Service—Penitentiary Service and National Parole Service—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I would propose that you seek the unanimous consent of the House to apply the result of the vote just taken to the following: Vote 1 under Health, Vote 1 under Fisheries and Oceans, Vote 1 under National Defence, Vote 1 under Agriculture and Agri-Food, Vote 1, under Environment, Vote 1 under Privy Council, Vote 1 under Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Vote 1 under Transport, Vote 25 under Health, Vote 1 under Foreign Affairs, Vote 1 under Natural Resources, Vote 35 under Canadian Heritage, Vote 1 under Treasury Board, Vote 1 under Canadian Heritage and Vote 5 under Finance.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: There is not unanimous consent. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (2320)

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

*Supply**(Division No. 196)*

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Coppes
Desjarlais
Dion
Dockrill
Drouin
Earle
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Knutson
Laliberte
Lavigne
Leung
Lincoln
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proctor
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Robinson
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
DeVillers
Discepolo
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Longfield
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Myers
Normand
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pratt
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—164

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dubé (Lévis)
Dumas
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guay
Hanger
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Konrad
Laurin
Lefebvre
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Obhrai
Penson
Plamondon
Price
Reynolds
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
St-Hilaire
St-Jacques
Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vellacott
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brisson
Casey
Chatters
Cummins
de Savoye
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Epp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Harris
Harvey
Hill (MacLeod)
Hillstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
Lunn
Manning
Mark
Matthews
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Muise
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Power
Ramsay
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp
Venne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—109

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Crête
Dhaliwal
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Marchand
Mitchell
Rocheleau

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Desrochers
Duceppe
MacAulay
Marleau
Perron
Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 6.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 25—SOLICITOR GENERAL

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 6

That Vote 25, in the amount of \$20,224,000, under SOLICITOR GENERAL—National Parole Board—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2330)

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

(Division No. 197)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Copp
DeVillers
Discepolo
Drouin
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis

Supply

Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—148

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison
Casey
Chatters
Cummins
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guay
Hanger
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lebel
Lill
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bigras
Borotsik
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis)
Dumas
Earle
Épp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Harris
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Laliberte
Laurin
Lefebvre
Loubier
Lunn
Manning

Supply

Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Nunziata	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Power
Price	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Riis	Ritz
Robinson	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Solomon
St-Hilaire	Stinson
St-Jacques	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vautour
Vellacott	Venne
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—125	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Crête	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Duceppe
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	MacAulay
Marchand	Marleau
Mitchell	Perron
Rocheleau	Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 6 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 7

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 35—SOLICITOR GENERAL

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 7

That Vote 35, in the amount of \$789,932,000, under SOLICITOR GENERAL—Royal Canadian Mounted Police—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would propose that you seek unanimous consent of the House to apply the result of the vote just taken to the following items—

An hon. member: No.

The Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

• (2345)

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

(Division No. 198)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gallaway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Lincoln
Longfield	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nunziata
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proctor
Proud	Provenzano

Supply

Redman
Richardson
Ritz
Robinson
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

Reed
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—164

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borosik
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dubé (Lévis)
Dumas
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guay
Hanger
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Konrad
Laurin
Loubier
Lunn
Manning
Mark
Matthews
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Muisse
Penson
Plamondon
Price
Reynolds
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Jacques
Thompson (Charlotte)
Turp
Venne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—104

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison
Casey
Chatters
Cummins
de Savoye
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Epp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Harris
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Lalonde
Lefebvre
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Power
Ramsay
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vellacott
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Crête
Dhaliwal
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Marchand
Mitchell
Rocheleau

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Desrochers
Duceppe
MacAulay
Marleau
Perron
Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 8.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 45—SOLICITOR GENERAL

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 8

That Vote 45, in the amount of \$718,000, under SOLICITOR GENERAL—Royal Canadian Police External Review Committee—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2355)

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

(Division No. 199)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Coppes
Desjarlais

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
DeVillers

Supply

Dion	Discepolo	Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dockrill	Dromisky	Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Drouin	Duhamel	de Savoye	Debien
Earle	Easter	Doyle	Dubé (Lévis)
Eggleton	Finestone	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Dumas
Finlay	Folco	Duncan	Elley
Fontana	Fry	Epp	Forseth
Gagliano	Galloway	Fournier	Gagnon
Godfrey	Goodale	Gauthier	Gilmour
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)	Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Grose	Guarnieri	Goldring	Gouk
Harb	Harvard	Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Hubbard	Ianno	Guimond	Hanger
Iftody	Jackson	Harris	Hart
Jennings	Jordan	Harvey	Herron
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis	Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Hilstrom	Hoeppner
Knudson	Kraft Sloan	Jaffer	Johnston
Laliberte	Lastewka	Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Lavigne	Lee	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Konrad
Leung	Lill	Lalonde	Laurin
Lincoln	Longfield	Lebel	Lefebvre
Mahoney	Malhi	Loubier	Lowther
Maloney	Manley	Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marchi	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Manning	Marceau
Massé	McCormick	Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McDonough	McGuire	Matthews	Mayfield
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)	McNally	Ménard
McTeague	McWhinney	Mercier	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken	Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna	Muise	Pankiw
Murray	Myers	Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Nault	Normand	Plamondon	Power
Nunziata	Nystrom	Price	Ramsay
Obhrai	O'Brien (Labrador)	Reynolds	Sauvageau
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly	Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Pagtakhan	Paradis	Solberg	St-Hilaire
Parrish	Patry	St-Jacques	Strahl
Peric	Peterson	Thompson (Charlotte)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Pettigrew	Phinney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri	Vellacott	Venne
Pratt	Proctor	Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Proud	Provenzano	White (North Vancouver)	Williams—106
Redman	Reed		
Richardson	Riis		
Ritz	Robillard		
Robinson	Rock		
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)		
Sekora	Serré		
Shepherd	Solomon		
Speller	St. Denis		
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)		
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson	Asselin	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
St-Julien	Stoffer	Crête	Desrochers
Szabo	Telegdi	Dhaliwal	Duceppe
Thibeault	Torsney	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	MacAulay
Ur	Valeri	Marchand	Marleau
Vautour	Volpe	Mitchell	Perron
Wappel	Wasylcyia-Leis	Rocheleau	Vanclief
Whelan	Wilfert		
Wood—167			

PAIRED MEMBERS

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 8 carried.

I know it is a long night and I know many of the members want to come in and come out. The rule is this. You should be in your seat when I am finished reading the motion. After you have voted you are to stay in your seat and you are to be in your seat at the end of the vote.

