



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 228 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Thursday, May 13, 1999**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

## CONTENTS

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

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

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, May 13, 1999

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1005)

[*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 three petitions.

\* \* \*

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### CANADIAN HERITAGE

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

Pursuant to its order of reference of Friday, April 23, 1999, the committee has considered Bill C-64, an act to establish an indemnification program for travelling exhibitions, and has agreed to report it with amendments. The bill was passed unanimously.

[*English*]

#### PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I move that the 74th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House yesterday, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to)

## PETITIONS

### IMMIGRATION

**Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to present a petition signed by several hundred constituents in the Toronto area.

The petitioners state that the current immigration sponsorship requirements are very high for an average person to sponsor a relative. Therefore they call upon parliament to ask the Department of Citizenship and Immigration to review the existing fee structure and combine the landing and processing fee into one fee, which would lower the expense to \$500 per application.

• (1010)

### IMPAIRED DRIVING

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of citizens of the general Peterborough area who are concerned about drinking and driving.

The petitioners pray that parliament immediately amend the Criminal Code to add mobile digital breath test units to the list of approved instruments under the Criminal Code, that the police be authorized to use passive alcohol sensors in impaired driving enforcement, that the police be authorized to demand a physical co-ordination test from any driver reasonably suspected of drinking, and that this test be admissible in court.

### KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present another petition. This petition has been signed by hundreds of people in Peterborough, Kingston and other parts of southern Ontario who are concerned about the 18,000 Canadians who suffer from end-stage kidney disease.

The petitioners point out that those on kidney dialysis and those who have had successful kidney transplants recognize the importance of the bioartificial kidney approach to the treatment of kidney disease. The petitioners also point out that there are inadequate kidney treatment facilities across the country and they call upon parliament to work and support research on the bioartificial kidney

*Routine Proceedings*

which will eventually eliminate the need for both dialysis and transplantation for those suffering from kidney disease.

[Translation]

## IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present the following petition.

The undersigned residents of Canada draw the attention of the House to the following: that the current immigration sponsorship requirements are very high for an average person; that specifically maintaining an adequate income to support an immigrant is excessive for one person to bear; and that Canada is a multicultural country and immigrants are a great contribution to multiculturalism in Canada. Therefore, the petitioners call upon parliament to ask the Department of Citizenship and Immigration to review the existing income requirements to allow all potential sponsors to not be unduly burdened by them and request that more than one person be allowed to sponsor the same individual and share the responsibility of financial support for that immigrant.

## CANADA POST

**Mr. Charles Hubbard (Miramichi, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition from hundreds of people in New Brunswick who express concerns about the condition of work and contracting arrangements between Canada Post and the rural mail carriers group.

## IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present a petition with over 2,500 signatures which highlights the contribution that immigrants make to our great country of Canada and the desire by many to sponsor their families.

The petitioners mention the high landing fee and processing fee per application and they ask our government to combine the processing fee and landing fee into one, thereby reducing the total cost per application to \$500.

**Ms. Maria Minna (Beaches—East York, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am also pleased to present a petition with well over 1,000 signatures from people of my riding, as well as the general Toronto area, concerning landing fees.

The petitioners request parliament to ask the Department of Citizenship and Immigration to consider lowering the landing fee, which they feel is too high, and to consider combining the landing fee and the charge for administration to lower the expense.

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the following question will be answered today: Question No. 203.

[Text]

Question No. 203—**Mr. Paul Forseth:**

With respect to the restoration of the Stanley Theatre in Vancouver, what are the amounts of the federal government's financial contributions, including low interest or interest free loans, tax incentives or grants?

**Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification), Lib.):** Western economic diversification has provided one federal contribution of \$1.3 million through the infrastructure works program to renovate the Stanley Theatre in Vancouver.

[Translation]

**Mr. Peter Adams:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[English]

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, on November 23, 1998, I placed Question No. 169 on the order paper. The question asked how many gun smugglers and illegal gun traffickers have been identified, prosecuted and convicted in Canada using the gun registration system. In accordance with Standing Order 39, I asked for a written answer within 45 days. My constituents and I have now been waiting 169 days. Why can the government not answer my questions in 45 days as it promised? When can I expect an answer to Question No. 169.

• (1015)

**Mr. Peter Adams:** Mr. Speaker, I know of the hon. member's great interest in Question No. 169 and I will follow-up on this question.

However, in the area of petitions, we are running at well over 90%, having received several thousand petitions. In the area of questions, we are running at 75%. Some questions involve questioning every department of the government and some questions only involve questioning one department of the government. I assure the member I will follow up on Question No. 169.

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz:** Mr. Speaker, that excuse would not apply to this next point of order.

On December 9, 1998, I placed Question No. 185 on the order paper asking for a list of contracts between the government and the consulting firm KPMG, Peat Marwick Thorne. Again, in accor-

*Government Orders*

dance with Standing Order 39, I asked for a written answer within 45 days. I have now been waiting 156 days. I have been waiting three times as long as the standing orders require.

Why do I have to raise multiple points of order to get answers to my written questions? The government is really interfering with my ability to do my job. When can I expect an answer to Question No. 185? A real serious pattern has developed here. The government should answer within 45 days and it is not doing so.

**Mr. Peter Adams:** Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to what the member has to say. I will certainly look into the whereabouts of the response to Question No. 185.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

• (1105)

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

(Division No. 425)

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[Translation]

**PUBLIC SECTOR PENSION INVESTMENT BOARD ACT**

BILL C-78—TIME ALLOCATION

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I move:

That, in relation to Bill C-78, An Act to establish the Public Sector Pension Investment Board, to amend the Public Service Superannuation Act, the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act, the Defence Services Pension Continuation Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Pension Continuation Act, the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and the Canada Post Corporation Act and to make a consequential amendment to another Act, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage of the Bill and one sitting day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the said Bill; and that, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time ordinarily provided for government business on the day allotted to the consideration of the report stage and on the day allotted to the third reading stage of the said Bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the Bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

**Some hon. members:** Shame, shame.

• (1020)

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**YEAS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaunier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Copps
Cullen	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Harb
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri

*Speaker's Ruling*

Pratt	Proud
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Speller	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—132

● (1110)

*[English]*

## REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from May 11 consideration of Bill C-78, an act to establish the Public Sector Pension Investment Board, to amend the Public Service Superannuation Act, the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act, the Defence Services Pension Continuation Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Pension Continuation Act, the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and the Canada Post Corporation Act and to make a consequential amendment to another act, as reported (with amendments) from the committee; and of Group No. 2.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Before we get into debate I would like to read this into the record.

I wish to advise the House that an error has been found in the research underlying the ruling on the report stage amendments proposed for Bill C-78.

As usual, when we considered the report stage amendments being proposed, we relied on the printed copy of the bill to provide the context for that study. In this particular case the first reading copy of Bill C-78 dated April 15, 1999 mistakenly omits the royal recommendation which accompanies the bill. Yesterday we noticed a discrepancy between the printed Bill C-78 and its listing on the order paper that correctly shows the bill accompanied by a royal recommendation.

Since the record shows that a royal recommendation is attached to the bill and this is invariably a key factor in considering the admissibility of amendments, I asked that my original ruling be reviewed.

Citation 596 found on page 183 of Beauchesne's sixth edition states that the royal recommendation lays down:

—once for all . . . not only the amount of the charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications.

Citation 698 found on page 207 of the same work states:

An amendment is out of order . . . if it extends the objects and purposes . . . in the Royal Recommendation.

Thus, because of well established precedents I have concluded that Motions Nos. 24, 25, 27 and 29 standing in the name of the hon. member for Scarborough Southwest and seconded by the hon. member for Calgary Centre are not in order and will be dropped from the order paper.

I regret this confusion and I wish to apologize to the House and particularly to the hon. members for Scarborough Southwest and Calgary Centre for this unfortunate situation.

**Mr. John Williams:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I find it rather distressing that you would seek to rule out of order

## NAYS

## Members

Ablonczy	Alarie
Anders	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman	Canuel
Casson	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Dalphondu-Guiral	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Doyle
Duceppe	Dumas
Earle	Elley
Epp	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guimond
Hanger	Hardy
Hart	Harvey
Herron	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Johnston	Konrad
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Lill	Lowther
Lunn	Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McNally
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Muisé
Nystrom	Obhrai
Pankiw	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Power
Price	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Ritz	Sauvageau
St-Jacques	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Turp
Vellacott	Wappel
Wayne	Williams—85

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cardin	Chan
Comuzzi	DeVillers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Guay
Marceau	Marchand
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)	O'Brien (Labrador)
Rocheleau	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	Szabo
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Volpe

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** I declare the motion carried.

*Government Orders*

several motions that have been made to amend this bill because it did not carry the royal recommendation at the very beginning. Yet you have allowed the bill to stand because the royal recommendation has been added at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, you mentioned that when the bill was first tabled it did not carry a royal recommendation but that was added at a subsequent point after these amendments were tabled, by the way I understand your ruling. Therefore, I think—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** If I may interrupt, no, that is definitely not the case. I hope that was not the impression made when I read the ruling.

The royal recommendation was in place. It was our error in not picking that up later that allowed the amendments to stand. The amendments should not have been accepted because the royal recommendation was attached to the bill from the very beginning. The error rests with the Speaker.

We will now proceed to debate.

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I stand here to finish my speech which I started the other day.

Of course, now the heat has been really turned up. What is happening is absolutely shameful. The government is ramming through legislation which does not bear the support of members of the public. It does not bear the support of the members most affected by this. The government is just shamefully using time allocation so that there will be no time for people to even talk about it.

• (1115)

Sure, we can talk about it here, but those blinking Liberals over there—

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Ken Epp:** Yes, blinking. I just called them blinking Liberals, that is all I said. There is nothing bad about that. It is as bad as I can get under the rules of the House.

We have all of those members standing up on command today, except for one, saying, "I do not want to disobey my party orders. I'll just vote for it".

I have come to the conclusion that these members do that because their own pensions depend on this. Let us stop and think about this. If a member wants to be eligible for that gold-plated MP pension plan, which past Conservative, Liberal, NDP and Bloc parties set up, voted for and accepted, the member must serve for six years. If members disobey party orders in their first term, the

Prime Minister, in exercising discipline, could simply say that he will not sign their nomination forms. This basically means that they would not get re-elected. They could also put their own MP pension plan at risk if they disobey the party orders. Consequently, because we have a majority government, we have absolutely no way of stopping legislation which is clearly bad.

In this particular bill we have motions brought forward in part of the MP pension plan and other plans that say that the government will just simply take the money back.

I know why the Liberals want time allocation. I know why they want to jam this through by the end of the week. I know why they do not want anyone to talk about it too much. It is because of all the seniors who are affected, all the civil servants who are affected and all the taxpayers who are affected by this. None of them will have an opportunity to actually organize and get their opposition to the bill heard here before it is a fait accompli. That is absolutely shameful.

I am not surprised that the Liberals are doing it. I remember a bank robbery in Edmonton not long ago. They had a getaway car because when people take money that does not belong to them, they do not want to hang around too long. Obviously these guys want to grab the money and run, otherwise someone might catch on to it. It is absolutely ridiculous what the Liberals are doing. If I were a Liberal I would be hanging my head in shame at this stage.

We are debating the motions in Group No. 2. A lot of people do not realize that the motions in Group No. 2 are meant to sustain the current definition of family and marriage as it has long been held through centuries.

The Liberal government has presented a bill which takes away \$30 billion from the people to whom it belongs and is also sneaking a revision into the bill of the definition of spouse. Instead of calling it a surviving spouse, the government has subtly changed it to survivor. The survivor of course is whoever one chooses, but the bill attempts to jam through that partners in a conjugal relationship can also be survivors.

How the dickens are the Liberals going to find out who is in a conjugal relationship? I will give members an example. It just so happens that my son, when he was at university for three years, shared housing costs with another young lad. They cared for each other and shared expenses, but I absolutely and positively assure members that there was no conjugal relationship.

• (1120)

What if one of them had died during the time when they were sharing this apartment? There could have been a benefit involved, but not in this particular case because this involves pensions. However, now that I think about it, I guess my son did have some credits under the Canada pension which this could apply to. He could say that they were in a conjugal relationship. How would

*Government Orders*

anyone be able to prove otherwise? Will the Liberals stand on command next week if a motion is put to the House to install video cameras in everyone's bedroom so we can see if they are conjugating. This is so ridiculous and offensive. Furthermore, it is in opposition to what almost every MP in the House voted against.

In the six years since we have been here we have had a number of occasions when these exact questions on same sex benefits have been asked. I remember way back when one of the Bloc members had such a motion, 10 Liberals stood in favour of it while everyone else was either against it or absent. Only 10 Liberals voted for it. Why are they now for it? It is because their pension plan depends on them voting for this one. They are told how to vote and they simply comply.

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the member for Elk Island was getting quite vociferous, and rightly so. He was trying to point out that the government, through Bill C-78, is overturning all the norms of society. It is allowing through the back door changes affecting same sex marriages and so on. It is becoming a term that is used in society every day.

When I arrived at my desk this morning I had a government response to a petition that I tabled in the House some time ago regarding marriage and so on. Let me read the government's response. It states:

The term "marriage" in Canada is clear in law and is defined as "the union of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others". There is no need to either enact this definition in legislation or to amend any existing legislation. The definition of marriage in federal law is not in a statute passed by Parliament, but is found in what is called the federal common law dating from 1866 British case of *Hyde and Hyde v. Woodmansee*, L.R. 1 P. & D. 130. This case has been applied consistently in Canada and states that no marriage can exist between two persons of the same sex, and is void *ab initio*, similar to "marriages" made within prohibited degrees of consanguinity.

This government remains committed to supporting Canadian families and there are no plans to legislate a change to the definition of the term "marriage". The definition of marriage is clear in law in Canada and has been successfully defended before the courts as the union of two persons of the opposite sex.

The government says it is committed to maintaining marriage as it is seen in the eyes of the Canadian people, but through the back door it is ignoring marriage and is now into conjugal relationships and cohabitation. What this long sentence means is that any kind of sexual relationship, perverted or otherwise, is now deemed to be the norm and will therefore qualify for survivor benefits under this pension.

I would have thought that the government, which is here to represent the Canadian people and uphold the laws of the land and which tells us that marriage as defined is the law of the land as accepted by all Canadians, is allowing that venerable, holy institution of marriage to be watered down, defiled, changed and become anything whatsoever. That is a serious affront to many Canadians across the land and to the sanctity of their marriage. As it states here, a marriage is the union of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others. However, in the eyes of the government that no longer matters.

• (1125)

We have a serious problem with single parent families in the country. A large percentage of them are poor and rely on some form of government assistance. Research is now telling us that children brought up in a single parent family may not develop as well emotionally as children growing up in a two parent family. We are now being pressured by same sex couples to adopt children. We now have same sex couples demanding the right of marriage. We see the definition here saying that they want the same rights as everybody else.

We have to recognize that people of the same sex form associations and live together as couples, but let us not call it marriage by any stretch of the imagination. The government is failing Canadian society when it allows the encroachment of the idea that any kind of relationship can be called marriage.

We are talking about survivor benefits under pension plans for the civil service. When an employee, who was living with someone or was married, died in his or her old age what would happen to the person's survivor? Our society said that the survivor should be cared for. However, we are now questioning the definition of a survivor. Anybody who has any kind of a relationship with the retired employee seems to be now called a survivor provided there is some kind of conjugal relationship going on.

As the member for Elk Island pointed out, will we be installing video cameras in every bedroom? Are we going to have sex police around to check on whether there is some kind of conjugal relationship going on or not. I do not know. The government has never said and I do not think it intends to say.

When we had the lawyer from the Department of Justice and Treasury Board before committee last week—the bill is being rushed through by the way—I asked about the common law conjugal relationship.

I know this is a sensitive and delicate issue that one does not normally talk about in public, but we do have to get the facts on the table. If two people are living common law and that common law relationship ceases to exist before one of the persons dies then there will be no survivorship entitlement.

I put forth the scenario of a retiree whose health is gone. One person is living in a nursing home and the other person is living at home. They are not cohabiting and they may not cohabit for several years because the health of the retiree is completely gone. One has to assume there is also no conjugal relationship. Therefore, under the law, as proposed by the government, the survivor would not qualify, even if the couple had been living together for 40 years.

I posed that point to the lawyers. They told me that the courts would probably be lenient and recognize it. Again the House is deferring to the courts to write the laws that we know, as we stand and debate the bill, are flawed and deficient. Under the above



*Government Orders*

circumstance, that couple would have no protection at all. The government knows it, we know it and the lawyers know it.

The government does not know how to deal with the issue because it is kind of technical and complex. At the same time, it wants to extend survivor benefits to virtually every kind of relationship we can think of. It wants the courts to figure it out. We complained in the House about the courts dictating to parliament and about abdicating our responsibility to write legislation that is clear, definitive and which makes it obvious what is meant. I think the bill is absolutely terrible.

• (1130)

We will be debating other issues in a few minutes when we move on to the financial side of the bill. However I wanted to put on the record that the government says it is clearly committed to upholding marriage. By its omission and commission it is circumventing the whole institution of marriage. It is not upholding it. It is allowing it to be overwhelmed by people who do not understand the sanctity of marriage. Therefore, we have a problem in the land, led by a government which does not stand up for principles any more.

Our great society was built by people who came here for freedom and opportunity. They have prospered and lived together in the sanctity of marriage. They have raised families. They did a wonderful job of building the country from nothing. Because the government has no desire to uphold the principles people have been living by for generation after generation, we are seeing the erosion of our standards. We see that through its back door attempts at eliminating and undermining the sanctity of marriage. That is why we are opposed to it.

I am very disappointed in your ruling a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, on the disallowance of the motions. I understand the point you are coming from; it is just rather unfortunate that the wrong bill was used. In closing, I hope the government would withdraw the bill and rethink the whole issue.

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in the next few moments I will express my concern as well with this group of amendments.

The government is bringing in through the back door what it does not have the courage to do openly. It is becoming more and more obvious as we look at this group of amendments that there is a real problem. I have a hard time understanding how the Liberals can sit in their seats and calmly observe and accept the whole process that is taking place because of its serious implications. They are faced with the questions we are asking, which I will summarize in a few moments.

I would like to defend the definitions of marriage, spouse and the traditional family. Unfortunately the Liberal government says one

thing and does the opposite. I have listened to what government members have said. They have used the excuse that the courts made them do it.

Who makes the laws in the country? Is it not supposed to be parliament? If it is not the people through their elected representatives making the laws in the country, we have a problem and we had better change the system.

The Liberals say that they are defending the family, except when they will not fight court cases that undermine it. That is at the root of this problem. The Liberals say that they are all for strengthening the family, except when they bring in laws to redefine it. I say that facetiously because they say one thing and do another.

Bill C-78 is yet another example of the Liberal government redefining marriage and spouse in federal legislation, thereby undermining the definition of the family which has served society so well for thousands of years.

Bill C-78 would not only extend survivor benefits to married couples, as it should be, but survivor has been redefined to include couples who cohabited in a relationship of a conjugal nature for at least a year before the death of the pension plan contributor. I found the word conjugal 19 different times in Bill C-78.