If someone does leave and another hon. member wants to challenge whether that member was here for a vote or not what I simply do is ask the member who was mentioned if he or she was here under those conditions. If he or she was not then his or her vote will not be counted.

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Borosik	Brisson
Brien	Casey
Cadman	
Casson	

The next question is on Motion No. 9.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 9

That Vote 5, in the amount of \$131,745,000, under HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT—Department—Human Resources Investment and Insurance Program—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2405)

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 200)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dion	Discepola
Dockrill	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard

Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Longfield
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murray
Nault
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proctor
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Robinson
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

Supply

Ifody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Knutson
Laliberte
Lavigne
Leung
Lincoln
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Milliken
Minna
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pratt
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—160

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Borotsik	Brison
Brien	Casey
Cadman	Chatters
Casson	Cummins
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	de Savoye
Dalphon-DuGiral	Doyle
Debien	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dubé (Lévis)	Duncan
Dumas	Epp
Elley	Fournier
Forseth	Gauthier
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Golding
Godin (Châteauguay)	Grey (Edmonton North)
Gouk	Guimond
Guay	Harris
Hanger	Harvey
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Herron	Hilstrom
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Jaffer
Hoepfner	
Johnston	

Supply

Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Konrad
Lalonde	Lefebvre
Loubier	Lowther
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Manning	Marceau
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews	Mayfield
McNally	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nunziata
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Power	Price
Ramsay	Reynolds
Ritz	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	St-Hilaire
Stinson	St-Jacques
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vellacott
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—106

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Crête	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Duceppe
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	MacAulay
Marchand	Marleau
Mitchell	Perron
Rocheleau	Vancielief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 9 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 10.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10—HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 10

That Vote 10, in the amount of \$1,018,347,000, under HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT—Department—Human Resources Investment and Insurance Program—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (2415)

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

(Division No. 201)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Baker	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knudson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lill
Lincoln	Longfield
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nunziata
Nystrom	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proctor	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney

Ur
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—159

Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcyia-Leis
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Borotsik
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dubé (Lévis)
Duncan
Epp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Konrad
Lefebvre
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Obhrai
Penson
Power
Ramsay
Ritz
Scott (Skeena)
Stinson
Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison
Casey
Chatters
Cummins
de Savoye
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guimond
Harris
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Laurin
Loubier
Lunn
Manning
Mark
Matthews
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Muisse
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Reynolds
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Jacques
Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—99

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Crête
Dhaliwal
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Marchand
Mitchell
Rocheleau

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Desrochers
Duceppe
MacAulay
Marleau
Perron
Vanclief

Supply

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 11.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE NO. 1—HEALTH

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 11

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$867,573,000, under HEALTH—Department—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2425)

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

(Division No. 202)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Copps
DeVillers
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne

Supply

Lee
Lincoln
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Leung
Longfield
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Milliken
Minna
Myers
Normand
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—144

Penson
Power
Proctor
Reynolds
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Jacques
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—111

Picard (Drummond)
Price
Ramsay
Riis
Robinson
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
Stoffer
Thompson (Charlotte)
Turp
Vellacott
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Crête
Dhaliwal
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Marchand
Mitchell
Rocheleau

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Desrochers
Duceppe
MacAulay
Marleau
Perron
Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 12.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 12

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$793,631,000, under FISHERIES AND OCEANS—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

Mr. Lee Morrison: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if you would seek unanimous consent for members to remove their coats.

The Speaker: Does the member have unanimous consent?

An hon. member: No.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (2435)

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

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brisson
Casey
Chatters
Cummins
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Epp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Konrad
Laurin
Loubier
Lunn
Manning
Mark
Matthews
McDonough
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Nunziata
Pankiw

Ablonczy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis)
Duncan
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guimond
Harris
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Laliberte
Lill
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Muise
Nystrom

(Division No. 203)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Copps
DeVillers
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Gallaway
Goodale
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Paradis
Patri
Peterson
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pratt
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—141

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Barnes
Bélaire
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Milliken
Minna
Myers
Normand
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Supply

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brisson
Casey
Chatters
Cummins
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Epp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Konrad
Laurin
Loubier
Lunn
Manning
Mark
Matthews
McDonough
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Nunziata
Obhrai
Penson
Power
Proctor
Reynolds
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Stoffer
Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—114

Ablonczy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis)
Duncan
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guimond
Harris
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Laliberte
Lill
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Muisé
Nystrom
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Ramsay
Riis
Robinson
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
St-Jacques
Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp
Vellacott
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Crête
Dhaliwal
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Marchand
Mitchell
Rocheleau

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Desrochers
Duceppe
MacAulay
Marleau
Perron
Vanclief

Supply

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 12 carried.

Mr. Joe Fontana: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if there are any rules in the House that would allow the member for York South—Weston and his five conspirators from the Reform and Conservatives to be charged the \$40,000 it has cost the Canadian taxpayers for this farce tonight.

Mr. Stan Keyes: Mr. Speaker, given the hour of the evening I wonder if I could get unanimous consent of the House to allow our pages to go home if they so choose.

The Speaker: I need them to help me up here for the most part. I need them to get through the night.

Mr. Nick Discepola: Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything when the member for York South—Weston got up from his seat when we voted on Motion No. 3. Nor did I say anything when he got up from his seat on Motion No. 6. Nor did I say anything when he used his cellular as we were voting on Motion No. 8.

However, on the current motion, Mr. Speaker, if you consult Beauchesne's it says that the member should remain in his seat until the division is complete and the result announced. I believe the member left his seat before the result was announced.

The Speaker: I will address myself to the hon. member for York South—Weston. Did he vote according to the rules of the House?

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, the member is quite right. I was absent as was the House leader of the government. I would expect his vote to be nullified.

• (2440)

I should add that on several of those matters I voted with the government. Many members of the House throughout the evening have absented themselves.

Mr. John Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I know voting this late in the evening is very stressful for us. I also know that you are very concerned, as are the rest of us, about decorum in the House. I would appreciate it very much if you would rule on the propriety of the member for Medicine Hat and the member for Edmonton North playing cards in the House of Commons while the Leader of the Opposition looks on.

The Speaker: I agree that it is a long night and I would appeal to my colleagues. We are going to go through this exercise unless the House decides not to go through it. I would suggest that we have to keep decorum in the House. I would hope all hon. members would conduct themselves accordingly as members of parliament.

Points of order are being raised. I will hear the points of order because it is the right of members to raise them, but I would hope you would reflect on the points you are raising.