• (1135)

According to the government it does not matter whether one is a husband or a wife of a pensioner. If one is having sex with a government employee over a period of a year and that person dies, one is entitled to his or her pension benefits. That is what the legislation clearly says. That is what we will be approving in the House when we vote this evening on these amendments.

The Liberals are promoting a system whereby government benefits will be allotted on one's sexual relationships, and not on whether or not one is married. Is not ironic that the party of Pierre Trudeau who said that the government has no business in the bedrooms of the nation, is now willing to extend benefits because of what happens in the bedroom? What has happened in the last 20 or 30 years?

The Reform Party believes in the institution of marriage and would vigorously defend it in Canadian law. Reform policy defines marriage as:

—the union of a man and a woman as recognized by the state, and this definition will be used in the provision of spousal benefits for any program funded and administered by the federal government.

That is what we stand for and that is what we believe in. Opening up public benefits to conjugal relationship will create a nightmare. I want to conclude with four questions which must be answered by the government before it passes the legislation.

*Government Orders*

First, how will the government determine if a relationship is conjugal in nature? My colleagues have asked questions about whether it will put a camera in the bedroom.

Second, how will a survivor prove that his or her relationship with the dead pensioner was indeed of a conjugal nature? How will the survivor prove that when it comes to a court case or to claiming the benefits? What will the survivor do? Will our government now go into the bedrooms of the nation to determine whether or not there has been a conjugal relationship?

Third, why has the government shifted from a clearly defined test of legal marriage to a relationship that is open to anyone's definition and therefore abuse? We now have a clearly defined definition of marriage. Now it will do away with that and go to anyone's definition of it. This will open the door to tremendous abuse.

Fourth, and maybe the Liberals never even thought of it, how many survivors will there be? The spouse and one, two, three or more lovers who claim to have had a conjugal relationship with the pensioner? How many people will start claiming after the death of someone that they have had a relationship of a sexual nature with that person?

It will be a dream world for lawyers. I can just see the court cases coming forth as all these people claim that they slept with a person for a year. Another person will say "so did I", and so on. It is absolutely ridiculous what the legislation does and what it creates. Before we go any further I call upon the government to answer those four questions.

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

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The question is on Motion No. 15. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

• (1140)

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 17 to 23, 26, 28 and 30.

We will now proceed to Group No. 3.

[Translation]

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.)** moved:

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-78, in Clause 55, be amended by replacing lines 31 to 33 on page 31 with the following:

"set out in an Act of Parliament in respect of that portion.

(1.21) In subsection (1.2) "Act of Parliament" does not include a regulation made under that Act."

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 38

That Bill C-78, in Clause 113, be amended by replacing line 9 on page 94 with the following:

"71. (1) The Governor in Council shall, for"

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.)** moved:

Motion No. 39

That Bill C-78, in Clause 117, be amended by replacing lines 33 to 36 on page 96 with the following:

"at the contribution rates set out in an Act of Parliament in respect of that portion.

(1.011) In subsection (1.01), "Act of Parliament" does not include a regulation made under that Act."

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 46

That Bill C-78, in Clause 167, be amended by replacing line 20 on page 142 with the following:

"80. (1) The Governor in Council shall, for"

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.)** moved:

Motion No. 47

That Bill C-78, in Clause 171, be amended by replacing lines 24 to 27 on page 144 with the following:

"contributions rates set out in an Act of Parliament in respect of that portion.

(2.1) In subsection (2), "Act of Parliament" does not include a regulation made under that Act."

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 54

That Bill C-78, in Clause 206, be amended by replacing line 20 on page 189 with the following:

"41. (1) The Governor in Council shall, for"

*Government Orders*

• (1145)

[*English*]

**Mr. John Williams:** Mr. Speaker, basically the motions in Group No. 3 relate to the concept of good governance. This large section of Bill C-78 deals with the privatization of the civil service pension plan, out of which the government will take \$30 billion. We say that it has no right to that money, but it seems that the government is going to ram this bill through parliament so it can get the cash. That will still leave \$100 billion in the plan.

Over the next number of years the money will be converted from where it now sits, which is in government debt. The civil service pension plan carries approximately 25% of the government debt of \$579.3 billion. This money will be invested in the private sector through private capital markets on the Toronto stock exchange, as well as around the world if the government continues to relax foreign content rules.

When we have a plan of that magnitude one of the fundamental things we must put in place is the concept of good governance; rules and requirements to ensure that the fund is safe and secure.

Several witnesses appeared before the committee from the capital markets and the equity markets, professional people of great repute. They told us about good governance and how to manage this money to get a reasonable return on behalf of the investor without rolling the dice and perhaps losing the lot.

The concept of good governance ensures that the proper checks and balances are in place so that no one can run away and bet the bank.

I raise the issue of the pension fund in Orange County, California, which was a very large pension fund of about \$9 billion, only one-tenth the size of this plan. One manager of the fund thought he was so smart that he could play the futures market, he could play hedge funds, he could make a great career for himself by getting a phenomenal rate of return on the investment. One day he woke up and found he had bet the wrong way and had broken the bank. He had pushed the whole pension plan straight into bankruptcy because he had the authority to make investment decisions without the proper checks and balances and supervision to ensure that did not happen.

I think of Barings Bank, one of the great venerable banks of London, England. It had been around for the better part of 200 years, perhaps longer. It had been around a long time by ensuring good governance, respectability, and not assuming too much risk as the order of the day. Two hundred years is a good long time to thrive, prosper and to continue to do business. That bank expanded around the world. We remember the rogue dealer in Singapore who single-handedly destroyed the institution in a matter of weeks because he bet the wrong way and senior management, the auditors, the board of directors and the shareholders were not

supervising him closely enough. He broke the bank all by himself through lack of good governance.

Last year in New York there was a capital hedge fund which just about upset the entire capital markets of the free world because it found it had bet the wrong way on Italian bonds versus Russian bonds and so on, trying to grab that extra one-tenth of 1% or maybe one-hundredth of 1%, which would be big bucks when dealing with tens and hundreds of millions of dollars. They bet the wrong way and it just about broke them.

I want to ensure that this plan has good governance and the witnesses before the committee said it is absolutely imperative that we have good governance.

• (1150)

I recall one witness who said that his company had a large client. They were handling a very significant amount of cash and investments on behalf of this large client and had been given almost unfettered rein and authority to invest any way they wanted on behalf of the client. He felt that good governance was so important that he imposed upon himself a semi-annual audit; not an annual audit, a semi-annual audit; not just of the funds under his administration, but of the procedures, the processes, the checks and balances that he had in place to ensure that decisions were sound, reasonable, rational and could be defended.

We are putting in place a board of managers which will be nominated by various people. I suggested that the auditor general be the auditor for the special audits that this bill requires once every six years; not every six months as the witness before the committee imposed upon himself, but once every six years. A lot of money could be lost in six years. Once every six years there is to be a special audit; not just a financial audit, but an audit of procedures. Who better in this country has the resources than the Auditor General of Canada who does value-for-money audits of large government departments and so on? Who better than he to do the intense analyses of procedures, processes, checks and balances to ensure that this fund has the integrity to handle \$100 billion? What did the government say? "We do not want to hear about motions that introduce better governance".

When I said "Let us take some time to talk about governance and understand what kind of processes have been built in", the government was not interested. It said "Let us move on. Let us vote this through. It is a done deal. Next clause, please".

A great deal of supervision will be required for \$100 billion of taxpayers' money and civil service employees' money which will be invested in capital markets. I have very serious concerns about whether we will have the proper governance procedures in place. What can I say? One day we may wake up and, like the Barings Bank or the Orange County pension fund, find out it is gone.

Then we will ask: What happened? Who is to blame? The government will point its finger at some manager, the board of

*Government Orders*

directors, the auditor or the internal accountant and say “You are to blame” and he will lose his job. I submit that the blame lies here if that ever happens because we were not prepared to examine the governance issues and put them in place to guarantee that we have the best possible governance for one of the largest pension funds in North America. We have abdicated our responsibility.

I was speaking a few minutes ago on the issue of morality and now I am talking about financial accountability. The government is not prepared to put the processes and the rules in place to do the best it can with money which rightfully belongs to the people. What can I say?

I would like to be able to debate this all day. I would like to be able to talk to the auditor general and the investment community, ask them what we should be doing and incorporate that into the bill, but the government will not give us that opportunity.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétién (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, here I am back today, once again, with the famous Bill C-78.

This is a huge bill, with over 200 pages, which will affect hundreds and hundreds of thousands of employees in the public service. I have the bill here. It is clearly a huge document.

• (1155)

The government of the Prime Minister and member for Saint-Maurice is imposing closure—four hours to deal with such a huge bill—true to the Liberals’ democratic style.

This bill will allow the President of the Treasury Board and member for Hull—Aylmer to appropriate the surplus in the pension fund of 275,000 employees, just as this very same government has taken the \$21 billion surplus in the employment insurance fund by digging into the pockets of those with the least, those working on hourly wage, by making it harder to obtain EI and by artificially creating revenues because contributions are too high compared to the benefits the plan pays out. So, surpluses were created, and the finance minister, the ships minister, took \$21 billion.

Today, the President of the Treasury Board is preparing to take \$14.9 billion from the public service pension fund, \$2.4 billion from the employees of the RCMP and \$12.9 billion from the pensions of the Canadian armed forces, our military. This adds up to \$30.2 billion. Bill C-78, which will probably be passed this afternoon, will allow the President of the Treasury Board to take \$30.2 billion.

This affects 275,000 contributors. Of course, those who contributed in the past are now benefiting from the plan. There are 160,000 retirees and 52,000 surviving spouses receiving benefits.

These 212,000 people receive monthly payments totalling \$3.1 billion annually, while 275,000 contributors pay \$1.8 billion into the plan. The difference between what the plan takes in and what it pays out is \$1.3 billion annually.

But, if the present surplus of \$30.2 billion were well managed, it would bring in more than what the government pays out in monthly benefits. Public service, armed forces and RCMP employees could be given a premium holiday lasting a number of years.

I agree that this would not be a smart thing to do. But, and I am being perfectly honest here, I do not trust the government. I have seen how it treated the hourly workers of this country in its reform. I have seen how it treated the BC mine workers, who were laid off on November 1, 1997. Its track record is not good.

What is worse, this sends a clear message to the private sector that it can follow the lead of the government and the President of the Treasury Board and illegally help itself to the surpluses in employee funds. This is the message this government is sending the private sector.

This is precisely what happened to former BC mine workers, when their employer helped itself to part of the money in their pension fund, leaving some of them with a very small pension after 30 or 35 years of work. This is the sort of government we have.

• (1200)

In a 1998 press release, Treasury Board stated and I quote: “The President agreed with a number of the recommendations of the special advisory committee. . . [which] was the result of four years of dedicated work by union representatives, pensioners and government employees”.

Here we have a minister, who stated in February 1998 that he agreed with a number of the recommendations of an advisory committee on the Public Service Superannuation Act established by the government, not even recognizing the negotiations suggested in its report.

The President of Treasury Board is trampling roughshod over these recommendations and doing what he pleases. Gangway, he is coming through. And he will get his hands on a surplus to which he is not entitled.

At the present time, there are no provisions for the over \$30 billion that is excess to expenditures, and Bill C-78 enables the government to get its hands on a surplus the ownership of which, while not clearly defined, is morally the property of employees and ex-employees, i.e. pensioners.

It is going to get its hands on the dough, and then what it is going to do with it? It will probably argue that it invested it to reduce our collective debt. Once again, a small group of people will be footing

*Government Orders*

the bill for all Canadians, just like the hourly-paid workers of this country, who make excessive contributions to employment insurance and receive very little in the way of benefits, while the employment insurance fund has generated a surplus in excess of \$21 billion over four years. The government stole this surplus to reduce the collective debt and create budget surpluses for the minister of ships, thus allowing Ottawa to spend money in provincial jurisdictions.

The government did the same thing with the millennium scholarship program and a \$2.2 billion budget. It also showed disrespect for Quebec by giving the four Atlantic provinces close to \$1 billion in compensation for collecting the GST, while Quebec, which has been collecting the GST since 1991 under an agreement signed by Robert Bourassa and Prime Minister Mulroney, did not get one single dollar. This is what we call a double standard.

Under Bill C-78, contributions would be deposited in retirement funds and then transferred to the Public Sector Pension Investment Board. Who will manage the board? The appointment process will be very similar to that used for the Senate. The appointees, who will be responsible for managing and administering this fund, will be friends of the government.

The President of the Treasury Board will establish an advisory committee of eight persons. He will, of course, appoint eight of his friends, who will make a list of candidates—again chosen among the minister's friends—from which the board's 12 directors will be selected.

This is how the Prime Minister appoints his friends to the Senate and to the superior court. The former president of the Liberal Party of Canada was just rewarded by being appointed to the bench in my riding.

The Prime Minister appointed to the Senate the opponent of the Bloc Quebecois leader in the last general election, Liberal candidate Aurélien Gill, for having been defeated by my colleague. He was rewarded for his sacrifice by being appointed to the Senate until the age of 75.

• (1205)

The President of the Treasury Board will be no better than the Prime Minister. He too will appoint friends, who often are not qualified to administer a \$30 billion surplus.

[*English*]

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have a chance to join in the last dwindling minutes of the debate on Bill C-78.

As those in the House realize, in the last hour we have seen closure moved yet again. We are not going to have an opportunity

to go into the bill in nearly the depth that it certainly warrants. This is getting to be a real pattern. We have heard speaker after speaker comment on the fact that it is getting to be far too easy for the government to use closure and time allocation. They used to be very rare occurrences, but they are being used more and more frequently. Every time it meets the Liberals' expedient needs they have no qualms whatsoever about doing this.

This whole bill had its origins in a failure of the government to be able to negotiate a settlement with the unions and with the bargaining agents who have control over the pension plans. Now it is failing to use the democratic process to achieve its means.

I have always been of the mind that if your ideas have merit, they should be able to stand up to fair and honest debate and you will win the arguments. If the ideas come from a point of view that has more merits than the other arguments, then what would you be afraid of? The only time you should run from a free and open debate is when you know there is not a great deal of substance on your side of the argument. Then you have to take actions which I consider to be cowardly and circumvent the democratic process.

We are dealing with the amendments in Group No. 3. We have spoken to Group Nos. 1 and 2. Group No. 3 gets into some of the minutiae and detail dealing with the governance of this new public sector pension investment fund. This in itself could take up months and months of debate because a lot of things have been left unresolved in the bill as it stands.

We are going to have a 12 person board governing hundreds of billions of dollars of investment being openly invested in the free market. We have not really scratched the surface as to what impact that is going to have on the financial community.

Where are we going to invest this money? What kind of brokerage fees are we going to pay? What are the brokerage fees on a \$100 billion being invested and reinvested every day? I have heard estimates that it might be \$500 million to \$700 million a year in brokerage fees.

What firm are we going to use to convey these transactions? What is the risk or the possibility of conflict of interest if we are going to be wielding that kind of clout financially? If there are 12 people on this board who is to say they do not have some remote relationship with one investment firm or another? Do they sit on another board of directors as well as the public sector pension investment fund? The conflict of interest possibilities are enormous. We should have dealt with that at great length and very carefully before we jumped into this whole idea.

We will be voting in favour of Motion No. 16 which was put forward by the Reform Party. It deals with the fact that the minister under this bill has enormous powers moved into his camp, things that used to be resolved in the House of Commons. The minister can now arbitrarily make changes to the rates of contribution to the

*Government Orders*

pension fund. This is something that the House of Commons used to do. It used to have to be tabled here and be debated here.

It is also a breach of trust. I do not think it is unparliamentary to say it is a breach of trust. There has been a longstanding pact between the bargaining agents for the public sector unions and the government that if they took pensions off the bargaining table at negotiating time, the trade-off would be that they would never ever unilaterally alter the terms and conditions of the plan without bringing it to the House and without debate, et cetera.

The Liberals said they would not do it. That harkens back to the early 1960s and Walter Gordon, and maybe the current Prime Minister was part of that caucus. Those are the people who made the deal back then. There is a historical record with this labour pact that this would not happen.

• (1210)

Now they are instituting the very thing they promised they would never do. They are incorporating it into Bill C-78. The minister will unilaterally and arbitrarily alter the terms and conditions of the public sector pension plan because it is given that that right will in fact be his under this bill. Motion No. 16 seeks to remedy this one flaw of the many flaws in Bill C-78.

We cannot talk about this bill without talking about the public sector in general. We all know this bill will take the \$30 billion surplus and all future surpluses out of the public sector pension plans. I have said this before, but to deduct something from a person's paycheque for a specific purpose and then to use it for something entirely different is at best a breach of trust. I could go further with the worst case but I will not say what it could be if I really took it to its logical conclusion.

What will the impact be on the public sector when it finally sinks in? In the fullness of time when seniors, pensioners and retirees have had a chance to look through Bill C-78, these 200 pages of verbiage, what will the effect be on the public sector and the people paying into the plan? It will be another dent in the morale of the public sector.

Productivity is the big buzzword these days. The Minister of Finance, the Minister of Human Resources Development, the Minister of Industry, all they want to talk about is the productivity in the workforce. I can tell the House something about productivity and morale in the public sector.

Public servants have had blow after blow after blow to their morale and I would argue to their productivity or their ability to function. It used to be that if people took a job in the public sector they would probably take less money than in the private sector, but they could feel good about a couple of things.

They had a pretty good idea that some job security was associated with it. They probably had some comfort there. That went out the window when the government started cutting, hacking and slashing the public sector. There were 50,000 employees out on the street with no job security anymore. That protective umbrella is a thing of the past. They did not have the job security but they were making an okay wage. Then there were six years of wage freezes. Six years without a wage increase and they fell way behind the private sector. If they started out on par, they fell way behind.

There are 50,000 fewer people to do the same amount of work. The work does not go away. They are working harder and their wages are frozen. They can barely function because the government has taken out that whole middle band of skilled people, but they can still take some comfort in the fact that they have a pretty good pension. That gets used against them at the bargaining table. The employer says, "Yes we are paying you less money, but you have this great pension". Now for the unkindest cut of all, the government is going after that too.

What else is there to feel good about working in the public sector with all these things being chipped away bit by bit until now when morale has never been lower, when any kind of pact that might have existed in the post-war years between labour and management is gone? It is eradicated. The deal has been broken. It has been violated. I would argue that we are looking at real chronic long term problems in the public sector and this is one more example.

I want to come back to the idea of the motions in Group No. 3 of dealing with this massive fund, the public sector pension investment fund. That is a lot of power, \$100 billion. Twelve individuals from all walks of life, ordinary Canadians will be the trustees of this enormous fund.

There will be no joint labour-management trusteeship as with most pension funds I have had any dealings with. Most employee benefit plans have some kind of joint labour-management trusteeship. Then at least the employees or the beneficiaries of the plan have some say in how these things are invested and directed. This bill calls for none of that and there is no opportunity for them to take part in the governance of the plan.

There are no stipulations about what kind of investments will be acceptable. We are arguing through some of our amendments that it should be an ethical investment fund at the very least. We do not need to take less money to have an ethical investment fund. Frankly the ethical investment plans in the private sector are doing as well or better than the conventional financial instruments.

• (1215)

We had a couple of stipulations. We wanted to make sure that no investments made by this fund would be involved in any environ-

*Government Orders*

mental degradation. I think that is pretty safe. Most Canadians would not want their pension plan polluting Lake Ontario.

We do not want the pension plan investing in any industry that uses child labour or follows labour laws that are substandard or do not match Canadian standards. Most Canadians would agree with that. No Canadian has any appetite for the economic exploitation of children. Why do we not have an ethical plan that stipulates these things? What about tobacco? Do we want a pension fund that invests in tobacco and is pushing smoking on our kids? No.

The plan falls short in any stipulation of ethical investments. Many of the motions in Group No. 3 are very valuable and we look forward to voting on them later.

**Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak to Bill C-78 before the House today and the changes it makes with respect to pensions and other matters. It is important to have this kind of debate so all Canadians can understand fully what we as a government are trying to accomplish in this all important area.

I want to talk a bit about the area of investment of funds and management of surpluses with respect to the bill. As we have heard repeatedly in the House, and I think it is worth repeating once again, as a government we are trying to improve the rates of return and reduce pension costs. That has been noted in a way which is very meaningful for everyone who will be impacted by the legislation.

In the past Canadian taxpayers have covered the deficits in the plans, but the legislation will now authorize the government to debit the existing surplus of \$30 billion over a period of up to 15 years. I think that is in keeping with what the majority of Canadians want to see happen. It is important that we underscore that yet again today.

In addition, the independent board of directors will be authorized to manage future surpluses either by reducing contribution rates or by withdrawing amounts from the pension funds. Based on the board being put in place, it is important to note as well that it is certainly in keeping with overall government policy.

I want to talk about same sex survivor benefits. As members know, pension survivor benefits will be extended to same sex partners. Federal employees who have same sex partners should have access to the same pension entitlements and be subject to the same obligations as their colleagues.

It is important to note that there is no radical agenda at work here. The amendments do not redefine marriage, for example. Nor do they legalize same sex marriage. That is not what is at play here. It does not do much good to have members in the House indicate

that this is the case. It is not and it is important that we speak on the record accordingly.

We are simply keeping federal pensions in line with court decisions and trends elsewhere in the public and private sectors. Provincial pension plans in Nova Scotia, British Columbia, Ontario and New Brunswick have been similarly amended as have those offered by companies such as Sears, Dow Chemical, Shell, Levi Strauss and others.

The courts are not setting the agenda. That too is important to understand. We believe it is for the courts to make rulings and for the government to make policy. This is appropriate legislative action then to eliminate a provision which has been identified as discriminatory by the courts. It has been estimated that the amendment will see an increase of less than 2% in the number of persons entitled to survivor benefits under the plans. The cost has been estimated at approximately \$5 million per year.

I also recap, based on retirement and other benefits, that the retirement benefits will be calculated on the average salary during the best consecutive five years rather than the current six. Life insurance benefits under the PSSA will be improved, including a 25% reduction in premiums. Though not part of this legislation, a dental plan will be established for pensioners by Treasury Board after consultation with employees and other member representatives. It is important to have that on record in a clear and concise fashion which Canadians can and will understand.

• (1220)

I will talk a bit about what it means to be a survivor and what that term means. I will also talk a bit about the phrase, relationship of a conjugal nature, and the Supreme Court of Canada decision in Egan and Nesbit, a judicial ruling of which we in parliament have to take note.

Under Bill C-78 a survivor is defined as a spouse of a plan member at the time of the plan member's death, or the person living in a common law relationship with the plan member for at least one year at the time of the plan member's death.

The courts have been very clear on the issue of discrimination based on sexual orientation. They have indicated that discriminatory language must be removed. Under Bill C-78 words referring to the opposite sex have been taken out. This is in keeping with recent court decisions on the issue of providing employment related benefits to same sex partners.

A key decision in the federal court in Moore and Akerstrom directed Treasury Board as the employer to extend benefits to same sex partners in the same manner as it did to opposite sex partners living in a common law relationship. Treasury Board

*Government Orders*

could not create a separate category for same sex partners because that would have the effect of perpetrating harmful stereotypes.

So it is that Bill C-78 contains neutral language which draws no distinctions between same sex partners living together and partners of the opposite sex living together, while maintaining a distinction between married spouses and individuals living in a common law relationship.

Bill C-78 strikes a balance between the courts and what they have said, what is necessary with respect to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and what is required to maintain the distinction between legally married spouses and two people living in a common law relationship. The definition of a survivor in Bill C-78 follows the guidance provided by the court on precisely this issue.

I elaborate further on the use of the word spouse. It is preferable from a drafting point of view to avoid cumbersome constructions such as repeating the words spouse and common law spouse in the statute. The use of the word spouse as is currently used is appropriate in the case of same sex partners as it would misrepresent their relationship as per Iacobucci in Egan and Nesbit. A term defined such as survivor in Bill C-78 keeps the drafting simple.

I want to speak as well on conjugal, the recognition of common law relationships for the purpose of survivor benefits. It has been a feature of the public service pension plans for many years. These types of relationships are also recognized in other legislation both federally and provincially such as the Income Tax Act and family law.

Generally speaking legislation does not refer to a common law relationship. As a rule legislation sets out the test that has to be met in order to establish the existence of such a relationship. It is important to highlight that the courts have provided direction by setting out the recognized elements of a common law relationship.

Factors looked at by the courts include various elements of cohabitation and conjugality such as a commitment of the two individuals to each other and financial contributions to the necessities of life, et cetera. They looked at the attitude and conduct of each of the partners toward members of their respective families, how the families behave toward the partners, and how the partners present their relationship to the community.

As well, when a word has been considered by the courts, what has been judicially said is incorporated into the meaning of the word as used in the legislation. Courts have extended the meaning of conjugal to cover individuals living in a common law relationship and more recently have extended the meaning to include same sex partners living in a common law relationship.

In Rosenberg, a decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal on provisions of the Income Tax Act dealing with the registration of

pension plans, the court amended the definition of spouse which refers to a person living in a conjugal relationship with the taxpayer to include same sex partner of the taxpayer.

Provisions of Bill C-78 refer to "a relationship of a conjugal nature" in order to capture the judicial meaning of conjugal in reference to same sex partners while ensuring the bill does not go beyond what the courts have said. For these reasons it is necessary to define the word conjugal in the legislation in this manner.

• (1225)

From a legal point of view physical intimacy is not considered the essential element in establishing the conjugality of a relationship. Rather, from a legal point of view the courts have focused on the existence of a committed monogamous relationship in assessing whether a conjugal relationship exists. It is in keeping with Bill C-78 and provides that only one person living in a common law relationship with a plan member will be recognized at the time of the plan member's death. There are no provisions for the payment of more than one survivor benefit to more than one common law partner.

I want to look at the Supreme Court of Canada decision in Egan and Nesbit, a very important decision and one that we in the Parliament of Canada are now obliged to follow and to recognize in terms of what it represents. It is important to note that under the finding of discrimination five justices of the Supreme Court of Canada in four separate sets of reasons found that the definition of spouse infringed section 15 of the charter based on sexual orientation.

In conclusion, I note that this is a very important issue and certainly one that we as a government take very seriously. In the great scheme of things and in the great balance of fairness and equity, it is important we make sure that Bill C-78 is put in place in an effective manner in keeping with what Canadian society is all about.

**Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is always good to speak in the House when you are in the chair, so I wish I could say it was a pleasure to be here today.

It is a beautiful day in Ottawa. There are people in tour buses and school buses visiting the House of Commons and the Parliament of Canada, the centre of democracy in the country. Groups of school children and people from all over come here.

What are we doing? What did we do an hour ago? The government moved a motion to restrict debate on a bill as important as this one. That goes against everything that the country stands for.

It goes against some gentlemen I talked to last week in my office in Lethbridge. They would have liked more time to have input into



*Government Orders*

the decision being made here today because they are part of the group of pensioners being governed by this law. They felt they were being shortchanged by not being able to have the input they wanted.

Today is the 52nd time the government has moved closure. I can remember when the Liberals were on this side of the House in opposition and how they used to rail against the government moving closure. Yet they seem to make it one of their everyday tools. As important as the bill is, one would think some time would have been given in the parliamentary timetable to debate it properly and not to bring in closure.

Bill C-78 and the amendments in Group No. 3 that we are specifically debating at this point will change how the government can deal with the pension plans of the public service, the RCMP and the Canadian forces. This huge group of people has worked very hard in support of the country in all aspects. They need to be recognized for the work they have done. They should be able to retire in some form of security. When they see a government sitting on a huge surplus and projecting huge surpluses for the next number of years reaching out to grab \$30 billion surplus out of their pension fund, they get somewhat nervous, and rightfully so.

Why would a government sitting on such a huge surplus want another \$30 billion? Has it told us what it will do with the money? Will it pay down the debt? Will it pay the unfunded liability in the CPP that has built up? It has not told us that. That is what makes the people who have paid into these plans all their lives and are counting on them to carry them through their golden years somewhat nervous.

The bill will give the government the right to seize the \$30 billion surplus. It will establish a public sector pension investment board. That needs some looking at as well. It is yet to be seen if the House will have a say over how that board is structured and who is going to be on it, or if it is just going to be another government patronage group.

• (1230)

Employee premiums will increase from 30% to 40%. The employees are going to fund 40% of this plan, beginning in 2004. How does the government feel that it is entitled to the entire surplus? That needs debate. If the government was responsible or the taxpayers were responsible for the entire contribution, then fine, but they are not. The employees are contributing as well and they do not feel that the government has a right to take the entire surplus.

The motion put forward by the Reform member for St. Albert would force an act of parliament to be passed in order for changes to be made to the contribution rate of the public sector pension

plan, which currently is in the hands of Treasury Board. I believe that is a very good motion. I hope it will receive support from the House because decisions that are made to deal with the pension plan should be made by the House, not by the President of the Treasury Board.

The reason for that is because of our constituents. When my constituents come to me for answers about what is going on with their pension fund, how can I respond to them if the decisions have not been made by the House but by a member of cabinet?

All of these issues need to be addressed. More and more we are seeing the purpose of the House eroded by closure and decisions being made outside the House rather than by the elected people of the country. The government member who spoke before me mentioned a definition of spouse, a definition of survivor, that was decided by the courts. More and more we are seeing the government leaning toward the courts to make the tough decisions which need to be established by law and should be established here after public debate. That comes into this whole issue.

One of the reasons people are concerned about this is, if the government balanced the budget on the backs of the taxpayers, why is it looking at \$30 billion? What does it want it for? Why is it so eager to get its hands on it? It seems that if people pile up more than \$2 in one spot the government looks for ways to grab it away.

Let us consider our health care system. We have 180,000 people who are on waiting lists for health care in the country. As a country we put \$800 less per person into the health care system than our American counterparts. We definitely have developed and the government is supporting a two tier health care system that is not necessary.

Again, the government is sitting on a huge surplus and it wants another \$30 billion from this pension fund. Why are some of these things not being done? The waiting time for Canadians to receive health care is increasing. The length of time to see a specialist is increasing.

This all comes back to the fact that there have been severe funding cuts to health care, while at the same time the government is sitting on a surplus. It is looking at every corner of its mandate to find pools of money that it can pull back, but not explaining to Canadians and to the House exactly what that money is going to be used for.

That is all part of the equation which boils down to the problem that we are having with Bill C-78. The whole idea of bringing issues such as these to the floor of the House to be debated is part of what we are discussing today. The government has introduced closure and members who wanted to have a chance to debate this bill will not have that chance. People who want information from this government will not receive it. Therein lies the problem.

*Government Orders*

• (1235)

I support the member for St. Albert who has worked so hard on all of these issues and put forward some very good amendments. I would certainly hope that members of all parties in the House would have a look at the amendments and consider the fact that the amendments we are proposing would make this bill far better than it is. They would give some accountability through this place, through elected members of parliament, to the people of Canada. If nothing else, the issue of accountability and the issue that decisions should be made here, not elsewhere, is very important.

I would like to say to the people of my riding and certainly right across Canada who are members of this pension plan and who are concerned with what is going on that they can rest assured that this party, regardless of the outcome of the vote, will keep an eye on the government and keep its feet to the fire to make sure that this pension plan is solid and will be there to help them through the rest of their lives.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak this morning to Bill C-78 with some sadness and some bitterness.

Sadness, because the government this morning, through the government House leader, took a most, if not the most, undemocratic step one can take in this House.

Sadness, because all the Liberal members voted in favour of this closure.

I would like to take a minute of my time to pay respect to this rapidly disappearing democracy, a minute of my speaking time so all the elected officials in this House may reflect on the effects of abusing democracy in this manner.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Perhaps the hon. member could tell us whether he wishes to continue his speech or whether he has finished for the moment.

We can continue certainly afterward, if the hon. member wishes, but he may speak only once to each group of amendments.

**Mr. Gilles-A. Perron:** Mr. Speaker, I will continue my speech, but I believe silence says a lot. It is a means of expression.

I would ask your permission to finish my minute of silence. It had lasted barely some 15 seconds.

**The Deputy Speaker:** This is not usual practice. Usually the Speaker calls for a minute of silence on the death of someone, but not during a debate. I do not think it is appropriate, and I hope the hon. member will resume his remarks.

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I think the point my colleague is trying to make today about democracy taking a back seat is a very important one. This is not the first time this has happened. There have been at least 50 other such occasions.

Is my colleague's request in order, under House procedure? His allotted time is his. He has ten minutes. We are told that we have ten minutes in which to express our views.

One means of expression is the spoken word and the other is silence. I would like a ruling on this and whether it is acceptable, under parliamentary procedure, for my colleague to say nothing for one minute. That is one form of expression.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Chair has recognized the point, but I do not think it is usual to have one minute of silence during a speech. The point of a speech in the House is to express an opinion.

• (1240)

If the hon. member wishes to stop speaking for ten minutes or one minute or even 30 seconds during the time allotted him to speak, he may do so with the unanimous consent of the House, but I think one would normally make a speech in the time allotted. That is why I have indicated to the hon. member that, if he wishes to resume speaking, he may now do so.

I invite him to go ahead, or I can seek the unanimous consent of the House for the hon. member to observe a moment of silence.

Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Ghislain Lebel:** Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, we are given to understand that there is freedom of expression in this House. Seeking the unanimous consent of the House for the point my colleague wishes to make is a bit like seeking its approval for what he will say and the approach he will take.

This means that, from now on, what we want to say in the House must first be approved by a majority of members.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The purpose of expression in this House, as I have indicated, is to make speeches, and the hon. member has a right to do that. I do not believe it is normal to have moments of silence during a speech.

One cannot, for example, ask for 10 minutes in which to say nothing. The member must speak.

The hon. member is entitled to do this, and there is no unanimous consent in the House for him to do otherwise. I therefore invite him to continue. I have already made a ruling on this issue.

**Mr. Yvan Loubier:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

*Government Orders*

I wonder. Did my colleague use language that was in contempt of Parliament? No. Did my colleague use props to illustrate what he was saying? No. Is my colleague inappropriately attired, and thus deserving of expulsion from the House? No. Did my colleague use unparliamentary language which could offend the institution? No. Does my colleague have a right to express himself? Is there a translation problem if my colleague decides to remain silent for a minute?

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I have already made a ruling on this point and I believe we now need to continue debate.

The purpose of this House is to hold debate, and there is time allocated for that, not for silence. If he wants to remain silent, let him do that in his seat, or in the lobbies, but in the House we are here to debate.

**Mr. Yvan Loubier:** Mr. Speaker, you have said that the purpose of this House is to debate. How then can it be that you prevent my colleague from taking a minute of silence, because you claim it prevents debate, yet when the government introduces a gag motion, which deprives us of our right—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member knows very well that the Speaker is not here to answer questions. I am here to rule on points of order.

I have already given my ruling and I ask the hon. member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles to continue his speech without raising any further points of order.

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker:** On the same point of order?

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** Yes. I want to know what Standing Order you based your decision on.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I have made my ruling on this and that is that.

[*English*]

**Mr. Gar Knutson:** Mr. Speaker, you have the right to rule us out of order, but I would like to ask for unanimous consent to grant the request of the hon. member. I would like you to ask a second time for unanimous consent.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is it agreed that we have one minute of silence during the hon. member's speech?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** No.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilles-A. Perron:** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry for all the kerfuffle I have caused. I thought it was an effective way to get a

message across and especially to give everyone an opportunity to reflect.

• (1245)

It was never my intention to treat this House as a circus or a place of ridicule. I have too much respect for the people here to do that.

Let us turn now to Bill C-78. I would like to provide a bit of background. The President of the Treasury Board created an advisory committee on the Public Service Superannuation Act to look at pensions within the public service.

This committee carried on consultations for four years. It comprised members of the government, public servants and representatives of employee and pensioner associations. Everyone contributed effectively to this committee. The President of the Treasury Board recognized the committee's effectiveness. We will recall that the president said in February 1998, "that the government had accepted a certain number of the committee's recommendations". These words speak reams.

Why then, a few years later, did this government make an about face? It totally changed its position. It did so simply because the President of the Treasury Board sat down at the table in cabinet, and the finance minister, also called the ships minister, saw an opportunity to get hold of some money so he could boast about his government's good management.

The minister finds it tempting to take from a fund of nearly \$30.2 billion the government does not contribute to anymore. This fund is made up of the public service, RCMP and Canadian forces pension funds, which have built up a surplus of \$30 billion.

This legislation will allow the government, and particularly the Minister of Finance, to take this \$30 billion and say "Look how good I am. I have achieved a zero deficit. Look how great it is". The government has made a habit of doing that. Remember the siphoning of money from the employment insurance fund. Remember the transfer cuts imposed on the provinces by the Minister of Finance and this government.

Remember that, in the health sector alone, the government has cut over \$20 billion in the transfers to the provinces. Now, a few years later, it is boasting and saying "We will reinvest \$11.5 billion of your money, the money that we siphoned off. But we will be the ones investing your money". The government siphoned off \$20 billion and is now reinvesting \$11 billion.

This is outrageous because, without telling anyone, this government decided to change the formula that determines equalization payments. The new formula will use a per capita basis, which, again, will create problems for the Quebec government.

*Government Orders*

Under the new formula, Quebec will get less than 8% of these \$11.5 billion, while Ontario's share will be very close to 47%. Talk about fairness.

Let us now take a look at what Bill C-78 does.

● (1250)

In Bill C-78, the government has had another brilliant idea, which is to form a sort of management committee to administer the \$30 billion surplus in the fund. The committee will be appointed by the President of the Treasury Board, and the unions and retired employees will have no say. This committee will be packed with friends of the government, those who contribute to its campaign fund, and those to whom it owes favours.