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member for London North made comments that were not in order

when he referred to the member for York—South Weston and said that he and a few Conservatives and Reformers know—

The Speaker: I ruled that the hon. member did not have a point of order and therefore that ended it.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that things seem to be breaking down on that side. I would like to make the point that we will be voting. We will be standing up—

• (2445)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 13.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 13

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$6,875,690,000, under NATIONAL DEFENCE—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2450)

(The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 204)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Baker
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Barnes
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon

Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Goodale
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Coppes
DeVillers
Discepolo
Drouin
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Milliken
Minna
Myers
Normand
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patty
Peterson
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pratt
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—140

Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Konrad
Laurin
Loubier
Lunn
Manning
Mark
Matthews
McDonough
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Nunziata
Obhrai
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Ramsay
Riis
Robinson
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
St-Jacques
Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vautour
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

Supply

Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Laliberte
Lill
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Muise
Nystrom
Pankiw
Power
Proctor
Reynolds
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Stoffer
Thompson (Charlotte)
Turp
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—108

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Crête
Dhaliwal
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Marchand
Mitchell
Rocheleau

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Desrochers
Duceppe
MacAulay
Marleau
Perron
Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 13 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 14.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—FINANCE

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 14

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$70,818,000, under FINANCE—Department—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Blaikie
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis)
Duncan
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guimond
Harris
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer

Ablonczy
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brisson
Casey
Chatters
Cummins
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Epp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner

Supply

● (2500)

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

(Division No. 205)

YEAS

Members

Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Baker	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélanger
Bellefleur	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dion	Discepola
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peterson	Pettigrew
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Speller	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	Wood—128

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Blaikie	Cadman
Brien	Casson
Casey	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chatters	Dalphond-Guiral
Cummins	Debien
de Savoye	Dockrill
Desjarlais	Dubé (Lévis)
Doyle	Duncan
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Elley
Earle	Forseth
Epp	Gagnon
Fournier	Gilmour
Gauthier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Girard-Bujold	Gouk
Goldring	Guimond
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hart
Hanger	Herron
Harvey	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (MacLeod)	Hoepfner
Hilstrom	Johnston
Jaffer	Keddy (South Shore)
Jones	Konrad
Kenny (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Laurin
Laliberte	Loubier
Lill	Lunn
Lowther	Manning
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mark
Marceau	Matthews
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	McDonough
Mayfield	Ménard
McNally	Meredith
Mercier	Morrison
Mills (Red Deer)	Nunziata
Muise	Obhrai
Nystrom	Penson
Pankiw	Power
Picard (Drummond)	Proctor
Price	Reynolds
Ramsay	Ritz
Riis	Schmidt
Robinson	Solomon
Scott (Skeena)	Stoffer
St-Jacques	Thompson (Charlotte)
Strahl	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Vautour
Turp	Wasylcia-Leis
Vellacott	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wayne	Williams—107
White (North Vancouver)	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Crête	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Duceppe
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	MacAulay
Marchand	Marleau
Mitchell	Perron
Rocheleau	Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 14 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 15.

Supply

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 15

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$361,286,000, under AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD—Department—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 15 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 16.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 16

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$388,654,000, under ENVIRONMENT—Department—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 16 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 17.

• (2505)

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—PRIVY COUNCIL

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 17

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$65,162,000, under PRIVY COUNCIL—Department—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 17 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 18.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 18

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$63,272,000, under INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—Department—Administration Program—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 18 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 19.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 19

That Vote 5, in the amount of \$219,317,000, under INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—Department—Indian and Inuit Affairs Program—

Supply

Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 19 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 20.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 15—INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 20

That Vote 15, in the amount of \$3,783,017,000, under INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—Department—Indian and Inuit Affairs Program—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 20 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 21.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 30—INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 21

That Vote 30, in the amount of \$83,507,000, under INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—Department—Northern Affairs Program—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 21 agreed to)

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I noted that on the last several votes you have declared votes carried on division. My understanding is that these motions in fact are not carried on division but are carried on your interpretation of the voice vote. I would ask for a ruling on that matter.

• (2510)

The Speaker: The member is correct. It is my call on the voice vote and I say that it is on division.

The next question is on Motion No. 22.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 35—INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 22

That Vote 35, in the amount of \$90,940,000, under INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—Department—Northern Affairs Program—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 22 agreed to)

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Historically the phrase on division has come to mean something. It

has been parliamentary tradition. That means that rather than taking a roll call vote and requiring every member to stand in his or her place to cast a ballot, the political parties agree that the motion is to carry without the opposition suggesting it is voting in favour, that there is opposition to the motion. That is what the words on division—

The Speaker: I made the decision that it would be carried on division because there were not five members standing. Therefore I said that it was on division. I made the ruling and it will stand.

The next question is on Motion No. 23.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 25—HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 23

That Vote 25, in the amount of \$7,728,000, under HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT—Canada Labour Relations Board—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 23 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 24.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 30—HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 24

That Vote 30, in the amount of \$1,528,000, under HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT—Canadian Artists and Producers Tribunal—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 24 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 25.

Supply

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—TRANSPORT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 25

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$143,098,000, under TRANSPORT—Department—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 25 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 26.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 30—TRANSPORT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 26

That Vote 30, in the amount of \$17,568,000, under TRANSPORT—Canadian Transportation Agency—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 26 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 27.

• (2515)

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—HEALTH

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 27

That Vote 5, in the amount of \$717,993,000, under HEALTH—Department—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

Supply

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 27 agreed to)

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Given the procedure that the House has adopted to vote on these matters, I presume that on the votes that are not being taken none of the members will be shown in the official record as having voted this evening on these matters. Is that correct?

The Speaker: That is correct. The next question is on Motion No. 28.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10—HEALTH

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 28

That Vote 10, in the amount of \$995,000, under HEALTH—Hazardous Materials Information Review Commission—Program Expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 28 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 29.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 15—HEALTH

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 29

That Vote 15, in the amount of \$8,239,000, under HEALTH—Medical Research Council—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 29 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 30.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 20—HEALTH

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 30

That Vote 20, in the amount of \$218,212,000, under HEALTH—Medical Research Council—Grants, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 30 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 31.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 25—HEALTH

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 31

That Vote 25, in the amount of \$2,698,000, under HEALTH—Patented Medicines Prices Review Board—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 31 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 32.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 20—FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 32

That Vote 20, in the amount of \$96,498,000, under FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE—Canadian International Development Agency—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 32 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 33.