This is oddly reminiscent of the other agencies this government has had the bad habit of establishing, such as ADM, the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency, the Canadian Wheat Board, and Nav Canada, among others. When there is a problem with these agencies and we ask a question in the House, what do the members opposite say? They say that they have created an agency that is responsible for its actions and that the directors are old enough to manage the taxpayers' money. This money is being managed by people who are not accountable. It is a disgrace.

In conclusion, I would like to remind the House that, this morning, we have witnessed something very sad, as we do here all too frequently. Once again, I am bitterly disappointed at what is happening to democracy in this country.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC):** Mr. Speaker, it is with a degree of sadness that I rise to speak to the amendments in Group No. 3, Motions Nos. 16, 39 and 47 at report stage of Bill C-78.

The reason I am sad is that individuals who are at home watching this series of speeches will be thinking that there is serious ongoing parliamentary debate to ensure that the right thing is being done with respect to this piece of legislation, in particular with these Group No. 3 amendments. I am sad to say that again the government has resorted to closure. Again the democratically elected individuals in the House are not able to properly debate this very important issue we have at hand.

We are primarily talking about the pensions of our valued civil servants whether they be in the RCMP or other areas. The average pension of these individuals is in the neighbourhood of \$9,000. The government under the guise of this legislation will say that it is managing its resources in a more prudent fashion. We know that the government may be looking at potentially garnishing the accumulated surplus in these funds.

I will revert to Group No. 3 as it is imperative that we refer to the amendments. Motions Nos. 16, 39 and 47 in Group No. 3 would give the power to set pension contributions to parliament rather

than to the President of the Treasury Board. This is a small step toward restoring part of the role parliamentarians should play in Canada, but it does not address many of the more serious deficiencies in Bill C-78.

For example, this bill does not make a strong enough link between the actuary of the fund, that is, the CPP actuary, and the board that will oversee the investments of the fund. In fact, nowhere in Bill C-78 is it specified when and how often the actuary will meet with or make a report on the fund to the board or to the government.

● (1255)

The President of Treasury Board will have incredible powers under this legislation with the ultimate power to set contributions and benefit levels. Imagine the following situation.

The government of the day decides it will have an election in a year or two. It wants to offer the voters some election goodies in the platform. Essentially the government wants to buy the votes of Canadians. A nice quiet and discreet way of stockpiling a little dough for just this occasion would be to set a pension contribution rate slightly higher than the rate really needs to be. In a year or two the government would have hundreds of millions of dollars to throw around. The best part is that nobody would have seen the government building up this nice little slush fund.

Bill C-78 will allow the government to withdraw the current surplus of over \$28 billion from the fund over a period of up to 15 years. Any future surplus can also be withdrawn from the fund, or the government may reduce employee or employer contributions. What are the chances the Liberals will do the right thing with these surpluses?

Since 1993 the Liberal government has continuously taken more from Canadians while giving less in return. Tax revenues are at a record high and government services are at a record low. From 1993 to 1998 the government took in an extra \$35 billion in tax revenues but at the same time cut \$20 billion from health care and education transfers, the priorities of Canadians.

There is no mechanism in Bill C-78 for parliament to hold the government accountable for these surplus withdrawals. Let us look at what is currently happening with the EI fund. The government takes in over \$7 billion annually within the EI fund than the program actually consumes on an annual basis. With this track record, I am fearful for the Canadian taxpayer that Bill C-78 will permit the government to do this with another fund.

Currently pension and CPP contributions are linked and capped at 7.5% of salary for public servants, the RCMP and the Canadian forces. Bill C-78 will de-link these contributions and allow for CPP contributions to increase until 2003 while pension contributions will remain frozen at 4%.

*Government Orders*

After 2003, pension contributions are expected to increase so the employees' contributions rise to 40% of total contributions. This means that public servants, the RCMP and Canadian forces personnel could see pension and CPP contributions rise steadily over the next five to 10 years. This could seriously erode the progress the Canadian forces made in their quality of life salary increases announced recently, and I will commend the government for taking that step in the right direction.

Bill C-78 establishes a public service pension fund investment board similar to the Canada pension plan investment board. The fund will now invest in the stock and bond markets rather than the Government of Canada bonds it now invests in. In fact, maximizing returns is written into Bill C-78 which is a good idea. This will help the pension fund achieve higher returns and allow for lower contributions in the future.

The pension fund however will be subject to the current rules regarding foreign assets, that is, the fund can only invest up to 20% of the assets in foreign property. This will have two major impacts for employees and pensioners.

Their savings will not grow as fast as they otherwise could if there were less restrictive rules on foreign content. When this fund has assets in the \$100 billion to \$120 billion range, it could end up costing nearly \$250 million in forgone wealth accumulation because historically Canadian markets have not performed as well as the American and European markets. Even most of Asia has done better than Canada despite the recent crashes and meltdowns.

The second impact of the 20% foreign content rule relates to the ultimate size of this fund. In not too many years the fund will account for a substantial portion of the stock markets in Canada. How will it be able to buy and sell companies without disrupting the markets? Managers of mutual funds in the \$1 billion to \$2 billion range say that they have problems buying or selling some stocks because their actions cause significant variations in the price of a stock. Imagine the effects of a fund worth over \$100 billion.

Another problem not addressed in this legislation is that of the RCMP. The RCMP's pension funds will be invested in this fund as well, but the Liberals as far as I can tell have not thought about some of the problems that might arise from this fact.

• (1300)

What would happen if the RCMP began investigating a company that was part of its pension fund? If the officers had to choose between shutting down the firm due to illegal activities and turning a blind eye because \$5 billion or \$10 billion of their retirement money was at stake, what would they do?

I can think of the example of YBM Magnex. It was found to be linked to the Russian Mafia. It was delisted from the stock

exchange and by some mutual companies, and individual investors lost millions of dollars in their portfolios.

The current Liberal government seems to have an insatiable appetite for money, no matter where the money comes from, taxpayers or government employees. Bill C-78 will concentrate the power of cabinet ministers and further erode the role of parliamentarians. If the government truly wanted to maximize returns for retirees, it would increase the allowable limit on foreign content in the bill and all other pension and RRSP legislation.

Given the Liberal track record to date of record levels of tax revenue, government expenditures being consistently higher than estimated, and erosion of government services, Canadians will surely pay more and get less.

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill C-78. I commend the Bloc Party for attempting to have moment of silence for the death of democracy this morning. I thought it was a very good tribute. I stand and applaud the Bloc for that. Although I may not agree with the Bloc in much of its politics, the fact is that it is right on with this one. It is the death of democracy in the House of Commons.

Over 50 time allocation or closure motions have been brought forth by the government since 1993. Bill C-78 is over 200 pages thick with legislation, some of which contains serious public policy. It affects over 1.8 million Canadians currently working for the federal service and those who are retired. It also affects every Canadian from coast to coast to coast.

I ask again why the government is ramming the legislation through. The only answer is that it has an awful lot to hide and it just cannot get its hands on that money fast enough. It just has to have it.

I can assure the House of the difference between an NDPer and a Liberal. We will walk down the street and see a quarter on the ground. An NDPer will pick up that quarter and give it to a street person. A Liberal will pick up that quarter, pocket it and not share it with anyone. That is the problem. That is the difference between the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party. It is as clear as night.

Reform and Conservative members are rightfully upset by the bill. We must understand that all the Liberals are doing is reforming Tory policies. If Canadians want true democracy in the country, they should elect a full house of New Democrats from coast to coast to coast, provincially and federally. Then we would have some solid democracy.

Bill C-78 affects every Canadian. I do not think the Liberals have thought this one through. It will come back to haunt them in

*Government Orders*

spades. They are ramming it through when the newspapers are full of items like Kosovo and other issues. They want it through the House by early June. Then they will go away and say "look what we have done, folks".

Here is my prediction of what will happen six months prior to the next federal election. The Right Hon. Prime Minister will step down. His finance minister may win the nomination to be the Liberal leader. He will then come to my riding, or a Reform riding, a Conservative riding, the riding of my colleague from Winnipeg Centre or the riding of my colleague from Halifax West, with \$30 billion from the EI fund. Probably the surplus in the pension fund will be \$35 billion at that point.

He will have about \$65 billion in his pocket and he will ask everyone what they need. If they need a road, it will be done. If they need another prison, it will be done. If they need tax breaks, it will be done. Those things will be done on the backs of the workers, just as the Liberals did with the EI surplus. They took \$11.5 billion over five years and dedicated it to health care. That was the money of employers and employees. Now they will do the same with the surplus in the Canada pension fund. This money does not belong to them. It belongs to the workers who worked hard for it.

• (1305 )

One of the reasons we have such a wonderful country is our public service. Our military men and women throughout the world work hard on behalf of Canada. What has been their answer to them for their efforts over the years? More taxes for one thing, absolutely. Now they are grabbing their pensions and next year or the year after they will have to pay more into their pension plans.

I may stand corrected on this one point, but this does not affect MPs, members of parliament. I am not sure on that. I will have to check into it. If it does not, obviously it is another scandal we will have to go after the Liberals for.

On behalf of all PSAC workers in Nova Scotia and across the country, on behalf of the RCMP, and on behalf of the military personnel at Shearwater base in my riding, whom my wonderful colleague from Halifax West, our defence critic, knows very well, what the government is doing to their pension plans is an outrage.

What an absolute disgrace that Liberals treat our military personnel, civilian workers and public service workers in that fashion. They are treating them with absolutely no regard at all. A classic example was the recent pay equity decision. They will fight pay equity tooth and nail. In most cases they are offending the women of the country by not honouring their commitment to pay equity.

I remind the House that it was the Liberals who said in opposition that when they formed the government they would honour the commitment to pay equity. They went back on their

word. I cannot say they l-i-e-d, but that is exactly what they did. They went back on their word.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The hon. member cannot bring in through the back door what the hon. member cannot bring in the front door. We ask the hon. member for Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore to retract the word l-i-e-d.

**Mr. Peter Stoffer:** Mr. Speaker, I absolutely retract it and apologize to you and the House for spelling out that word.

The facts are still the facts. This is precisely what the Liberals are doing. They say one thing in opposition and now that they are in government they completely reverse their proposal. No wonder the Reform, the Bloc, the Conservatives and the New Democrats are so angry with them. No wonder even some of its backbenchers are so angry with the government.

This will come back to haunt the Liberals big time. Mark my words. They have an opportunity right now to retract Bill C-78 and take it back to the drawing board. The next time, if they want to do anything with it, they should talk to the people most affected by it: public service workers, the RCMP, the military and the people who work in the House of Commons. They are the ones to whom the Liberals should be talking.

It goes on and on and on. I can give many examples of how deplorable government policies are toward working people. Bill C-78 is just a classic example.

Following on the heels is Bill C-32, the CEPA amendments. Mark my words, the Liberals will invoke closure on that one as well. There were over 800 amendments to that bill. Bill C-78 should have many more amendments to it but they were not allowed. I have always said that the Liberals believe in a capitulated democracy: one can say and do whatever one wants as long as one does what they tell one to do.

I will not take up much more time of the House. My voice is starting to wane after waiting about the government for over two years. I ask the government to retract Bill C-78 and never to invoke closure again on something as important to the Canadian people.

**Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to reiterate some of the points my colleague from Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore made so well in the last few minutes.

I thank the Liberals for giving me the opportunity to say a few words today about Bill C-78. Without their dedication to limiting democracy we might even have a few more words to say. This is about 50-plus times we have seen closure in the House. It makes us wonder about the capitulated democracy which was talked about earlier.

*Government Orders*

• (1310)

This morning we saw a bit of tinkering with some very good amendments that needed to come forward. We heard quotes from the member for Waterloo—Wellington and his quote was—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** It must be made very clear that the government did not tinker with the amendments that came forward. I made it very clear when I made the ruling this morning that it was an error made by the Chair. It had nothing to do with the government.

**Mr. Gerry Ritz:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for clarifying that.

The member for Waterloo—Wellington talked about some of the amendments which redefine spouse, survivor and so on. He indicated that parliament was merely keeping pace with court actions. That was quite a statement. On this side of the House we would call that judicial activism. The government of the day abrogated its responsibilities on politically correct or sensitive issues to the unelected courts. It is back door democracy.

I will refer to some comments made on Tuesday by the member for Mississauga West. At one point he said the \$30 billion pension surplus was generated primarily through good management of the pension fund. That is a real oxymoron when it comes to government generated returns on anything.

I wonder how he would define the \$13 billion taxpayers had to put into the fund at one point to make up for shortfalls, or the fact that the surplus was the result of a disastrous economic philosophy in the 1980s to fight inflation with high interest rates and wage freezes.

Does he also think it is good management, especially in light of future possibilities of shortfalls or setbacks in financial markets, for his government not only to arbitrarily seize a \$30 billion paper surplus but also to have used accounting tricks to date to drain off \$10 billion before now?

He claimed yesterday that his government should identify surpluses in each and every plan, in each and every department, supposedly to pay down the debt. We know it will not go there.

There may be merit in doing that, but what is the government doing instead? I direct the member to the budget figures which show a \$4 billion overdraft on the spending projections and a debt frozen at \$580 billion into the foreseeable future. If the shuffling contingent of Liberal backbenchers from Ontario had any clout or economic sense, they could convince their future leader to freeze spending and actually reduce the debt rather than let it sit there like a leech sucking the lifeblood out of the Canadian taxpayer. It

amounts to \$42 billion a year in interest payments and it is not going down.

Bill C-78 deals with a very contentious issue for which governments across the country have never shown much enthusiasm. Who owns any pension surplus? Since employers and employees contribute to the original funds it would seem fair to divide it between the two parties somehow. An alternative could be to reduce the contributions and/or raise the benefits, or perhaps arrange for some kind of one time payout to both side, something that is equitable. The federal government says no. It has its hands on the purse strings and claims the spoils for its own purposes, whatever they might be.

Members opposite have tried to question our integrity on this side for not wanting to back the government on this matter, but let us look at what it is really doing. It froze wages for six years so that anybody still in a particular job classification has not had a raise for a while. That depresses the liability for their ultimate pension level.

In 1996 we recognized a growing surplus sitting on the government books, certainly not sitting in a vault somewhere. There is no cash pool somewhere as some would have us believe. The wizards at finance waved their magic pencils and turned red ink to black. Some \$10 billion in liability disappeared without debate or vote, or any consultation with the people involved.

Members opposite will rightly give us credit for being in favour of reducing government liabilities, but the way to do it is not in the backroom, without consultation and, worst of all, in a one shot deal which does not get to the root of what is wrong with government, excessive spending.

We see the finance minister raid the so-called EI fund. We see him lay claim to the public pension surplus. We see him prebook future expenses to hide taxpayer surpluses today. That is not the way to balance the books. That is not fair because he will run out of unguarded accounts to claim. Inevitably there will be dips and bumps in the road that will cause our economic performance to fluctuate in the days ahead.

What if the interest rates rise as they seem poised to do in the States? The burden represented by that festering debt will grow in leaps and bounds just when the North American economy slows down, as it surely will. At that point will the Liberals be prepared to give up their support for porno films and kite flying projects?

Even with Bill C-78 on the order paper the finance department projections leave the \$580 billion debt untouched. In other words, it has not committed to subtracting this \$30 billion windfall. Left as it is, interest payments drain over \$40 billion from the government's books every year before it has paid for a single mile of road or another hospital bed that is so badly needed. That is not prudent or responsible. The fundamentals are not right.

*Government Orders*

• (1315)

Members opposite will claim that the pension surplus will be devoted to debt reduction but we have no assurance of that. We suspect the \$30 billion will be used to finance pre-election goodies and canoe museums. The Liberals have to admit their track record would suggest that this is a more likely outcome than debt reduction or that much cried about tax relief.

The opposition parties have put forward over 50 amendments to bring accountability and openness to the process of reforming the public service pension system. Let us be clear on this. The pension system was out of date and the unions and the pensioner associations agreed that something needed to be done. I am sure they can see that it was time public service employees accepted their share in CPP premium increases and re-balanced that proportion between the public pension and the government pension premiums. I understand that the employee representatives also agreed on the mandate for the new pension investment board.

The question before us is not is it good or bad to have a new investment regime for public service pensions or is it good or bad that it should be done by an arm's length investment board. The question before us is simple. Has the government been open and up front about how it has managed the previous system? I do not think so. Has it developed the best possible new system and is it entitled to walk away with \$30 billion to squander on programs that it likes? I do not think so and the majority of Canadians agree.

The Reform Party, particularly through the strenuous efforts of the member for St. Albert, has tried to wrestle this massive bill into some sort of responsible direction. Our amendments would bring accountability to the process.

For example, we recommend that the board of directors of the new investment board maintain contact with the actuaries of each fund under their management. It sounds like a simple business procedure. We want appointments to the board as well as those to the investment committees to be tabled in the House. We want to delete the clauses which allow the government to make off with the surplus in the first place. We also want a separate act to set the contribution rate for the RCMP superannuation fund, not have it determined behind closed doors.

We also have a problem with the vague and unnecessary interference with personal relationships. A number of amendments in Group No. 2 refer to the problems that will arise as this government fumbles its way toward accommodating special interest lobbies.

The Liberals have attempted to socially engineer the public service pension system by introducing the vacuous term, survivor, 249 times in this bill. They also introduced the qualification, relationship of a conjugal nature, to modestly describe same sex partnerships. Who will keep score? How will we stay on top of that? Or at least that is what we are left to assume. The terminology

is vague and will no doubt open up a whole new can of worms when some other groups decide they have been left out.

It has been estimated that the cost of recognizing same sex partners in Bill C-78 will be quite small, but this is not the issue. If the government wants back into the bedrooms of the nation that it supposedly vacated 20 years ago under Prime Minister Trudeau, then it should bring the issue to the floor of this House, not the courts. It should offer genuine and open debate and create legislation that addresses what needs addressing, not drop confusing hints and ambiguous references in this omnibus legislation.

The Reform Party recommends the surplus be left where it is to smooth the transition to a new and better administered pension system than we presently have. We are in favour of reduced government liabilities and better returns for our Canadian pensioners, but we cannot support slippery, open-ended and underhanded methods of financing re-election campaigns that we see in this bill.

As my colleague from Medicine Hat has said in the past on the EI grab, why does the finance minister not just leave the money where it is, put his hands where we can see them and back away slowly?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, what has been happening here these past few days is utterly deplorable. I said these past few days, but I could have said these past few months or these past few years, because the opposition has been subjected to closure more than 50 times. We are no longer in a parliament where we can speak freely. We cannot even express ourselves through silence, because of an earlier ruling by the Chair.

When we want to talk, we are denied the right to do so. We are not allowed not to talk, and we are denied the right to talk long enough to make a thorough examination of the bills before us. What has been happening here these past few months and these past few years—in fact, since the Liberals took office—is absolutely appalling.

When the Liberal Party was in opposition, it said exactly the same thing we are saying today. Does this mean that, once in office, a party tends to forget everything it said previously? There is no chance the Bloc Québécois will ever be in office in Ottawa. That is why we can debate issues very openly and we can say there is a limit to how far one can go in showing so little respect for democracy.