• (2520)

Supply

[Translation]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE NO. 25—FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 33

That Vote 25, in the amount of \$1,341,069,000, under FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE—Canadian International Development Agency—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 33 agreed to)

[English]

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 34.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—JUSTICE

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 34

That Vote 5, in the amount of \$283,651,000, under JUSTICE—Department—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

• (2525)

The House divided on Motion No. 34, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 206)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Baker

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Beaumier

Supply

Bélair
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Coderre
Collenette
Copp
Desjarlais
Dion
Dockrill
Drouin
Earle
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murray
Nault
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Proctor
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—147

Bellemare
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
DeVillers
Discepola
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Laliberte
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Minna
Myers
Normand
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guimond
Harris
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Laurin
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Nunziata
Penson
Power
Ramsay
Ritz
Scott (Skeena)
Stinson
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—94

Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison
Casey
Chatters
Cummins
Debien
Duncan
Epp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Konrad
Loubier
Lunn
Manning
Mark
Matthews
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Muisse
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Reynolds
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Jacques
Thompson (Charlotte)
Turp
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Crête
de Savoye	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe	Dumas
Gray (Windsor West)	Guay
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Lalonde
Lincoln	MacAulay
Marchand	Marleau
McWhinney	Mitchell
O'Brien (Labrador)	Perron
Phinney	Proud
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
St-Hilaire	Vancief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 34 carried.

● (2530)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit

Ablonczy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Supply

Motion No. 35

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$809,752,000, under FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE—Department—Operating Expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 35 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 36.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 36

That Vote 5, in the amount of \$81,661,000, under FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE—Department—Capital Expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

(Motion No. 36 agreed to)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 37.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10—FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 37

That Vote 10, in the amount of \$288,570,000, under FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE—Department—Grants and Contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 37 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 38.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 25—INDUSTRY

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 38

That Vote 25, in the amount of \$258,918,000, under INDUSTRY—Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour 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.

Some hon. members: On division.

Supply

(Motion No. 38 agreed to)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 39.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 60—INDUSTRY

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 39

That Vote 60, in the amount of \$216,376,000, under INDUSTRY—Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 39 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 40.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 120—INDUSTRY

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 40

That Vote 120, in the amount of \$231,263,000, under INDUSTRY—Western Economic Diversification—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The English translation of the motion that was just put before the House indicated that it was \$250,263,000 as opposed to \$231,263,000, a difference of \$19 million.

• (2535)

The Deputy Speaker: I am sure that the hon. member is correct in the figures. He cited the exact figure of \$231,263,000.

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 to will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 40 agreed to)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 41.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 41

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$372,776,000, under NATURAL RESOURCES—Department—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 41 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 42.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 35—CANADIAN HERITAGE

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 42

That Vote 35, in the amount of \$19,181,000, under CANADIAN HERITAGE—Canada Information Office—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

Supply

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.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 42 agreed to)

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 43.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—TREASURY BOARD

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 43

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$73,766,000, under TREASURY BOARD—Secretariat—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 43 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 44.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 2—TREASURY BOARD

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 44

That Vote 2, in the amount of \$44,229,000, under TREASURY BOARD—Secretariat—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour 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.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 44 agreed to)

[*English*]

Mr. Ken Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We are dealing with millions and billions of dollars. It is totally appropriate for you to go as far as reading the motion as to read the number so that we know it is accurate.

The Deputy Speaker: I go as far as the House demands. When I asked if I could dispense there was a chorus of yeases and I dispensed.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would ask the Chair to kindly slow down because it is very difficult for members to follow the English translation. I would ask you to slow down if you might.

The Deputy Speaker: It is getting late and we do have to try to move through the work.

The next question is on Motion No. 45.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—TREASURY BOARD

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 45

That Vote 5, in the amount of \$450,000,000, under TREASURY BOARD—Secretariat—Government Contingencies, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Supply

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 having risen:

• (2545)

(The House divided on Motion No. 45, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 207)***YEAS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Baker	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Copps
Cullen	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
Lee	Leung
Longfield	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
Nystrom	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proctor
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Stoffer

Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—145

Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcyia-Leis
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Dalphond-Guiral
Borotsik	Elley
Brien	Forseth
Casey	Gagnon
Chatters	Girard-Bujold
Cummins	Golding
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Guimond
Epp	Hart
Fournier	Herron
Gauthier	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Jaffer
Grey (Edmonton North)	Keddy (South Shore)
Harris	Konrad
Harvey	Loubier
Hill (Macleod)	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Hilstrom	Marceau
Jones	Matthews
Kennedy (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Ménard
Laurin	Meredith
Lowther	Morrison
Manning	Nunziata
Mark	Pankiw
Mayfield	Penson (Drummond)
Mercier	Price
Mills (Red Deer)	Ritz
Muise	Scott (Skeena)
Obhrai	Stinson
Penson	Strahl
Power	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Ramsay	Turp
Schmidt	White (North Vancouver)
Solberg	
St-Jacques	
Thompson (Charlotte)	
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	
Williams—82	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Crête	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe	Dumas
Gray (Windsor West)	Guay
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Lalonde
Lincoln	MacAulay
Marchand	Marleau
McWhinney	Mitchell
O'Brien (Labrador)	Perron
Phinney	Proud
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
St-Hilaire	Vanclief

Supply

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 45 carried.

Mr. Joe Comuzzi: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I apologize for being absent when the vote was started on the last motion. Would you be kind enough to record my vote as voting with my government?

The Deputy Speaker: I think in the circumstances that will require the unanimous consent of the House and I expect you might have trouble.