• (1320)

I also want to mention the tyranny that exists in committees where, once again, government members form the majority. We are constantly being told that there will be a time limit, that the committee will take only so much time to do such and such a thing.



*Government Orders*

The minister will appear, but will not be able to testify for very long. This is what I call the tyranny of the majority. It is sad that there are not more government members here today, because I would like them to hear what I have to say.

I also thought the government House leader was extremely arrogant this morning, when he moved time allocation. He was smiling and laughing because he had just gagged the opposition so that we would not have all the time required to speak out on a bill of such fundamental importance as this one.

There are not two kinds of MPs. There ought to be just one kind. We have all been elected by our constituents, but some assume additional rights over the others. I am referring again to what I call the tyranny of the majority.

I would like to pause a moment now, if I may. I do not want to use unparliamentary language, and what has taken place here is too irritating. If I may, I will put my papers into order a bit and start up again in a minute. I find what has taken place here deplorable and I would not like to get carried away. If I may, I will take a minute to calm down.

**Mr. Denis Coderre:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Hon. members are well aware that we do not have to put up with the state our colleague is in. One is not allowed to do indirectly what one cannot do directly. When someone's papers are mixed up, and it takes a minute to get them straight, and that same person was the one who asked just now for a minute of silence, we are nobody's fools, at least not on this side of the House.

I would like us to continue, because I want to hear the speeches.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** From time to time I am sure there are many members in the House and certainly many Canadians who would think that perhaps more silence from this chamber would be a good thing. The hon. member for Saint-Jean has 10 minutes of debate. Provided the debate goes forward, I think we should allow the hon. member for Saint-Jean to organize his thoughts as he sees fit.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your solicitude. Unlike the member for Bourassa, you can understand.

If a person does not want to start using unparliamentary language, he is sometimes better off taking a break. I have calmed down now. I thank you for your decision.

Today, we have two motions before us. There is Motion No. 16 calling on parliament to pass an act of parliament if it wishes to change the contribution rate to the employee pension fund.

**Mr. Denis Coderre:** When is he going to stop talking?

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** Mr. Speaker, I am having trouble concentrating because of the member for Bourassa's continual interruptions. Could you caution him so that I might continue?

That is one other way the tyranny of the majority is exercised in this House. When opposition members are speaking, we are continually being interrupted.

**Mr. Denis Coderre:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. They are preventing me from speaking. I too can speak while he does. I am simply following his logic—

**An hon. member:** No, you do not have the floor.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The hon. member for Bourassa will have an occasion to participate in the debate and I am sure other members would welcome that lucid participation.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** Mr. Speaker, I hope the points of order my colleague from Bourassa raised are not going to cut into my 10 minutes of speaking time. If my colleague interrupts me for 10 minutes, I hope I will still have my time to speak.

I was talking about the importance for parliament of having a new approach when the time comes to deduct money for employee pensions. Although this amendment was not introduced by the Bloc Quebecois, it is extremely important.

• (1325)

Up to now, everything that went on with the pension fund was out of parliament's control. When the government decides, for example, as the President of the Treasury Board did, to play around with it a bit, it causes distortion. Canada's parliament is never involved in the approach and the arrangements for consensus on what people should contribute weekly to their pension.

What is particularly deplorable as well is that these people, who have contributed to the accumulated surpluses we have now have annual incomes of some \$9,000. We are not talking about huge fortunes.

Once again, I understand that the Liberal Party wants to go after these people. These people do not contribute to the Liberal Party coffers like the big multinationals, the major banks and big business. The Liberals give big business a sort of total absolution, they try not to bother it too much. However, those who have had to pay from the start, as I said in my first speech, are the employees of

*Government Orders*

the federal public service, women in the federal public service, who have been denied pay equity. It is also the people on employment insurance who have paid for the fight against this government's deficit and debt.

There is one who quite neatly hides behind the President of the Treasury Board—the Minister of Finance. We never see him taking part in debates when it comes time to siphon off some money so that the government can then say how wonderful the Minister of Finance is for putting Canada back on track, reducing the deficit and starting to pay down the debt.

It forgets to say that this has been done at the expense of unemployed workers. It forgets to say that women are the losers in the pay equity battle. It forgets to say quite a bit.

Another thing we have noticed is that the minister always sends others to the front lines. The Minister of Human Resources Development will be sent out to cut EI payments. The President of the Treasury Board will be sent after this amount. We have talked about robbing, raiding, taking over, and we have used parliamentary terms like siphoning, but we have stopped short of unparliamentary language. I could have crossed the line a while ago, but for your wise ruling, Mr. Speaker.

The point of Motion No. 38, by the Bloc Québécois, is to have the Income Tax Act apply. Under the Income Tax Act, when there are surpluses in certain plans, the government may decide what to do with them, as provided in the legislation.

All the plans are listed in the Income Tax Act. There are one, two or three exceptions, those before us today. At the time, it was agreed, and this is provided for in the act, that the armed forces, RCMP and public service pension funds would not be in the Income Tax Act.

Now, we simply want to find a way to deal with the surpluses and make sure that the Income Tax Act applies. This is merely a question of fairness, and it also shows the employees' good faith. They say "We want to go back to the act of 1985, and not just for the benefits. We want to take it as it is. We also want our pension plans to be listed in the Income Tax Act, which provides for a mechanism when a surplus becomes significant, so as to avoid having excessive surpluses".

I would like to conclude with a motion. I move:

That all government members, whose government imposed a time allocation motion on the review of Bill C-78, be prevented from speaking during today's debate on this bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move his motion?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

• (1330)

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** Mr. Speaker, I find it hard to understand how a government that uses closure could then say "We used closure, you can no longer talk, but we will do the talking now". Before closure, government members are silent. The opposition must do all the work. Then, when the government imposes closure, its members want to do all the talking. I think a review of House procedure is in order.

[English]

**Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to address the concerns we have regarding Bill C-78. These concerns are being brought forward as we discuss the amendments to the bill.

The important principle that we must first look at before we discuss the amendments is how the process is being abused on this particular issue. The government has chosen to move closure after only a few hours of debate on a bill that is important to all of us. The Liberals are also trying to shift the debate by suggesting that the unions want the entire \$30 billion surplus in the pension fund. We know this is not the case. The facts of the case are quite simple.

This fund belongs to the members of the plan. Any surplus should be used for the benefit of the members and others affiliated with the plan such as retirees and widows. This would be a very desirable use for the surplus. However, the government wants to grab the money, put it in its coffers and say it has wrestled down the debt, but it will have been done on the backs of those who need the plan, those who have contributed and worked hard. It will be done in the same way the EI fund was grabbed and taken away from those who are unemployed.

The unions are not trying to stuff their pockets, but the government is certainly trying to stuff its pockets. The unions want to improve benefits for their members, for the start-up costs in the future and for any changes to the plan.

We realize there are 670,000 members of the plans affected. The allocation of the surplus needs to address the contributions of these members who have contributed to the plan. We often hear the government say that the taxpayers own this money and that it is the taxpayers it must protect. The people who contributed to these plans are also taxpayers and we must look at their benefits and their rights.

Another important point that is being missed is that a very established principle is being undermined by this action. Under the

*Government Orders*

Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985, a principle was established that the use of a surplus should be determined by two-thirds of the plan members.

Bill C-78 and the Liberal's time allocation contradicts this principle. It takes away the principle of ownership of surplus of funds which is inherent in both public and private pension plans. It takes away the right of the pension plan members to determine what should be done with their surpluses. This is a shift in the way pension surpluses would be dealt with and it should be of great concern to all Canadians in both the private and public service pension plans.

The fundamental principle of agreement of all plan members is a principle that must be upheld. This is really a democratic principle. People should have the right to say what they feel should be done with the surpluses in their pension plans.

There are certainly some questions that need to be answered as we look at this whole issue. What possible justification can Liberals claim for shutting down democratic debate in parliament on a bill of this magnitude? We have seen it happen over and over again. We come to the House with an issue of very great importance to all of us and before we have a chance to debate it thoroughly and go into detail about it, the government calls for closure.

Why has parliament not had adequate opportunity to consider the effects on the economy or the effects on the public programs by taking the action it is taking?

This action is being taken at a time when our country is engaged in a war overseas in Kosovo, when matters of the highest order are consuming the public's attention and parliament's attention. It is at this time that the government seems to be trying to slip this complex legislation through. The government is trying to get this legislation slipped through the House while Canadians' attention is diverted elsewhere.

• (1335)

Who are we affecting with this legislation? We are affecting the Canadian military, the people who are fighting over in Kosovo. While they are away fighting, the government is back here grabbing the surplus from their pension funds.

We are also affecting the RCMP, the people who we entrust to keep law and order, to put their lives on the line fighting crime and to do all kinds of things to protect society. While they are protecting society, who is protecting their pension fund? It is certainly not the government.

**An hon. member:** Caught with its hand in the cookie jar.

**Mr. Gordon Earle:** A hand in the cookie jar, that is exactly what is happening.

Who is protecting the interests of the public servants, the people who work faithfully day in and day out trying to give effect to the laws and programs that parliament decides upon? It is certainly not their employer, which is the government.

We have a lot of concerns about this particular legislation.

Does the government recognize that the bill represents a shift in the way pension surpluses will be dealt with? It is setting a precedent not just for the public sector but for the private sector as well. Employers right across the country will soon be looking at the surpluses in the pension plans of their employees and deciding that they can perhaps take those to accommodate for business losses. Why not? The government has set the precedent by doing exactly that.

Does the government consider an individual's pension to be part of the wage packet? This again draws our attention to pay equity. What has the government done there? It is withholding money that is due to its employees, money that has been ruled on by a human right tribunal and money that has been determined to be rightfully that of the employees. The government is again failing to come to an agreement to settle those issues. This is just a continuation of that pattern. We have very great concerns about the approach that is being used by the government in this issue.

Let us look at some of the people who are suffering the most from this: widows, survivors and people in the low income bracket. The government talks about needing this money or wanting to take this money to improve things. Why not improve the pension benefits for those who are receiving benefits?

Currently the average pension for a woman with 20 years service is \$9,600 a year. We know that \$9,600 goes nowhere today. What is the government doing? Instead of saying "We've got a surplus and we should try to improve those benefits", it is saying "Let's take these benefits away, put it in our general coffers and pay down the debt".

Does the government not agree that much of the surplus was accumulated because of the wage freeze for the public sector employees and the delays in paying pay equity? Does it not agree that this meant that many people received lower than expected pensions? Does the government not agree that allowing the federal government to take the surplus means that employees must pay twice?

In conclusion, I would like to say a theme that I constantly say in the House. When we are dealing with matters of this importance, we should always be asking ourselves how we would want to be treated if we were in the same situation. We should ask ourselves if

*Government Orders*

we are treating people with respect and dignity when we do things that take away their right to have a say over their lives.

If we guide ourselves by the principle that we should not do something to others that we would not want done to ourselves, I am sure that we would have a much better approach in terms of governing the country.

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, once again I have to address the bill.

It is a sad occasion as far as I am concerned when a property rights bill that I brought before parliament has fallen by the wayside. However, I will save that matter for another day.

It seems that the longer the Liberals are in power, the more often we have to point out that this is a sad day for democracy in Canada. Bill C-78 is another one of those sad days for Canadians under this arrogant, self-serving Liberal regime.

Canadians do not have to believe me. All they have to do is listen to the words of a pension plan expert. On May 2, Mic Cohen of the actuarial consultants William Mercer Ltd. was quoted in the Ottawa *Citizen* as saying:

The handling of this bill is symptomatic of the government's failure to come clean with taxpayers and negotiate with its own unions. It's a sad commentary on democracy. When the government isn't prepared to agree, it bullies its way. Now I think they are doing all the right things to fix the plan but the process stinks.

● (1340)

I agree with the actuary from William Mercer. The process stinks. It stinks to high heaven. The Liberals make it stink even worse by invoking closure or time allocation in the House to arbitrarily take away \$30 billion from a pension fund surplus that rightfully belongs to both public servants who paid into their own pension plan and the taxpayers of Canada who paid the other share.

I notice there are smiles and grins across the way. This is a serious situation for the people involved.

The government is saying that the 670,000 employees and pensioners who are covered by this plan do not have a say in how the surplus will be managed or spent. By limiting debate of this 200 page monstrosity in the House of Commons and through committee, the government is also saying that it does not want the taxpayers to find out what it is doing with the share of the surplus paid into the pension plan by taxpayers. It has hidden it. The government is not disclosing what it is doing with it.

The Ottawa *Citizen* also quoted another pension expert, pension lawyer Fiona Campbell. She said:

This bill is unprecedented. I'm not aware of pension legislation of this magnitude in both what it's trying to do and how quickly it's being done with no input from the people affected.

We just witnessed, even after this quotation, that the government has invoked closure on the bill. It is limiting debate.

The *Citizen* article went on to say that Ms. Campbell is worried that the government's actions may allow other employers to lobby for changes that will allow them to get at pension surpluses when they need some cash. Is this the tip of the iceberg? Is this just the beginning? If it is this easy for the government to just run roughshod over the rights of Canadians, when will it do it again and who else will take that as a precedent?

Why is this so worrying? It is because for the first time the government will have the power to change premiums or benefits without seeking parliamentary approval.

Why does the government need this unprecedented power? Why do so many bills rammed through the House create new powers for ministers to bypass parliament? The absolute power by the Prime Minister and his cabinet make a mockery of democracy except at election time. I guess the logic of the cabinet is why bother going through the trouble of running a bill through the House of Commons when we can just pass one bill to give us the power to bypass parliament from now until forevermore. This is called enabling legislation. It enables the government to bypass parliament and put to regulation whatever it wishes.

Back in April of 1997, I wrote an article called "Power Grab", which cited a number of ways the fundamental principles of democracy were being violated by the Liberal government. It is getting worse not better since I put that out.

Bill Krause, president of the Social Sciences Employees Association, told the standing committee, and I quote:

This plan is unlike any other in Canada or the world and gives the government unique powers which could be abused in generating revenue from its employees. In essence, it gives them the power to tax employees.

Do members want to see the hypocrisy of the government? Let us look at another act of parliament that the government passed to regulate the pensions of employees working for federally regulated industries, the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985.

Here is how the government requires federally regulated employers to manage surpluses in federally regulated plans.

● (1345)

Section 9.2(1) states:

If an actuarial report filed under subsection 12(3) indicates that there is a surplus, no part of that surplus may be refunded to the employer unless

(a) the employer establishes that

(i) it is entitled to the surplus, or part of it, under the pension plan, or

(ii) it has a claim to the surplus, or part of it, under this section;

*Government Orders*

—and the Superintendent of Financial Institutions consents to the refund of the surplus to the employer.

Subsection 3 is the most important. “An employer has a claim to the surplus, or part of it, if, after being notified of the employer’s proposal for a refund of that surplus or part of it, at least two-thirds of the persons, members or former members of the pension plan, notify the employer that they consent to the proposal”.

The hypocrisy. I have to ask why there is this double standard. Why is there one set of democratic pension rules for federally regulated industries and a dictatorial set of rules for the federal government? Why pass one set of reasonable rules to govern pension surpluses in federally regulated industries and then pass Bill C-78 which gives the government total control to do anything it wants with the pension surpluses? Why?

One more question. Why did the government not put the same provisions from the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985 in Bill C-78? Why? Because it has the absolute power to do anything it wants. And we all know that absolute power corrupts absolutely. To cap it all off, the government has made sure the secrets of how it handles or mishandles pension surpluses remain secret.

Bill C-78 denies the auditor general’s conducting an audit of the board’s investments. The pension investment auditors will not have the power to report to parliament and the board will be exempt from access to information laws.

A couple of hours ago I asked the government some questions. They are on the record. I do not think I have to repeat them. In fact I do not have time to repeat them. It is refusing to answer these questions. We are supposed to have a debate here and not only does the government invoke closure on this and limit the debate, but it does not even answer our questions. It does not even have the courtesy to reply to the very serious questions we ask. I have just asked another series of questions. I think it is about time the government came down off its high horse, became a little less arrogant and responded to our questions.

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I stand to speak against the amendments in Group No. 3. Each one is a frivolous amendment and does not help either the interests of the employees or the interests of the taxpayers as a whole.

I remind my colleagues that whenever there is a deficit in the pension plan, it is the responsibility of the government to make up for the shortfall. The government is guaranteeing that the pension fund will remain there for the employees in the public sector.

I do not understand what the fuss is all about. Even what we have before us is pure estimation that the liability of the government will be close to \$96 billion over the next number of years, while the pension fund has been estimated at \$126 billion. If there is a problem tomorrow, who is going to make up for the shortfall? Is the opposition going to write a cheque to pay for the shortfall?

After all, whose money is it anyway? Who has contributed to the pension fund in the first place? The employees put in up to about 7.5% and the government matches the balance. There is one thing for sure. If the percentage of contribution is 70:30, 60:40 or 50:50, right off the bat one would say if there is a surplus, that surplus should be shared equally by the employees and the employers. That is in theory if that is the case.

• (1350)

Here we have something completely different. We have a situation where the government is absolutely on the hook, no matter what, under any circumstances. If there is a shortfall, if there is a problem, the government will have to come up with the shortfall. It will have to ensure that every public servant is guaranteed to have his or her pension for as long as they are eligible.

That is sound, good economics. That is sound, good social policy on the part of the government to do what it is doing and frankly what it should have done a long time ago.

I agree with those in the community who are asking for clarification in terms of what it is we should do from here on in. That is exactly what Treasury Board is trying to do with this proposed legislation. It is trying to clarify things once and for all so there will be no grey area whatsoever. We know what we have at this point, we clear it out and we start down the road again. As a result of that, everyone will know what his or her responsibilities are. Everyone will know what his or her rights are. We will move forward.

To stand and say that the \$30 billion belongs to the employees, I think is being unfair to the taxpayers of the country. They were the ones in the first place who put out the cash, including the employees of the government, including those who are eligible for the pension.

Frankly, if we were to look at the proposal by the minister he has been quite forthcoming and pragmatic in his approach in trying to deal with some of the issues that have not been dealt with over the years.

To say that we have something which in our estimate could be \$30 billion and we have to jump in and put our hands on it is unfair. It is totally uncalled for. In fact this money, as the government is planning to do, should remain in the public coffers because it belongs to the public. The employees of Canada should be guaranteed security and a right to access their pensions, and they are. No one is taking anything away from them. It is the opposite. There have been a number of improvements.

The President of the Treasury Board has gone out of his way to accommodate those who are calling on the government to have a proper mechanism to equally and collectively manage the funds

*S. O. 31*

and the pension benefits. If someone were to say, "I will call for better management and administration of the public service pension fund, a joint administration of that", we are quite open to it. What some colleagues on the opposite side of the House are asking for is absolutely ridiculous and no one in their right mind on either side of the House would go for it.

We are unnecessarily delaying the passage of the bill by putting amendments that have nothing to do with the facts. A good number of those amendments are based on fiction and on wild imagination that somewhere somehow this money belongs to someone. Yes it does. It belongs to us collectively as taxpayers. It also belongs to the public servants.

No one is saying it does not belong to the public servants, but it belongs to the public servants as taxpayers of the nation and not as individuals. As individuals they are entitled to their pensions no matter what. No one is going to take more than what they are entitled to and no one is going to take less than what they are entitled to.

To that extent I am at a loss to hear some of my colleagues calling for things that are unwarranted, uncalled for and asking the government to do things. It is irresponsible to ask for them.

The President of the Treasury Board is doing the absolutely responsible and right thing. I commend him for that. I would like to see the proposals he has implemented as quickly as possible so the representatives of the employees and the government can work together collectively in a partnership to better manage the pension funds for generations to come.

• (1355)

The House should reject unequivocally every one of the amendments in this package. Let us move on with the bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** We have a few minutes. Are there any members who would wish to debate for about two minutes on the bill? Otherwise we could get started on Statements by Members just a little bit early.

**Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that I will get the rest of my time after question period.

I want to say very clearly that this bill which the government has moved closure on will affect Canadians from coast to coast for years to come and it will not be in a positive way. This bill will cause more confusion, more anger, more disappointment in that years to come than any other bill in the last two years. I can guarantee that simply because the Liberals are letting through the side door and the back door and through the roof what they are saying up front. It is a camouflage bill. It totally distorts something which is true and historic to Canada.

I have presented hundreds, not dozens but hundreds of petitions to the House which this bill completely ignores. I want to use an

analogy. In the town where I lived as a boy there was a store and on the front it said "Men's Clothing", but what went on inside the store? Bootlegging. What this bill does—

**The Speaker:** I always hate to interrupt these lively debates. Nonetheless we are going to proceed to Statements by Members and the hon. member will have the floor when we return after question period.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### JIM WILLIAMS

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to honour a great Canadian from my riding of St. Catharines, Mr. Jim Williams. Well known for his hard work and dedication, Mr. Williams is the area director for the Niagara region office of Human Resources Development Canada.

Jim Williams was recently honoured with a nomination for a Public Service Outstanding Achievement Award and was invited to Ottawa to meet with Canada's Governor General, His Excellency, the Rt. Hon. Roméo LeBlanc. This award recognizes a sustained and exceptional performance of duties and accomplishments by senior public servants and is considered the most prestigious public award.

Mr. Williams' nomination for the Public Service Outstanding Achievement Award is a testament to the leadership role he has taken at Human Resources Development Canada.

For his commitment to public service, for his tireless efforts in the St. Catharines community and for the difference he has made in the lives of so many, we honour and thank Mr. Jim Williams.

\* \* \*

### CALGARY FOOTHILLS HOSPITAL

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to report a shocking story of violence being done to innocent human life, the sanctity of conscience and freedom of the press.

We have recently learned that at the Calgary Foothills hospital there are procedures being performed known as genetic terminations which are really eugenic infanticide. The hospital routinely induces premature labour of mothers whose unborn children are suspected of having some imperfection. These late term babies are delivered only to be left to die without medical attention or nourishment. In one case an attending nurse has described how an apparently viable baby was left for some 12 hours without care until it died.

According to hospital documents that I have obtained, nurses with moral objections are forced to participate in these obscene acts.

In an effort to cover up this scandal the Foothills hospital obtained a court order requiring the magazine that broke this story not to report on its details.

I have asked the attorney general and the Calgary police chief to investigate whether these procedures violate the Criminal Code's homicide provisions and they have agreed to do so.

While there are those in this current culture who would seek to kill the imperfect, infanticide is still against the law.

\* \* \*

● (1400)

#### HARRISTON KINSMEN CLUB

**Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Harriston Kinsmen Club, a service club in the town of Harriston, located in my riding of Waterloo—Wellington, recently celebrated its 40th anniversary.

This club does a great deal of fundraising and its efforts, which include helping to create much needed park and recreational facilities, contribute greatly to the community.

Like many other community groups and volunteers the people in this club in particular contribute significantly to the fabric of Canadian society. They make our communities a better place in which to live.

I urge all Canadians to support their community service clubs. I congratulate the Harriston Kinsmen Club for the many contributions it has made to our community over the past 40 years. We wish it many more years of success.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### CANADIAN CENTRE FOR MINERAL AND ENERGY TECHNOLOGY

**Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Minister of Natural Resources and member for Wascana, Saskatchewan, visited Val d'Or and Malartic yesterday to announce that an additional \$2.5 million dollars would be added over three years to the Canadian Centre for Mineral and Energy Technology.

The money will be used in the CANMET mine laboratory in Val d'Or for research on innovative ways to extract gold from narrow veins.

In many cases, the small regional mines lack the resources to develop new technology that would enable them to work more

*S. O. 31*

efficiently. CANMET can work with them to develop and adapt technologies meeting their particular needs and help them reduce production costs and remain in business.

Canada is a world leader in the field of mining. CANMET helps make Canada the place the rest of the world turns to for innovative mining technology.

We can become the best in the world in the development, production, distribution, use and exploration of mining products, abilities and technologies.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### NUNAVUT

**Mrs. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1999, as Canadians celebrated the birth of our third territory, Nunavut, 19 newly elected members sat for the first time in the Nunavut Legislative Assembly.

Today those members resume their seats to begin the business of governing the new territory. As Nunavut takes its place in the Canadian federation our colleagues in government have many challenges and opportunities ahead of them.

With a fast growing population to represent, spread across two million square kilometres, their priorities include addressing social and housing problems, employment opportunities, health and education concerns. These members have an incredible opportunity to shape the direction of their territory, creating a brighter future for their constituents.

Allow me to send our territorial colleagues best wishes on their first day of business in the legislative assembly. May they govern wisely and govern well.

\* \* \*

#### TARTAN DAY

**Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the St. Andrew Caledonian Society to ask for recognition of Tartan Day every year on April 6.

April 6 has special significance, for on that day in 1320 Scottish nobles gathered in the Abbey of Arbroath and pledged to defend their land from persecution and foreign dominance.

Swearing even to cast aside their King, Robert the Bruce, if he should falter from the principles of self-determination and freedom, this declaration is one of the earliest expressions of the rights of humanity to a peaceful, productive and secure life.

From the first contracts granted in Nova Scotia, or New Scotland, in 1621 to the present day, the Scots have played a major role in the founding of this nation.

*S. O. 31*

The declaration of April 6 as Tartan Day will recognize not only the events of history in supporting the right of people to be free from oppression, but will also recognize the significant contributions of the Scottish people in the exploration and foundations of Canada.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL MINING WEEK**

**Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is National Mining Week, a time when we recognize the major contributions of Canada's minerals and metals industry to our quality of life.

[*Translation*]

With its some 1,500 mining and exploration companies in over 100 countries, Canada is a recognized world leader in the sustainable production of metals and minerals.

[*English*]

We rank among the world's top five producers for some 16 major mineral commodities. Canada's industry is environmentally friendly, socially responsible and a major user of high tech products and services.

[*Translation*]

The mining industry currently offers highly specialized jobs to women and men throughout Canada, especially in its remote and rural regions.

[*English*]

Last year the Canadian minerals and metals industry contributed over \$26 billion to our economy, employed more than 360,000 Canadians and generated some \$45 billion in export earnings for Canada.

I invite hon. members to join with me in celebrating the accomplishments of this important sector and to salute the men and women who have helped to make the Canadian mining industry a world leader.

\* \* \*

• (1405)

[*Translation*]

**DRUMMONDVILLE'S LÉGENDES FANTASTIQUES**

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening at the annual Quebec tourism award gala where the Grands Prix du tourisme québécois were handed out, the gold Lauréat national award in the category of tourist development and innovation went to Drummondville's *Légendes fantastiques*.

In its first season, this production involved the efforts of 300 volunteers, 150 of them as extras, and entertained a total audience of 43,000. This is one more example of the artistic contribution to the already exceptional economic boom in our region.

On behalf of my fellow citizens, I would like to thank all those who took part in this outstanding production, whether behind the scenes or in the spotlight. I would invite everyone to drop by Drummondville this summer and enjoy *Légendes fantastiques* in its second season.

My congratulations to its directors, and best wishes for a good summer.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**LAND MINES**

**Hon. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the first meeting of state parties to implement the convention on the prohibition of the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel land mines and on their destruction took place last week in Mozambique.

Tribute was paid to those countries which spearheaded this humanitarian security cause and Canada was noted for its courage of true leadership.

Experience warns us that it can take decades to remove these life destroying mines once conflicts have ended. I have seen firsthand the excruciatingly labour intensive procedure that demining entails, prodding every square metre of soil 600 to 700 times. There are tens of millions of these mines to remove worldwide.

Casualties in war are 80% civilian. Too many are land mine victims, even after conflict ends.

We must free this world of these abominable, evil weapons so that we can limit the suffering of civilians, make the world a safer place and enable those affected areas to become liveable and productive once again.

\* \* \*

**JULIE PAYETTE**

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, today I would like to wish Canada's next astronaut a successful voyage.

Julie Payette, Canada's newest star in the sky, will blast off on May 20 in the space shuttle *Discovery*, bound for the new international space station.

A mission specialist, Julie will be using her engineering and technical skills to assist in building the new orbiting facility. She will be part of a crew of seven who will add a pair of cargo doors to the station as it orbits 400 kilometres above the earth.

Julie, a native Montrealer, is a most outstanding individual. An award winning engineer who speaks several languages, an accomplished classical soprano, an athlete, a trained jet pilot and a sparkling personality, she exemplifies the best that Canada has to offer.

I say good luck and bon voyage.



S. O. 31

**ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE**

**Mr. Lou Sekora (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, once again the Reformer on the opposite side has his facts all wrong.

This week the member for Dewdney—Alouette incorrectly stated that I asked for an audit of the RCMP. That is hogwash.

The fact is that it was the mayors of the greater Vancouver regional district who requested the audit.

I have a suggestion for the member for Dewdney—Alouette. He should form a new party that is neither Reform nor the united alternative. He should be the founding member of the huff and puff party.

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN NURSES**

**Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, nurses recognize their part in creating and maintaining quality health care.

Nurses traditionally and even today are predominately female. As a result, they have had to fight for wages that truly reflect the value of the service they provide.

Nurses are not personal care hostesses, as Premier Ralph Klein suggested a few years ago. They are professionals, dedicated and committed to the well-being of human kind.

Nurses everywhere have been made to suffer as a result of government cuts to health care. They suffer from workload fatigue and are stressed from worry over how to deliver quality care with limited resources. They are denied job and economic security by the casualization of nursing positions. Is it any wonder we are facing a nursing shortage?

Governments and employers have a responsibility to foster environments and work conditions that promote a quality of life for nurses. That is a sure way of increasing entrants into nursing programs, of enticing nurses back into the profession, of recruiting nurses and, finally, of retaining nurses.

Let us begin to repair the damages by offering nurses decent wages and working conditions.

\* \* \*

• (1410)

[Translation]

**THE LATE MARCEL PÉPIN**

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we were saddened yesterday to learn of the untimely death of Mr. Marcel Pépin, ombudsman for the CBC French network.

After an illustrious career at *Le Droit*, *La Presse* and *Le Soleil*, Marcel Pépin gained still more recognition as the first chairman of the Commission d'accès à l'information du Québec.

After heading Radio-Canada's radio news services, he went on to become vice-president of French-language radio, and then ombudsman in 1997.

Just recently, Ombudsman Marcel Pépin gained attention for his painstaking report in response to a complaint against Radio-Canada by the Office of the Prime Minister of Canada concerning the events surrounding the Asia-Pacific summit in Vancouver.

Marcel Pépin was passionately interested in politics and an independent soul. He was a staunch and untiring defender of the freedom to inform and the right to be informed, as well as a great believer in the importance of maintaining a relationship of independence and non-interference between journalists and those in power.

Marcel Pépin, you will be greatly missed.

\* \* \*

**KOSOVAR REFUGEES**

**Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this week, the Canadian and Quebec governments met and put aside their old jurisdictional quarrels to properly welcome Kosovar refugees.

For over a month now, these refugees have been experiencing the pain of having been forced out of their homes, villages and homeland. Deprived of shelter and exhausted, thousands of people still managed to reach refugee camps. Canada then invited some of them to settle here, and quickly provided humanitarian and material assistance.

This week, the Quebec government announced the concrete measures that it will take to welcome Kosovar refugees. These efforts on the part of the Canadian and Quebec governments make all Quebecers proud.

We wish a warm welcome to these women, men and children, and we hope they can resume a normal life here, in peace and serenity, while waiting to go back to Kosovo.

\* \* \*

**QUEBEC FAMILY WEEK**

**Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Shefford, PC):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, I am pleased to recognize Quebec family week.

The purpose of this week, whose theme is "My family, my roots: a lifelong strength", is to invite Quebecers from all origins to celebrate the strength of their family network, to renew privileged relations with their close ones, and to cultivate family spirit.

*Oral Questions*

In this international year of older persons, let us rediscover the value of intergenerational contacts and relations. Whether we are talking about adoptive or natural families, the family remains a powerful lever, an infallible denominator to which we go back at one time or another during our life, to find strength, love and support, and to give back some meaning to our life.

I encourage all families to celebrate the strength and richness of the family unit, and I hope that this week will be one of harmony, mutual support and solidarity between generations.

\* \* \*

[English]

**MILTON WONG**

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the election of Milton Wong as Chancellor of Simon Fraser University. He is the first Canadian of Asian origins to be elected to that post. He follows closely Bob Lee, who recently completed his mandate as Chancellor of the University of British Columbia.

Milton Wong's career as an investment counsellor, a founder of the Laurier Institute, Science World, the Vancouver Dragon Boat Festival and the World Chinese Entrepreneurs Convention has involved co-operative action with all of Vancouver's cultural communities.

His election as chancellor reflects the values of cultural diversity and the creative dynamism of the new pluralistic society that has emerged in British Columbia.

**The Speaker:** I have been requested to save the last statement for one of our colleagues, the member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar.

\* \* \*

**RESIGNATION OF MEMBER**

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, with these, my last words in this House, I would like to take the opportunity to thank the constituents of Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, and before that Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, and the hundreds of workers in election campaigns who granted me the privilege of being a member of the House for almost 11 years. It truly has been a privilege to be one of the 301 members who come here to serve the people of Canada.

I also extend my thanks to the House of Commons support staff, people like Tom, J. P. and Ray, who really make this place work, to my own staff over the years, and to my present staff, Mike, Adrian, Doris and Erika, in particular.

I thank members on all sides of the House for their many courtesies over the years and for their many friendships.

Lastly, I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and each and every member of the House for the privilege of working with them, as we all, each in our own way, strive to make Canada an even better place in which to live.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

● (1415)

[English]

**IMPAIRED DRIVING**

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, drunk driving kills thousands of Canadians every year, twice as many as homicides. Thousands more are injured. Yet the government is introducing only half measures to deal with this tragedy.

Reports indicate that the government is against the police using hand held sensors to detect drunk drivers. Apparently it would rather stick to the good old usual smell your breath, walk a straight line approach that is not exactly science.

Why is the justice minister against police using this reliable tool to fight drunk driving?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member undoubtedly is aware, the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights has been studying the issue of impaired driving for some time.

In fact I anticipate a thoughtful and detailed report in which members of the official opposition have participated. When I receive that report I will review it and I will respond.

As I said earlier in this week in the House, all of us understand the scourge of impaired driving and we will do what we can to prevent it.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, studying and reports will not save lives. We are going into summer and we know that is a horrible time for carnage on our roads with drunk driving.

Unless the government acts now we will probably continue to see the death rate rising as a result of drunk drivers. There is no time for political delay. We need tougher laws now. We have studied and we have reported long enough.

Will the justice minister commit now to passing new tough anti-drunk driving legislation before the House rises for the summer?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I have already indi-

*Oral Questions*

cated on this matter, I await the report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

I understand members of the official opposition have been working on this report. I actually think it would be somewhat contemptuous of me today to pre-empt the work of that committee. I look forward to receiving it.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we were asking for a commitment before the House rises.

Another thing we talked about in that report, and one of my colleagues brought it forward in the first place, was that we needed to lower the blood alcohol level from .08 to .05. That is the standard in 10 European countries and Australia. It seems to be working. Transport Canada said that if we lowered the limit to .05 it would save more than 500 lives a year. I dare say that would be worth it.

Let me ask a question of the justice minister again. Why will she not take the advice of her own government officials and the standing committee and commit to getting this thing done before summer so we would save lives?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I have already said twice today, I look forward to receiving the report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. I will take very seriously that which is recommended by the standing committee.

**Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear the minister. She said three times that she anticipates the report, that she awaits the report.

When we were asking some reporters this morning about where they got the leaked report, they said they received it from the minister's office. It was a senior Southam reporter who said it was leaked from the minister's office.

The minister's staff has seen the report. They know we have a unanimous report of the committee. All parties have agreed. We do not totally agree with everything that is in the report but we said we would compromise. A half a loaf is better than no loaf at all. We want the report to be in the House.

Will the minister commit to tabling a bill, when we come back after our recess next week, which we will pass quickly in the House?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know from where the hon. member gets his information but he should check it.

In fact I have not seen the report. I have to say I find it deplorable that there are those who choose to treat the House of Commons with contempt and leak the contents of a standing committee

report. Because I respect the House of Commons I will wait to receive the report and I will respond at that time.

• (1420)

**Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this is not about a leaked report. This is about drunk driving.

The minister knows her staff has told people. They have been involved in this. We did not leak the report. We do not leak reports like the other side.

This is about drunk driving. The government has delayed it since the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley brought it into the House in 1995.

Will the minister commit to bringing a bill to the House which we will support and pass in one day when we come back after our recess next week?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what I commit to do upon receipt of the standing committee report on impaired driving is to review it very seriously.

I have said before in the House that all of us on this side take the scourge of impaired driving very seriously. I look forward to the work of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. I know it has worked very hard on this report. Hon. members of the opposition have worked very hard. When the report is tabled in the House, I will respond.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has often said that he has final responsibility for the integrity of his cabinet.

According to Canada's information commissioner, the Minister of Human Resources Development deliberately contravened the Access to Information Act, an act of parliament, for political ends.

Does the Prime Minister think a minister should be able to contravene an act of parliament with complete impunity?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied with the explanation the minister gave yesterday.

There has been a sharp increase in the number of access to information requests. Responding to all these requests takes time and staff. Unfortunately, there was a delay. It was not caused by the minister. Nothing can therefore be held against the minister.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this is an all too convenient excuse.

*Oral Questions*

According to the *National Post*, the commissioner said he had to threaten to go to the federal court to have the minister's office release the information that it had received 74 days earlier for authorization.

How can the Prime Minister accept his minister's explanations that the error was an honest one, when the information commissioner had to throw his weight around and even threaten the minister with legal action before he would finally conform to the legislation?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, this is completely inaccurate.

No investigator ever came to my office with any request whatsoever. I categorically deny it.

This is a tempest in a teapot. The whole thing is absolutely clear and transparent. The files were given to the journalists as requested. The opposition is saying my office held them up. The files were in my office for 12 working days.

Also, the opposition is saying that my office delayed them because I did not want this to come up during the debate in the House. The debate took place in early February, and the file arrived in my office on March 24.