The next question is on Motion No. 46.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 95—INDUSTRY

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 46

That Vote 95, in the amount of \$6,409,000, under INDUSTRY—Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

[*English*]

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.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 46 agreed to)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 47.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 100—INDUSTRY

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 47

That Vote 100, in the amount of \$84,201,000, under INDUSTRY—Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council—Grants, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour 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.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 47 agreed to)

• (2550)

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 48.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10—ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 48

That Vote 10, in the amount of \$32,178,000, under ENVIRONMENT—Department—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 48 agreed to)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 49.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 20—PRIVY COUNCIL

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 49

That Vote 20, in the amount of \$2,614,000, under PRIVY COUNCIL—Chief Electoral Officer—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Supply

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 yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 49 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 50.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10—FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 50

That Vote 10, in the amount of \$41,594,000, under FISHERIES AND OCEANS—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour 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:

• (2600)

(The House divided on Motion No. 50, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 208*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Baker	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan

Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lee
Leung	Lill
Longfield	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Miffiin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proctor	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—150

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien	Brisson
Cadman	Casey
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	

Cummins
Doyle
Elley
Fournier
Gauthier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guimond
Harris
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Loubier
Lunn
Manning
Mark
Matthews
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Muisé
Obhrai
Penson
Power
Ramsay
Ritz
Scott (Skeena)
Stinson
Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp
White (North Vancouver)

Dalphond-Guiral
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Laurin
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Nunziata
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Reynolds
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Jacques
Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—88

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Crête
Debien
Dhaliwal
Duceppe
Gray (Windsor West)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Lincoln
Marchand
McWhinney
O'Brien (Labrador)
Phinney
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire

Asselin
Bakopanos
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis)
Dumas
Guay
Lalonde
MacAulay
Marleau
Mitchell
Perron
Proud
Sauvageau
Vanclief

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 50 carried.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 51.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN HERITAGE

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 51

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$96,322,000, under CANADIAN HERITAGE—Department—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

Supply

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 yeas have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 51 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 52.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—FINANCE

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 52

That Vote 5, in the amount of \$281,200,000, under FINANCE—Department—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour 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.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 52 agreed to)

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 53.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—PARLIAMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Supply

Motion No. 53

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$28,245,000, under PARLIAMENT—The Senate—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

• (2605)

(The House divided on Motion No. 53, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 209)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Baker	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casey
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dion
Discepola	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Folco
Fry	Gagliano
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lee	Leung
Longfield	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)

McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Power
Pratt	Price
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Charlotte)
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—148

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Bigas)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman
Chatters
Cummins
Desjardis
Duncan
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Hanger
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Konrad
Laurin
Loubier
Lunn
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McDonough
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Obhrai
Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay
Riis
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vautour
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Crête	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe	Dumas
Gray (Windsor West)	Guay
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Lalonde
Lincoln	MacAulay
Marchand	Marleau
McWhinney	Mitchell
O'Brien (Labrador)	Perron
Phinney	Proud
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
St-Hilaire	Vanclief

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 53 carried.

Mr. John Herron: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to seek unanimous consent of the House for me to reverse my vote on that last motion.

Some hon. members: No.

• (2610)

The Deputy Speaker: I am afraid there is no consent.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. For the last vote I was required to leave the Chamber in the middle of the vote. Therefore I would request that my vote be struck.

The Deputy Speaker: The vote will be struck.

The next question is on Motion No. 54.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—CANADIAN HERITAGE

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 54

That Vote 5, in the amount of \$463,875,000, under CANADIAN HERITAGE—Department—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

An hon. member: On division.

Supply

(Motion No. 54 agreed to)

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 55.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 25—PRIVY COUNCIL

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 55

That Vote 25, in the amount of \$8,912,000, under PRIVY COUNCIL—Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour 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.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 55 agreed to)

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on the motion for concurrence. 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 yeas have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion agreed to)

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that Bill C-45, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1999, be read the first time.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that Bill C-45, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of

Supply

Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1999, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

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 yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Milliken in the chair.)

(On clause 2)

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Chairman, could the President of the Treasury Board please confirm that the bill is in its usual form?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Chairman, the form of this bill is the same as that passed in previous years.

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston, Ind.): Mr. Chairman, presumably hon. members are permitted to ask questions as we proceed through the clauses.

The Chairman: No, because the rules provide that there is no debate on this bill. Standing Order 81 provides that at 10 o'clock p.m. on the last supply day the Speaker will interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of all proceedings under supply without debate or amendments.

• (2615)

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, why did you permit the hon. member for Medicine Hat to ask a question?

The Chairman: Because there is a longstanding tradition that that question is asked on each bill to assure the House that the bill is in the usual form.

Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall clause 6 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Clause 6 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Chairman: Shall schedule 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Title agreed to)

[*English*]

(Bill reported)

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Supply

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

• (2625)

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

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

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to)

(Division No. 210)

The Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 1.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A)

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Vote 1a, in the amount of \$95,548,185, under JUSTICE—Department, in the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Baker
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Grose
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Leung
Mahoney
Maloney
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Patry
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Thibeault
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—129

YEAS

Members

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Coderre
Collenette
Coppes
DeVillers
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Knutson
Lee
Longfield
Malhi
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Minna
Myers
Normand
O'Reilly
Paradis
Peterson
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pratt
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Supply

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Blaikie	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Brien
Brisson	Cadman
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Doyle	Duncan
Earle	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Fournier	Gagnon
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guimond
Hanger	Harris
Hart	Harvey
Herron	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoeppner
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Konrad
Laliberte	Laurin
Lill	Loubier
Lowther	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Manning
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Nunziata	Nystrom
Pankiw	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Power
Proctor	Ramsay
Reynolds	Riis
Ritz	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Solomon	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Strahl
Thompson (Charlotte)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Wasylycia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—97

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Crête	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe	Dumas
Gray (Windsor West)	Guay
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Lalonde
Lastewka	Lincoln
MacAulay	Marceau
Marchand	Marleau
McWhinney	Mitchell
O'Brien (Labrador)	Perron
Phinney	Proud
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
St-Hilaire	Vanclief

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

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Vote 11a, in the amount of \$13,800,000, under AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD—Department—Debt forgiveness, in the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 2 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 3.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Vote 26a, in the amount of \$4,600,000, under PRIVY COUNCIL—Millennium Bureau of Canada—Operating expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 3 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 4.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Supply

Motion No. 4

That Vote 27a, in the amount of \$40,000,000, under PRIVY COUNCIL—Millennium Bureau of Canada—The Grants listed in the Estimates and contributions, in the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 4 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 5.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Vote 95a, in the amount of \$625,000, INDUSTRY—Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council—Operating expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 5 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 6.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 6

That Vote 100a, in the amount of \$8,300,000, INDUSTRY—Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council—The Grants listed in the Estimates, in the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 6 agreed to)

• (2630)

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

That the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, except any vote disposed of earlier today, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to)

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that Bill C-46, entitled an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1999, be read the first time.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that the bill be read a second time and referred to committee of the whole.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Government Orders

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Milliken in the chair)

(On Clause 2)

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Chairman, could the President of the Treasury Board please confirm that the bill is in its usual form?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Chairman, the form of the bill is the same as that passed in previous years.

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Chairman: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall clause 6 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 6 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall schedule 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1 agreed to)

[*English*]

The Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Title agreed to)

(Bill reported)

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that the bill be concurred.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to)

• (2635)

The Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

JUDGES ACT

The House resumed from June 4 consideration of Bill C-37, an act to amend the Judges Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Thursday, June 4, 1998, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions on the motions at report stage of Bill C-37.