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister often refers to his ethics counsellor as the ultimate tool to evaluate the behaviour of his ministers.

We now have a situation where, in the opinion of the information commissioner, the Minister of Human Resources Development violated an act of parliament to protect himself from political damage.

Since the defence strategy used by the Minister of Human Resources Development is to feign indifference and to plead carelessness, would the Prime Minister not be well advised to submit this case to his ethics counsellor?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the commissioner never said that I violated the act. This is totally absurd.

The word "defy" was used in reference to my office. There is some confusion in the letter between my department and my office. My office received the document on March 24, while the debate took place in the House during the first week of February.

This is a tempest in a teapot created by people who are looking for winning conditions for a referendum, people who are systematically harassing Quebec ministers in this government. This is a case of Quebecers going after Quebecers, as has been the case all too often in our history.

• (1425)

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the information commissioner is not a Quebecker. He is a person mandated by the federal government to do a job.

We know that the Prime Minister has a tendency to protect his ministers excessively, as was the case with the former solicitor general, who revealed confidential information while travelling on an airplane. However, what the Minister of Human Resources Development has done is much more serious. He violated the act for a political gain.

How can the Prime Minister protect a minister who violated an act of the federal parliament for over two and a half months, and who only complied with that act under extreme pressure, under the threat of legal proceedings?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first, I again categorically deny that a commissioner's investigator came to my office. This never happened. The fact that the *National Post* wrote this does not mean it is true. Bloc Quebecois members should learn that the *National Post* is not the most reliable source of information in Canada.

Second, the information commissioner said the law may have been defied in my office. The fact is that the file arrived at my office on March 24, while the debate had taken place in the House during the first half of February. This is a tempest in a teapot. They are desperately trying to achieve the winning conditions for a referendum that three quarters of Quebecers do not want.

\* \* \*

[English]

**IMMIGRATION**

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister dismissed the head tax on refugees as a little problem. Yet the Canadian Council for Refugees has documented that the head tax imposes on refugee families a vicious cycle of hunger, hardship, exploitation and despair.

Why does the Prime Minister not show a little compassion, show a little leadership, and scrap the head tax on refugees once and for all?

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** First of all, Mr. Speaker, there is no head tax in this country.

Second, I think the Prime Minister was right to say that the leader of the New Democratic Party tried to raise an issue that is not an issue.

We are in a situation right now of an emergency evacuation. We are so proud about the welcoming of these people into the country

*Oral Questions*

by all Canadians. We all know that they want to go back to their country so the problem does not exist.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Council for Refugees has made it clear that it is a real issue, a serious issue. The UN High Commission on Refugees has condemned it. The Canadian Human Rights Commission has condemned it. Even the Liberal Party has condemned it. In fact the Liberals described it at their convention as “a heavy burden for those seeking to integrate themselves into the Canadian economy”.

If the Prime Minister will not listen to anyone else, will he listen to his own party and scrap the head tax on refugees trying to rebuild their lives in Canada?

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the difficult situation in Kosovo we did not see any political party in the country making political points on the backs of refugees.

I am really disappointed by what is going on right now. We are working for these people. Canada is one of the most generous countries of the world.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, in a preliminary report, a copy of which I received on the weekend, it is recommended that the Minister of National Defence cut our reserves from 51 units to 20 in the infantry, from 15 units to 7 in the artillery, and from 17 units to 10 in the armoured units.

The government has already cut the military from 80,000 to 60,000. Is the Minister of National Defence going to cut our reserve forces or not? According to the parliamentary secretary yesterday in the House the decision rests with him.

• (1430)

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of cutting the military further.

The matter of reserves restructuring has to be noted in the context that we are still operating under the same reserves structure we had during the second world war. A lot of things have changed and there is a need for an update on it. Indeed, reservists, honorary colonels, people who I am sure the hon. member is concerned about, were involved in drafting this particular proposal which is now before us. At this stage it is only a proposal. There has been no decision made about it. I am happy to look at this proposal and other proposals.

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the record now shows that the minister is not going to adopt any of the

recommendations that are in the report. I am so pleased to hear that. That is just what he said. He is not going to cut the reserves whatsoever. Is that what the minister is telling us today? Because how could he possibly consider the cuts that are recommended in that report which would absolutely devastate the reservists in Canada?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of cutting the reserves. However, there are a lot of other recommendations that deal with modifications, updating, reform for the reserves and re-rolling of a number of the units. I consider all of those proposals to be valid for examination and I will examine all of them.

\* \* \*

**SUPREME COURT OF CANADA**

**Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has an opportunity to restore public confidence in the judiciary. Supreme Court Justice Cory is retiring. Canadians, legal scholars and even provincial ministers of justice want a more open process. “Judges should be known to the public as much as possible ahead of time”, stated retired supreme court Justice La Forest.

It is time to open up this pre-charter process. Will the Prime Minister take action and bring nominees to a parliamentary review before appointing them to the highest court in the land?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we do not want to do that because we have been well served with the system we have at this time. I do not want to import an American system that would not work as well.

One of the pillars of our system is the separation between the judiciary, the executive and parliament. It is the way that we guarantee the freedom of the people. I do not want people to come here and have to testify and expose their lives and after that go to the bench as they do in the United States. We do not want that system because we want to protect the—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Calgary Centre.

**Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that even retired supreme court justices are calling for a more open process. Why is this government so averse to public scrutiny and accountability?

The current closed door process clearly does not have the backing of Canadians, especially in this era of increased judicial activism. What is it about a parliamentary review of potential appointments to one of the most powerful institutions in our country that the Prime Minister is concerned about? What is it about consulting parliament that offends the Prime Minister so much?

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting that the official opposition continues to try to undermine important federal institutions like the Supreme Court of Canada. The official opposition quotes numbers from various studies. What it does not tell us is that in fact in those same studies Canadians have told us that they have overwhelming confidence in the Supreme Court of Canada as an institution of impartiality and integrity.

I do not think anything speaks more eloquently to the quality of appointment to that court.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I want to refresh the memory of the Minister of Human Resources Development.

The information commissioner's letter read in part as follows: "However, the file was sent for approval on January 28. Departmental officials took 74 days to agree to the release of all the material requested. The minister's office put its interests ahead of those of the applicant and defied the legislation throughout this period. This is completely unacceptable".

• (1435)

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister may reply if he wishes.

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Bloc Quebecois said that my office had deliberately held up certain information in order to prevent it from coming out during a debate in the House.

What I am saying is that the debate took place during the first half of February, but the document did not reach my office—because my office is what we are talking about—until March 24. It remained there for 12 working days.

I have already told my own office that I found 12 working days too long, and I can assure the House that we regret the delay. We have taken steps to correct the situation, and the documents were provided to the journalist in question.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minister is responsible for his department, by virtue of ministerial accountability. If he does not know that, there is a problem.

How can the minister now try to divest himself of all responsibility, when never before has such a serious direct and unambiguous accusation been made against a government minister as that made in the letter from Canada's information commissioner? This has never happened before.

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, despite the histrionics of the members opposite, I never said that I was not responsible for my department. But they said my office was aware of this matter since January 28, and I am saying that it was not.

My department has received 50% more access requests. We are taking steps to correct the situation. The delay is decidedly regrettable, but it was not intentional. We have already taken steps to address the situation.

But it is truly a tempest in a teapot, and I think the Bloc Quebecois members have motives entirely different from those they are claiming. They are much more—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Fraser Valley.

\* \* \*

[English]

**ARTS AND CULTURE**

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, first taxpayers funded *Bubbles Galore*, the sex fantasy film that won the Freakzone International Festival of Trash Cinema award. What an honour. Today we learned that the taxpayer will also fund *The Girl Who Would Be King*, a drag king adventure that is due out in September. Two days ago the minister said that it was the Mulroney government's fault for approving this kind of flick, but *The Girl Who Would Be King*, which is no doubt another Oscar award winner, was approved by a council appointed by this government.

Will the minister accept responsibility for this decision? Will she do something to ensure Canadian taxpayers are not subsidizing the pornography industry?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first I want to underscore that last year the Canada Council funded approximately 15,000 organizations, artists and writers to help build the culture of this country. Obviously as the minister responsible, I do not think the member would want a situation where the minister decides what films and what books are supported. I can underscore for the hon. member that the Canada Council has assured me it will be doing a revision of its conditions to ensure all applications are respectful of the public purse.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**The Speaker:** Order, please. I appeal to you my colleagues once again to please let us hear the answer on one side and the question on the other.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the auditor general recently stated that when it comes to giving grants, the federal government has a very poor track record. He said that there are "problems in compliance, weaknesses in program design"—which is the problem here—"and instances of poor control". In other words, taxpayers' money is being spent where no one ever intended it to be spent, and these films are a prime

*Oral Questions*

example. Even the minister said that she is concerned about the government funding for this kind of movie.

If the minister is genuine in her concern, will she rewrite her department's guidelines for giving funds to the Canada Council? Will she move today to cancel this latest grant which is going to help out the Canadian pornography industry?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have not seen either of the films in question.

I can repeat that there were 15,000 artists, writers and filmmakers who were helped last year by the Canada Council. I can underscore for the hon. member that the Department of Canadian Heritage does not write the guidelines. The guidelines are written by the Canada Council precisely because successive governments and successive politicians have understood that it is not up to a politician to determine what is art.

\* \* \*

• (1440)

[Translation]

**MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development tells us that he was not informed before the month of March, and that the debate took place in February.

How can he explain to us that his department received the request on January 28? Normally, a minister is responsible for his departmental employees, responsible for his department. Today he is trying to play the wise guy by telling us "We got the information in my office only in March. The department has nothing to do with me". He says that, even if they got the request on January 28. He is the one responsible for his department.

How is it that he did not answer?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I see that the hon. member, the leader of the Bloc Quebecois, or at least the pseudo-leader, is still not ready to be part of a government.

I am totally responsible for my department. I have 25,000 employees under my responsibility, moreover.

What the leader of the Bloc Quebecois referred to was my office. He brought my office into question. I am responsible for my department. I have already said the delay was regrettable. What I said was that this was brought to the attention of my office only in the month of March and that there were no wrong intentions in connection with providing the documents to the journalist.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I prefer not to be like the minister if governing means doing so with disdain and carelessness, and playing the wise guy in the House.

When he tells us that his office is not involved, I would reread again for his benefit what the letter from the information commissioner said "The minister's office put his interests before those of the requesting parties and has defied the law all this time." This seems to me to be pretty clear.

Could he tell us, when he claims that no one in the information commissioner's office had come to see him, how it can be that the commissioner refers to April 12, a request—

**The Speaker:** The Minister of Human Resources Development.

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, no investigator ever came to my office. There is a distinction between my office and my department, that is clear.

I can assure the House that there is a big difference, but I am responsible for my department and I am very proud of it. We are going to improve the situation. Moreover, we are one of the top departments when it comes to complying with the rules on access to information.

The adjectives used by the leader of the Bloc Quebecois in the introduction to his question and the personal attacks to which I was constantly subjected by the Bloc members are another thing. They claim to be here defending Quebec but there is a constant anti-Quebec attitude from these people who are here to promote—

**The Speaker:** The member for Calgary Northeast.

\* \* \*

[English]

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the government is sending 800 Canadian troops over to Macedonia. The trouble is it will take two months to get there and guess what? They are going to have to hitch a ride across the ocean to get over to the Balkans.

The chief of defence staff admitted in his last annual report that Canada has limited lift capacity for heavy equipment. The defence minister can see for himself the problem. I ask the defence minister, when is he going to buy or build the necessary ships that our troops desperately need?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we do not need a large capacity ship on a regular basis. To spend \$1 billion or \$2 billion on a ship that might get used once every five years would be a waste of taxpayers'

*Oral Questions*

money. The Reform Party of course knows how to waste taxpayers' money. [English]

Let me tell the House that all of our allies will use commercial ships as a means of getting their heavy equipment into different theatres. In fact, during the Falklands war the British used commercial ships to get all its equipment and its troops into the Falklands area.

There is nothing unusual about NATO countries doing this. We are spending the money in the best way for the taxpayer.

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that this government has cut billions of dollars out of the defence budget. It has literally laid to waste the troops and their capacity to move around the world. Instead it resorts to rent a ship to get our equipment over there.

I am going to ask the defence minister again, when is he going to commit to building or buying the necessary ships to move our troops and equipment around the world?

• (1445)

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe what the hon. member is saying in view of the fact that his party wanted to cut still more money out of the defence budget.

Now he wants us to build a ship that might get used once every five years or so. That is not practical. All our partners in NATO use money in the most efficient and effective way possible and that is what we are doing.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BILL C-77**

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, according to the Association des propriétaires d'autobus du Québec, it takes an average of 20 passengers per bus to make a regional service cost effective. On some routes, carriers report no more than five passengers on average.

Does the Minister of Transport intend to increase fourfold the fares of buses used by students, seniors and people living below the poverty line so regional lines will survive his unreasonable deregulation?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague opposite is mistaken.

The intent of this government and the bill is to establish a national framework to permit standardization in the area of safety, the main criterion of trucking and bus transportation businesses, and to standardize it across Canada.

**EMPLOYMENT**

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

The Building and Construction Trades Council, along with the AFL-CIO, have been concerned for some time about the implementation of a fair wage policy by the Government of Canada.

On behalf of the thousands of workers affected, can the minister tell the House what the status is of our fair wage policy and when specifically the fair wage schedules will come into effect?

**Hon. Claudette Bradshaw (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, when I became Minister of Labour, a majority of members of parliament asked me to make fair wages one of my priorities.

I can inform the House that new regulations are being drafted. In late June 1999, in the provinces where there are no current wage schedules, Statistics Canada will conduct surveys to collect information to establish fair wage schedules.

The good news is that fair wage schedules will be in place in the fall of 1999 at the same time as the revised regulations.

\* \* \*

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the minister of Indian affairs told the House that the charter of rights and freedoms applies to all Canadians. The question is: Does it apply to all governments?

The Constitution says the charter applies to the federal and provincial governments but it is silent on its application to the proposed Nisga'a government.

On what authority does the minister believe the charter applies to the Nisga'a government?

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will quote to the House from Dr. Joe Gosnell, the president of the Nisga'a people. He said, "We are not prepared to be marginalized by any political party in the country. We want to be a part of this great country of ours, to take part politically, socially, economically. That's the basis of the treaty".

The Nisga'a are Canadians and the charter applies to all Canadians.

**Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the charter is an instrument for checking the powers of government over individuals and the Constitution is clear. The



*Oral Questions*

charter applies to the federal and provincial governments. It is silent on the proposed Nisga'a government.

On what authority does the minister believe the charter applies to the Nisga'a government?

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is the expressed intent of all three signatories to the Nisga'a treaty that the Constitution and the charter of rights do apply to the Nisga'a people.

It is the intention of the government to ensure that is reflected in the enabling legislation that will accompany the treaty when it is presented to the House.

\* \* \*

## GRAIN TRANSPORTATION

**Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, three days ago the Minister of Transport assured the House he would not slam the door on any reasonable suggestion from anybody at yesterday's grain transportation meeting in Winnipeg. However, he did just that by ruling out of hand any independent accounting of current handling costs for moving prairie grain. A dozen western farm organizations had unanimously requested that as a first step but the minister slammed the door in their faces.

• (1450)

How does the minister justify that decision?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had read the background documents that we released, he would know that Mr. Arthur Kroeger, a very eminent former public servant who will be our facilitator, will have a number of issues to look at in his mandate, including that of costs.

Mr. Kroeger can examine costs and the railway data, but we do not need a full costing review that will take nine months and delay the whole process.

Is the NDP more interested in delaying the process and lining the pockets of lawyers, or is it interested in getting a solution?

**Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the government has been sitting on the Estey report for five months now, it is a fairly feeble excuse.

The minister should simply stand up in his place and admit that he and the government have bought the Estey report lock, stock and barrel. They are not only refusing a review of costs, but they are stating that Mr. Estey's report is a compass for the future, a compass, I might add, that is pointed directly at the Canadian Wheat Board.

Why is the minister so eager to emasculate the role of the board and force ever higher grain transportation costs onto the backs of beleaguered prairie farmers?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member accuses us of sitting on the report. What we were waiting for was feedback from the various sectors that are affected, something the hon. member and others in the House have been urging us to do. If we had moved any faster we would have been accused of ramming this through.

The government accepts the basic framework of Justice Estey, but we realize that a lot of work has to be done to make those recommendations come into force and to implement them to the benefit of all, especially producers. The goal for the government is to ensure that the producers get a better stake and more money out of any reforms.

\* \* \*

## NEWFOUNDLAND ACT

**Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC):** Mr. Speaker, back in 1949, the Canadian Constitution, then known as the British North America Act, was amended by the addition of Newfoundland's Terms of Union with Canada. That amendment is now known as the Newfoundland Act, and section 44 says that Canada will provide for the maintenance in the province of Newfoundland of appropriate reserve units of the Canadian defence forces which will include the Royal Newfoundland Regiment. That is in the constitution.

Will the minister not agree that a constitutional amendment would be needed to eliminate the Royal Newfoundland Regiment which is actively being considered by DND?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am not proposing any amendments to the Constitution or any amendments to the Newfoundland Act. I am merely looking at a proposal that comes from a number of reservists themselves and people who are looking at reforms to an institution that has not been changed since the second world war.

As I have indicated previously, I will look at all those recommendations and any other recommendations. I am certainly not proposing any reduction in the size of our reserves or the size of our military overall, or anything that would involve anything akin to what the hon. member is talking about in terms of the change in the Newfoundland Act.

**Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC):** Mr. Speaker, let me remind the minister that a constitutional amendment would be needed.

Even though Newfoundlanders make up a disproportionately large percentage of the Canadian Armed Forces, our per capita share of defence spending is lower than the Canadian average. That means we receive less than our fair share of the economic benefits associated with the presence of military units in our province.

*Oral Questions*

The Minister of National Defence talks about elimination. What about amalgamation? If the minister decides to amalgamate the forces, would he not agree that a constitutional amendment would be needed?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am not proposing any constitutional amendments. The member is talking about a very hypothetical situation.

I think Newfoundlanders can be proud of what they contribute to the armed forces of the country. They contribute in great numbers to both the regulars and the reserves. They have a proud tradition and a proud history, both under Newfoundland prior to 1949 and since becoming a part of Confederation. I want to maintain that great pride they have and which we should all have in their contribution.

\* \* \*

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadian defence and aerospace companies are very concerned about recent restrictions that have been placed on them by the United States government which could threaten as much as \$5 billion of our exports.

Can the Minister of Foreign Affairs advise the House on the current status of this very serious issue and the prospects for an early resolution of the matter?

• (1455)

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** On April 22 I raised the matter with Secretary of State Albright and we came to an agreement that there would be a 120-day period of review.

Since that time, we have consulted with Canadian industry to register their concerns. In fact, we have a team of officials in Washington today who are raising those concerns directly with their state department counterparts.

We have also agreed that we would look at a review of our own export permit regulations to ensure there is no diversion of sensitive technologies or transfers of technologies. I think that will satisfy, in large part, the American concern in this matter.