The question is on Motion No. 1.

• (2640)

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

(Division No. 211)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bigras
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Desjarlais
Duncan	Earle
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Fournier
Gagnon	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond	Hanger
Harris	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Konrad
Laliberte	Lill
Loubier	Lowther
Lunn	Manning
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McDonough
McNally	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Nunziata
Nystrom	Obhrai
Pankiw	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Solomon	Stinson
Stoffer	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vautour
Wasylycia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—82

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Baker
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte

Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cullen
DeVillers	Dion
Discepolo	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keddy (South Shore)
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lee	Leung
Longfield	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peterson
Pettigrew	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Power
Pratt	Price
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Charlotte)
Ur	Valeri
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—145	

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Crête	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe	Dumas
Gray (Windsor West)	Guay
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Lalonde
Lastewka	Lincoln

Government Orders

MacAulay
Marchand
McWhinney
O'Brien (Labrador)
Phinney
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire

Marceau
Marleau
Mitchell
Perron
Proud
Sauvageau
Vanclief

*Nil/aucun

NAYS

Members

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Crête
Debien
Dhaliwal
Duceppe
Gray (Windsor West)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Lastewka
MacAulay
Marchand
McWhinney
O'Brien (Labrador)
Phinney
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire

Asselin
Bakopanos
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis)
Dumas
Guay
Lalonde
Lincoln
Marceau
Marleau
Mitchell
Perron
Proud
Sauvageau
Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 lost.

Mr. Ted White: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would just like confirmation that the vote of the member for Burlington was not counted. She was not sitting in her place.

The Speaker: She was not counted. The next question is on Motion No. 2. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[*Editor's Note: Chair read text of Motion No. 2 to House*]

• (2650)

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

(*Division No. 212*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Brien
Casey
Chatters
Cummins
Desjarlais
Duncan
Elley
Forseth
Gauthier
Gouk
Guimond
Harris
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Laliberte
Lill
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark
Mayfield
McNally
Meredith
Morrison
Nunziata
Obhrai
Penson
Power
Proctor
Reynolds
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Stoffer
Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Doyle
Earle
Epp
Gagnon
Gilmour
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Konrad
Laurin
Loubier
Lunn
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McDonough
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Muisé
Nystrom
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Ramsay
Ritz
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
St-Jacques
Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vautour
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—94

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 carried.

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I propose that you seek unanimous consent of the House to apply the results of the votes taken on report stage Motion No.1 standing in the name of the member from Berthier—Montcalm to the vote currently before the House, with the Liberal members voting yes with the exception of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development who has since left the Chamber.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

The Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to)

DNA IDENTIFICATION ACT

The House resumed from June 4 Bill C-3 consideration of the motion that Bill C-3, an act respecting DNA Identification and to make consequential amendments to the Criminal Code and other acts, be read the third time and passed; and of the amendment.

The Speaker: Pursuant order made on Thursday, June 4, 1998, the next deferred recorded division is on the amendment to the motion at the third reading stage of Bill C-3.

• (2700)

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

(Division No. 213)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Benoit	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brisson	Cadman
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Doyle	Duncan
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Harris	Hart
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Konrad
Lowther	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Manning
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Nunziata	Obhrai
Pankiw	Penson
Power	Price
Ramsay	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Stinson	St-Jacques
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—70

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellehumeur

Government Orders

Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brien	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Dalphond-Guiral
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fournier	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goodale
Graham	Grose
Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knudson
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Laurin	Lee
Leung	Lill
Longfield	Loubier
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proctor
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Ur	Valeri
Vautour	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan	Willert
Wood—168	

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Crête	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe	Dumas
Gray (Windsor West)	Guay
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Lalonde
Lastewka	Lincoln
MacAulay	Marceau
Marchand	Marleau
McWhinney	Mitchell
O'Brien (Labrador)	Perron
Phinney	Proud
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
St-Hilaire	Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

Mr. Dick Proctor: Mr. Speaker, it being 3 o'clock I wonder if you would declare question period over for the day.

The Speaker: I am willing.

* * *

MI'KMAQ EDUCATION ACT

The House resumed from June 8 consideration of Bill C-30, an act respecting the powers of the Mi'kmaq of Nova Scotia in relation to education, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions on the motions at the report stage of Bill C-30.

The question is on Motion No. 1.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I propose that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting no.

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

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I propose that the next three motions be deferred until 3 o'clock tomorrow.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

● (2710)

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

(Division No. 214)

YEAS

Members

Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Blaikie	Brien
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Dalphond-Guiral
Desjarlais	Earle
Fournier	Gagnon
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)	Guimond
Laliberte	Laurin
Lill	Loubier
McDonough	Ménard
Mercier	Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)	Proctor
Solomon	Stoffer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Vautour	Wasylcyia-Leis—33

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Brison
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cummins
DeVillers	Dion
Discepola	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton
Elley	Epp
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goldring	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Hanger	Harb
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Hubbard
Ianno	Ifody
Jackson	Jaffer

Government Orders

Jennings	Johnston
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lee
Leung	Longfield
Lowther	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchi	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Mayfield
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally	McTeague
Meredith	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Morrison	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
Nunziata	Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Pankiw
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Penson
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Power
Pratt	Price
Provenzano	Ramsay
Redman	Reed
Reynolds	Richardson
Ritz	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Scott (Skeena)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Solberg	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Wilfert
Williams	Wood—206

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Crête	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe	Dumas
Gray (Windsor West)	Guay
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Lalonde
Lastewka	Lincoln
MacAulay	Marceau
Marchand	Marleau
McWhinney	Mitchell
O'Brien (Labrador)	Perron
Phinney	Proud
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
St-Hilaire	Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

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

(Division No. 215)

YEAS

Members

Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Blaikie	Brien
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Dalphond-Guiral
Desjarlais	Earle
Fournier	Gagnon
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)	Guimond
Laliberte	Laurin
Lill	Loubier
McDonough	Ménard
Mercier	Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)	Proctor
Solomon	Stoffer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Vautour	Wasylycia-Leis—33

NAYS

Members

Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Baker
Beaumier	Bélair
Bellemare	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Brown	Caccia
Cauchon	Chan
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Dion
Duhamel	Eggleton
Finestone	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Goodale	Harb
Jackson	Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Lee
Manley	Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Normand	Peterson
Pettigrew	Robillard
Rock	Scott (Fredericton)
Speller	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Wappel	Wood—54

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Crête	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe	Dumas
Gray (Windsor West)	Guay
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Lalonde

Government Orders

Lastewka
MacAulay
Marchand
McWhinney
O'Brien (Labrador)
Phinney
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire

Lincoln
Marceau
Marleau
Mitchell
Perron
Proud
Sauvageau
Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 defeated.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion agreed to)

The Speaker: This House stands adjourned until 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 3.14 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Supply

Main Estimates, 1998-99

Mr. Keddy	7853
Mr. Wappel	7854
Mr. Keddy	7854
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	7854
Mr. Keddy	7855
Mr. McKay	7855
Mr. Jones	7856
Mr. McKay	7856
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	7856
Mr. McKay	7856
Mr. Abbott	7857
Mr. McKay	7857
Mr. Bonwick	7857
Mr. McKay	7857
Mr. Solberg	7857
Mr. McKay	7858
Mr. Jordan	7858
Mr. McKay	7858
Mr. Forseth	7858
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	7860
Mr. Forseth	7860
Mr. Muise	7860
Mr. Forseth	7860
Mr. Muise	7861
Mr. Karygiannis	7861
Mr. Forseth	7861
Mr. Telegdi	7861
Mr. Karygiannis	7863
Mr. Telegdi	7863
Mr. MacKay	7863
Mr. Telegdi	7864
Mr. Nunziata	7864
Mr. Adams	7865
Mr. Nunziata	7865
Mr. Cullen	7866
Mr. Nunziata	7866
Mr. Nunziata	7867
Mr. Discepola	7867
Mr. Discepola	7867
Mr. Nunziata	7868
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	7868
Mr. Nunziata	7868
Mr. Bryden	7869
Mr. Bryden	7869
Mr. Nunziata	7869
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	7869
Mr. MacKay	7872
Mr. Harb	7872
Mr. Epp	7872
Mr. Harb	7872
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	7872
Mr. Keddy	7872
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	7873
Mr. Discepola	7873
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	7873
Mr. Cullen	7873

Amendment negated	7875
Motion No. 1 agreed to	7876
Concurrence in Vote 1—Human Resources Development	
Mr. Massé	7876
Motion No. 2	7876
Motion No. 2 agreed to	7878
Concurrence in Vote 1—Industry	
Mr. Massé	7878
Motion No. 3	7878
Motion No. 3 agreed to	7879
Concurrence in Vote 1—Solicitor General	
Mr. Massé	7879
Motion No. 4	7879
(Motion No. 4 agreed to)	7879
Concurrence in Vote 15—Solicitor General	
Mr. Massé	7879
Motion No. 5	7879
Ms. Catterall	7879
Motion No. 5 agreed to	7881
Concurrence in Vote 25—Solicitor General	
Mr. Massé	7881
Motion No. 6	7881
Motion No. 6 agreed to	7882
Concurrence in Vote 35—Solicitor General	
Mr. Massé	7882
Motion No. 7	7882
Ms. Catterall	7882
Motion No. 7 agreed to	7883
Concurrence in Vote 45—Solicitor General	
Mr. Massé	7883
Motion No. 8	7883
Motion No. 8 agreed to	7884
Concurrence in Vote 5—Human Resources Development	
Mr. Massé	7885
Motion No. 9	7885
Motion No. 9 agreed to	7886
Concurrence in Vote 10—Human Resources Development	
Mr. Massé	7886
Motion No. 10	7886
Motion No. 10 agreed to	7887
Concurrence in Vote No. 1—Health	
Mr. Massé	7887
Motion No. 11	7887
Motion No. 11 agreed to	7888
Concurrence in Vote 1—Fisheries and Oceans	
Mr. Massé	7888
Motion No. 12	7888
Motion No. 12 agreed to	7889
Concurrence in Vote 1—National Defence	
Mr. Massé	7890
Motion No. 13	7890
Motion No. 13 agreed to	7891
Concurrence in Vote 1—Finance	
Mr. Massé	7891
Motion No. 14	7891
Motion No. 14 agreed to	7892

Concurrence in Vote 1—Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Mr. Massé	7893
Motion No. 15	7893
(Motion No. 15 agreed to)	7893
Concurrence in Vote 1—Environment	
Mr. Massé	7893
Motion No. 16	7893
(Motion No. 16 agreed to)	7893
Concurrence in Vote 1—Privy Council	
Mr. Massé	7893
Motion No. 17	7893
(Motion No. 17 agreed to)	7893
Concurrence in Vote 1—Indian Affairs and Northern Development	
Mr. Massé	7893
Motion No. 18	7893
(Motion No. 18 agreed to)	7893
Concurrence in Vote 5—Indian Affairs and Northern Development	
Mr. Massé	7893
Motion No. 19	7893
(Motion No. 19 agreed to)	7894
Concurrence in Vote 15—Indian Affairs and Northern Development	
Mr. Massé	7894
Motion No. 20	7894
(Motion No. 20 agreed to)	7894
Concurrence in Vote 30—Indian Affairs and Northern Development	
Mr. Massé	7894
Motion No. 21	7894
(Motion No. 21 agreed to)	7894
Concurrence in Vote 35—Indian Affairs and Northern Development	
Mr. Massé	7894
Motion No. 22	7894
(Motion No. 22 agreed to)	7894
Concurrence in Vote 25—Human Resources Development	
Mr. Massé	7895
Motion No. 23	7895
(Motion No. 23 agreed to)	7895
Concurrence in Vote 30—Human Resources Development	
Mr. Massé	7895
Motion No. 24	7895
(Motion No. 24 agreed to)	7895
Concurrence in Vote 1—Transport	
Mr. Massé	7895
Motion No. 25	7895
(Motion No. 25 agreed to)	7895
Concurrence in Vote 30—Transport	
Mr. Massé	7895
Motion No. 26	7895
(Motion No. 26 agreed to)	7895
Concurrence in Vote 5—Health	
Mr. Massé	7895
Motion No. 27	7895
(Motion No. 27 agreed to)	7896
Concurrence in Vote 10—Health	
Mr. Massé	7896
Motion No. 28	7896
(Motion No. 28 agreed to)	7896

Concurrence in Vote 15—Health	
Mr. Massé	7896
Motion No. 29	7896
(Motion No. 29 agreed to)	7896
Concurrence in Vote 20—Health	
Mr. Massé	7896
Motion No. 30	7896
(Motion No. 30 agreed to)	7896
Concurrence in Vote 25—Health	
Mr. Massé	7896
Motion No. 31	7896
(Motion No. 31 agreed to)	7897
Concurrence in Vote 20—Foreign Affairs and International Trade	
Mr. Massé	7897
Motion No. 32	7897
(Motion No. 32 agreed to)	7897
Concurrence in Vote No. 25—Foreign Affairs and International Trade	
Mr. Massé	7897
Motion No. 33	7897
(Motion No. 33 agreed to)	7897
Concurrence in Vote 5—Justice	
Mr. Massé	7897
Motion No. 34	7897
Motion No. 34 agreed to	7898
Concurrence in Vote 1—Foreign Affairs and International Trade	
Mr. Massé	7898
Motion No. 35	7899
(Motion No. 35 agreed to)	7899
Concurrence in Vote 5—Foreign Affairs and International Trade	
Mr. Massé	7899
Motion No. 36	7899
(Motion No. 36 agreed to)	7899
Concurrence in Vote 10—Foreign Affairs and International Trade	
Mr. Massé	7899
Motion No. 37	7899
(Motion No. 37 agreed to)	7899
Concurrence in Vote 25—Industry	
Mr. Massé	7899
Motion No. 38	7899
(Motion No. 38 agreed to)	7900
Concurrence in Vote 60—Industry	
Mr. Massé	7900
Motion No. 39	7900
(Motion No. 39 agreed to)	7900
Concurrence in Vote 120—Industry	
Mr. Massé	7900
Motion No. 40	7900
Mr. Nunziata	7900
(Motion No. 40 agreed to)	7900
Concurrence in Vote 1—Natural Resources	
Mr. Massé	7900
Motion No. 41	7900
(Motion No. 41 agreed to)	7900
Concurrence in vote 35—Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Massé	7900
Motion No. 42	7900
(Motion No. 42 agreed to)	7901
Concurrence in Vote 1—Treasury Board	
Mr. Massé	7901
Motion No. 43	7901

(Motion No. 43 agreed to)	7901
Concurrence in vote 2—Treasury Board	
Mr. Massé	7901
Motion No. 44	7901
(Motion No. 44 agreed to)	7901
Concurrence in Vote 5—Treasury Board	
Mr. Massé	7901
Motion No. 45	7901
Motion No. 45 agreed to	7902
Concurrence in Vote 95—Industry	
Mr. Massé	7903
Motion No. 46	7903
(Motion No. 46 agreed to)	7903
Concurrence in Vote 100—Industry	
Mr. Massé	7903
Motion No. 47	7903
(Motion No. 47 agreed to)	7903
Concurrence in Vote 10—Environment	
Mr. Massé	7903
Motion No. 48	7903
(Motion No. 48 agreed to)	7903
Concurrence in Vote 20—Privy Council	
Mr. Massé	7903
Motion No. 49	7903
(Motion No. 49 agreed to)	7904
Concurrence in Vote 10—Fisheries and Oceans	
Mr. Massé	7904
Motion No. 50	7904
Motion No. 50 agreed to	7905
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Massé	7905
Motion No. 51	7905
(Motion No. 51 agreed to)	7905
Concurrence in Vote 5—Finance	
Mr. Massé	7905
Motion No. 52	7905
(Motion No. 52 agreed to)	7905
Concurrence in Vote 1—Parliament	
Mr. Massé	7905
Motion No. 53	7906
Motion No. 53 agreed to	7907
Concurrence in Vote 5—Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Massé	7907
Motion No. 54	7907
(Motion No. 54 agreed to)	7907
Concurrence in vote 25—Privy Council	
Mr. Massé	7907
Motion No. 55	7907
Motion No. 55 agreed to	7907
(Motion agreed to)	7907
Bill C-45. First Reading	7907
Mr. Massé	7907
(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)	7907
Second Reading	7907
Mr. Massé	7907
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Milliken in the chair.)	7908
(On clause 2)	7908
Mr. Solberg	7908
Mr. Massé	7908
Mr. Nunziata	7908
(Clause 2 agreed to)	7908

(Clause 3 agreed to)	7908
(Clause 4 agreed to)	7908
(Clause 5 agreed to)	7908
(Clause 6 agreed to)	7908
(Schedule 1 agreed to)	7908
(Clause 1 agreed to)	7908
(Preamble agreed to)	7908
(Title agreed to)	7908
(Bill reported)	7908
Motion for concurrence	7908
Mr. Massé	7908
(Motion agreed to)	7909
Third reading	7909
Mr. Massé	7909
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)	7909
Supplementary Estimates (A)	
Mr. Massé	7909
Motion No. 1	7909
Motion No. 1 agreed to	7910
Mr. Massé	7910
Motion No. 2	7910
(Motion No. 2 agreed to)	7910
Mr. Massé	7910
Motion No. 3	7910
(Motion No. 3 agreed to)	7910
Mr. Massé	7910
Motion No. 4	7910
(Motion No. 4 agreed to)	7911
Mr. Massé	7911
Motion No. 5	7911
(Motion No. 5 agreed to)	7911
Mr. Massé	7911
Motion No. 6	7911
(Motion No. 6 agreed to)	7911
Mr. Massé	7911
Motion for concurrence	7911
(Motion agreed to)	7911
Bill C-46. First Reading	7911
Second reading	7911
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Milliken in the chair)	7912
(On Clause 2)	7912
Mr. Solberg	7912
Mr. Massé	7912
(Clause 2 agreed to)	7912
(Clause 3 agreed to)	7912
(Clause 4 agreed to)	7912
(Clause 5 agreed to)	7912
(Clause 6 agreed to)	7912
(Schedule 1 agreed to)	7912
(Clause 1 agreed to)	7912
(Preamble agreed to)	7912
(Title agreed to)	7912
(Bill reported)	7912
Motion for concurrence	7912
(Motion agreed to)	7912
Third reading	7912
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)	7912
Judges Act	
Bill C-37. Report stage	7912
The Speaker	7913
Motion No. 1 negatived	7914
Motion No. 2 agreed to	7914

Motion for concurrence	7914
Ms. McLellan	7914
(Motion agreed to)	7914

DNA Identification Act

Bill C-3. Third reading	7915
The Speaker	7915
Amendment negatived	7916

Mi'kmaq Education Act

Bill C-30. Report stage	7916
The Speaker	7916
Motion No. 1 negatived	7917
Motion No. 2 negatived	7918
Motion for concurrence	7918
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	7918
(Motion agreed to)	7918

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :

<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada – Édition, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9.