\* \* \*

**BRITISH COLUMBIA**

**Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, for the first time in Canadian history we learned the Government of Canada is prepared to violate the Constitution and expropriate British Columbia property at Nanoose Bay. The premier's office has advised me that the federal government has rejected all offers to settle this dispute.

I have to question the Prime Minister's judgment if he thinks this is the answer to his western alienation committee.

Instead of threatening B.C., will the minister sit down face to face with the premier of British Columbia and move to resolve this dispute through negotiation, not expropriation?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have made every effort to bring about a negotiated settlement of this matter. We have been working on this for two years. We have been taking the case to the B.C. government saying, "We need this for national security". This testing range has been in operation since 1965. It is vital that we continue to use that seabed.

We have not been able to come to a settlement with the B.C. government. We have been more than generous in attempting to come to a resolution. If we cannot get a resolution by the 11th hour and 59th minute, expropriation will then be necessary.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BILL C-77**

**Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in addition to franchising Via Rail lines, the policies of the Minister of Transport will eliminate the cross-subsidization of bus lines, which allows regions to have such services.

Since the people in the regions are likely not to have access to either trains or buses, is the Minister of Transport not contributing through his policies to emptying the regions?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the aim of this government is to improve the passenger rail system, especially in Quebec. The hon. member is mistaken. Our aim is to improve the situation.

The report by the Standing Committee on Transport contained recommendations in this regard. We accepted most of them and they were supported by all members, including the member opposite.

\* \* \*

[English]

**KOSOVO**

**Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, media reports indicate that the Yugoslav army may be withdrawing from Kosovo and there is concern that large movements of troops in convoy may attract bombing by NATO.

If the Yugoslav army is in fact leaving Kosovo, what is the government doing to ensure that these troops can withdraw without being bombed? I would also like to know what the

government is currently doing to bring us closer to a diplomatic solution for peace?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last week, along with the Russians and the other members of the group of seven, we put together a seven point peace proposal which included a commitment for the Yugoslav troops to withdraw. However, they had to have a verification of that withdrawal to make sure it was happening.

If there are unconfirmed reports we will certainly be glad to look at them. However, there is a whole package and part of that package has to make sure that the protection of the Kosovars, the refugees going back, is guaranteed. That is part of the package and it has to be looked at as a total package.

\* \* \*

#### NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence has just said that he could be re-rolling units. That means amalgamation, therefore loss of units, loss of their history, and losses for communities across Canada.

Is the minister really serious about considering such a drastic move?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not understand what re-rolling means. It does not necessarily mean amalgamation. It could mean that a unit that has been an infantry unit could become a unit doing another kind of function.

We have to look at what total functions we need to support the Canadian forces both in the regulars and in the reserves in terms of the operations we have today and in terms of our 1994 white paper on defence policy. Re-rolling could mean that they could carry on in a different function in support of the total army concept.

\* \* \*

• (1500)

#### CANADIAN BEEF

**Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

Canadian beef is recognized as top quality beef and enjoyed around the world. Canadians question, why will the Europeans not accept our beef?

**Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the European Union continues to practise fearmongering and the spreading of misinformation about the quality of Canadian beef in order to go against

#### Government Orders

the WTO ruling. It has been proven time and time again to the WTO by the World Health Organization, the European Union's own veterinarian and health committee, Codex Alimentarius and Health Canada that Canadian beef is safe.

We want access. If we do not get access, we want compensation. If we do not get that, we will retaliate.

\* \* \*

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the government hon. House leader if he could provide the House with the batting order so that we will know what pitchers to put up.

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question, which he put in baseball format.

This afternoon we will conclude the debate on report stage of Bill C-78, the pension legislation. That will result in a number of votes at 5.30 p.m., or thereabouts.

On Friday we shall consider the report stage and third reading of Bill C-69, the criminal records legislation, and second reading of Bill S-23, respecting the Carriage by Air Act.

I understand that there have also been negotiations today regarding the status of Bill C-64, with respect to travelling exhibitions, and there might be a disposition to deal with that bill without debate at third reading tomorrow.

• (1505)

Next week is a constituency week. We will return on May 25, given that May 24 is a holiday.

The hours that day will be those usually followed on a Monday. That is to say, the House will meet at 11 a.m. rather than 10 a.m., and the debate will be on third reading of Bill C-78, with the vote to take place at 6.30 p.m. that day.

On Wednesday, May 26 I hope to call the report stage of Bill C-67, the foreign bank bill. This will be followed by the report stage of Bill C-54, respecting electronic commerce, privacy and other such matters.

---

#### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

#### PUBLIC SECTOR PENSION INVESTMENT BOARD ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-78, an act to establish the Public Sector Pension Investment Board, to amend the

*Government Orders*

Public Service Superannuation Act, the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act, the Defence Services Pension Continuation Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Pension Continuation Act, the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and the Canada Post Corporation Act and to make a consequential amendment to another act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Group No. 3.

**The Deputy Speaker:** When the House broke for question period the hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain had the floor. He has eight minutes remaining for his remarks.

**Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as we were getting close to question period I was attempting to draw an analogy of this bill to a storefront. On the storefront it says “Men’s clothing”, but there are side doors and back doors. The main business being done in that building is bootlegging. We will call this building the government building.

I want to show the House what has happened. I have received hundreds of petitions from my constituency concerning the term marriage and for every one of those petitions I have received this response from the government: “The term marriage in Canada is clear in law and is defined as the union of one man and one woman, to the exclusion of all others”. That is what the government is saying at the front door. However, the bill we are discussing will change the meaning of marriage forever and ever.

The government goes on to say: “There is no need to either enact this definition in legislation or to amend any existing legislation”.

While the government makes that statement, while it appears to be maintaining the definition of marriage and while it appears to be saying that it will preserve it forever and ever, this bill will clearly destroy the meaning of the term marriage forever and ever.

This bill will go down as the bill which, when put on the storefront, says marriage, but through the back doors and the side doors it is anything but.

There are many questions that have to be answered. When this bill is proclaimed, think of the hundreds of thousands of people who will be able to claim spousal benefits from life insurance policies who are in a relationship which is not based on what we consider to be a marriage.

The government cannot even ask this question. What about CPP death benefits? To whom will they go? Anyone will be able to challenge the current existing laws relating to the Canada pension plan, and they will.

This is probably the most serious bill that has come before the House in years. It is the beginning of the destruction of what we

have had in this country from the beginning of time. This bill will destroy our heritage. This bill will destroy the terminology of marriage. Make no mistake about it, this bill will destroy the very moral fibre of this country. This is not a laughing matter. The government is going to have to answer to Canada. Unfortunately, Canadians will not see the ill effects of this bill for a few years.

● (1510)

What is the government’s definition of the relationship of what we call the new nature? What is the relationship? How does the government propose to ensure that only those individuals who are engaged in a relationship of a sexual nature will get the surviving benefit? The question has been asked, but it has not been answered. How will the individual prove that the relationship is indeed a true relationship? Who is going to prove that? Canadians need to be worried about this. It is not so much my concern, it is a concern for my grandchildren and for their children.

We have come through a great era in the building of this country. Men and women, marriages and families have built this country. The government has destroyed it through the back door.

On top of that, the government has moved closure on something that is held high and dear by Canadians. Shame on the government.

Why are pension benefits extended solely on sexual activities? No one on the other side will answer the question. Those members do not care. What the government puts on the front door is not what is going in the side door and it certainly is not what is coming out. Shame on the government.

Will we now have sex inspectors to verify activity? Just think of that. That will take place.

Hundreds of acts will be modified by this bill through the back door. The government may say that marriage will never be changed, but this bill will change it. The government knows that, so it brought in closure.

If a person is currently married but separated and living with somebody else, who is the survivor? That question has to be answered before we can proceed with this bill.

I beg the government to pull this bill before tonight. It is wrong for Canada. It is wrong for the people living in this century. It will certainly be wrong for Canadians in the future. This is a terrible piece of legislation. Canadians, I am afraid, will learn that only too late.

**Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Oak Ridges, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-78. I would like to focus, in particular, on the issue of the debt and talk about the financial implications of this bill.

In successive budgets the federal government has balanced the federal books and has made a commitment to bring down our national debt.

• (1515)

Bill C-78 represents another stepping stone toward that goal. Bill C-78 will allow the federal Treasury Board to deal with existing surplus in the superannuation accounts of the Public Service Superannuation Act, the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act.

Funds from these pension plans will be directed at paying down Canada's \$583 billion debt. The pension plan now has a balance of \$119 billion from years of contributions and interest payments. The federal governments actuaries, however, estimate that only \$94 billion is needed to pay the pension benefits of all existing and retired public servants.

In the public accounts of 1996-97 the Auditor General of Canada pointed out that the accounting for employee pensions should be carefully re-examined and changed. This is exactly what Bill C-78 addresses.

Canada's current economic success is due to sound economic and fiscal policies and the hard work and sacrifice of Canadians. In just four years we have eliminated a budgetary deficit which stood at \$42 billion in 1993-94. In fact our first surplus in 28 years of \$3.5 billion was recorded in 1997-98 and went to pay down the debt.

In the last federal budget the government put forward its debt repayment plan to address our national debt. The government will continue to present two year fiscal plans based on prudent economic planning assumptions. The first fiscal plan will continue to include a contingency reserve as a buffer against unexpected financial pressures. The current plan contains a contingency reserve of \$3 billion a year. When the contingency reserve is not needed, such as last year, it will go directly to paying down the public debt.

In addition to the federal budgets of the government, legislation such as Bill C-78 would go to bringing down our national debt further. I am surprised that the Reform Party does not support the bill. I would have thought that a party so ardent about pinching pennies would stand up against the chance to put a solid concrete contribution of \$30 billion toward reducing our national debt. I would like to know where the consistency is in terms of its policies on this issue.

There is support for the bill. The Edmonton *Journal* wrote the following about Bill C-78:

—the government is looking for money to pay down Canada's gigantic national debt—a worthy cause, if ever there was one.

The Toronto *Star* wrote:

### *Government Orders*

By claiming the surplus, Ottawa can thus produce a painless \$30 billion reduction in its debt. With reduction in the debt, of course, goes a reduction in interest payments, leaving Ottawa more money to spend on other things.

The Montreal *Gazette* stated the federal approach to dealing with the pension surplus was not only sound fiscal management but also a perfectly defensible use of the pension surplus.

Malcolm Hamilton, a pension specialist at William M. Mercer, said that time was ripe for the government to privatize the pension fund. With the deficit under control, he said, the government no longer needed to borrow from the plan. Mr. Hamilton argued that the government had public opinion on its side to use the surplus to pay down the debt. Public servants pay high premiums for their pension, 7.5% of their salaries, but they also have one of the best pension plans in the country.

Even Mr. Rex Guy, national president of the Federal Superannuates National Association, stated:

Any surplus must be shared equitably by the employer (the taxpayers), employees, and pensioners. FSNA believes that forcing a decision at the Supreme Court level on "ownership" of the surplus would inevitably lead the discussion away from the question of fairness and equity. FSNA has consulted independent professional and legal experts in the pension field and has been advised that, on the basis of current legal jurisprudence, the employer can decide how to dispose of the surplus.

Mr. Guy as well as many others have raised concerns to the effect that Bill C-78 might lead to shortfalls in the pension plan. There are provisions in the bill to address these concerns.

Bill C-78 proposals will allow for the establishment of an appropriate reserve to smooth any adverse effects in future actuarial assumptions. This is the same amount that is currently provided under the Income Tax Act for other employers, up to 10% of the pension liabilities.

Further, the legislation does not require surpluses to be withdrawn all at once. Rather they can be debited over a period of up to 15 years.

• (1520)

The federal government has always been committed to the pension plan. The current superannuation account was established by law to assure the employees that the government recognized its obligation to pay their pensions. If any shortfall or deficit exists between the amounts in the pension account, the government must make additional contributions to cover that shortfall. It has done so on many occasions in the past. The government has always assumed 100% responsibility for any funding deficits, that is all the risk that arose in the federal public service pension plan.

On the question of whether the government is setting a dangerous precedent by taking the surplus and applying it, clearly there are few plans primarily in the public sector where both surpluses

*Government Orders*

and deficits are shared by the employer and the employees. Entitlement to surpluses excluding withdrawals is actually based on specific provisions in the pension plan text. Again Bill C-78 is adding such a provision to the public sector plan.

Bill C-78 represents the government's commitment to putting our fiscal books in order while protecting the pension plan. It represents a strong commitment to taking Canada out of debt. By passing the bill we can take one more step toward a healthier fiscally sound future and, as the *Toronto Star* so rightly pointed out, reduce our debt and interest payments which in turn would allow us to focus on other Canadian priorities: health care funding, more money for children's benefits, for seniors programs, and for an overall better quality of life for all Canadians.

We are not taking money away from Canadians. We are actually judiciously addressing our financial and fiscal responsibilities. We are making sure that all those involved in the pension plan, both those who are currently working and those who are retired, will get every cent. As has been pointed out in the House, the plan is even being enhanced.

Again I urge my colleagues on all sides of the House to consider this point very carefully when they vote later this evening.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted if you came to visit my riding. Seeing all the regions and all the regional county municipalities is something you will never forget.

I am very pleased to speak to the motions in Group No. 3. I remind the House that time allocation has been brought in with regard to this most important piece of legislation. This bill deals with the use of billions of dollars, and yet the federal government has decided to limit the debate.

It seems rather inappropriate that, while the federal government has moved time allocation, some members of the government majority would be using up the time we have left, even though the government felt it was not necessary to take all the time needed to analyze this bill. This situation is somewhat ironic, and I will come back to that at the end of my speech.

However, I think it is important to adopt the two amendments in the group we are now debating because it would at least improve the bill somewhat, without necessarily making it acceptable. There are many other amendments that would be essential, but at least these would be a significant improvement.

First, Motion No. 16 proposes that the contribution rates be set out in an act of parliament to ensure that the government cannot do whatever it wants in the future. When it changes the contribution rates, it will be required to introduce a bill in parliament to that effect.

Knowing what the federal government has done with the employment insurance fund, the rationale behind this amendment is easy to understand. Year after year, it receives about \$19 billion in premiums and spends between \$12 and \$13 billion. This means that, each year, the federal government uses between \$5 and \$6 billion for purposes other than those provided for in the act, for example to pay off the debt or to finance other types of spending.

When people pay their employment insurance premiums, it is very clear that they want adequate protection. Right now, they have the worst of both worlds. They pay too much in premiums and they do not have adequate protection in case they become unemployed.

We do not want the same situation with regard to pension plans. The proposed amendment is aimed at making the government accountable to parliament for any changes it wants to make to contribution rates.

• (1525)

The other amendment, Motion No. 38, is designed to prevent the accumulation of very large surpluses so we do not end up in the kind of situation we are in today. When there is a large surplus in a pension plan, there are always two options: reducing or suspending contributions, or improving the plan.

Without this kind of safeguards, the federal government will have total discretion. It will be able to do whatever it wants with this money, and contributors will not have the impression of getting adequate benefits.

Between 1924 and 1998, federal contributions represented only some 48% of all contributions made over 74 years. People wanting sufficient control over their money put in 52%, the lion's share.

The federal government took this money. I think the arguments made by my colleague on the majority side are inadequate. It is not because the government has money available and the need to repay a debt that it is necessarily entitled to take this money from a fund.

It is taking money from the employment insurance and the pension funds. The funds were not collected for this purpose. The government must assume its responsibilities and ensure the solidity of the employment insurance plan so that it truly meets the objectives it was designed for. This goes as well for the pension funds. These are not cash cows. The intent of our amendment is to correct this situation.

We therefore have two amendments intended to improve the situation and to try to have sufficient minimum control over the surpluses. That does not mean that it will become acceptable from the entire bill. The government opposite was highly criticized. It manages in a very egotistical and personal fashion the funds that belong to all those who contribute to them.

It is also in the process of defining the ground rules for the future and, in this regard, I think it important that the bill be reviewed, that there be a series of amendments making it more acceptable and, ultimately, if ever the goal of legitimate use of contributors' funds is attained, the House could always debate whether the bill was acceptable or whether more changes were required.

The government's decision to impose a time limit on debate is ridiculous. These are decisions involving billions of dollars. Individual members are being denied an opportunity to speak. Moreover, majority members, who were told by the government that there would be time allocation, voted in favour.

This gives them the chance to take up the time of those who might have suggestions for improving the bill. The Liberal majority is contradicting itself. On the one hand, it voted to impose time allocation and, on the other, it is taking up debate time when it itself felt that the debate should be wrapped up as quickly as possible.

I think that the government should at least have had the decency not to have any speakers, given its desire to bring the debate to a speedy conclusion, and given that opposition members have a great many points to make.

The government's logic is questionable, particularly as they are a bit short on arguments. Clearly, this is a decision that was imposed by cabinet and that is based on the same logic as the EI decision.

They are trying to tap into as many sources of funds as possible, in order to amass as much money as possible, regardless of its source, regardless of the fact that it might belong to someone else, regardless of the fact that it belongs to the contributors into the employment insurance fund, the employers and employees, or, in the case of the public service pensions, the federal government employees who are seeing billions of dollars getting away from them and into the hands of the government, to be used for purposes other than the one for which they were intended.

• (1530)

This is a rather frustrating debate. It is also one that will surely lead people to pass judgement on this government. When they have to assess the government's track record in the next federal election, they will have to keep in mind that the government has decided to use the surplus in their pension funds for purposes other than those for which they contributed.

They will be able to send a message to the government, one that will be richly deserved. In the end, it would lead the government to show a greater sense of responsibility and to make sure that when it must provide sound management it does so with the money available and by monitoring spending, not by taking money elsewhere to make up for ineffective monitoring in its own jurisdictions.

### *Government Orders*

For all these reasons, unless the two amendments in that group are adopted and substantive changes are made to the bill, the Bloc Québécois will vote against the bill. We do hope, however, that the amendments in the group now under consideration will be approved by the majority. These two amendments would go a long way to making this bill more acceptable. I am asking the government majority to adopt them.

In conclusion, I would like to get the unanimous consent of the House to move the following motion:

That all government members, since government has imposed time allocation on consideration of Bill C-78, at report stage, be prevented from speaking during today's debate on this bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move his motion?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

[*English*]

**Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-78, the public service pension plan act.

The hon. member for Oak Ridges talked about how the government had every angle covered when it wrote the bill and how nothing could ever go wrong. I point to the Canada pension plan and successive governments saying no problem, don't worry, be happy; nothing can go wrong with the Canada pension plan. Those were smooth assurances to soothe the fear of taxpayers, to soothe the fears of actuaries and to convey hope.

Now we see the plan increasing the amount of pension contributions every year until it is up to almost 10%. That is hardly the kind of action which engenders a lot of confidence.

The Liberals have proudly characterized themselves as deficit slayers, but it takes real creativity to call themselves deficit slayers given the record of the Liberal government. In the context of this important debate on Bill C-78 it is time to set the record straight.

During the budget debates and in the many kind words the Liberals spoke about themselves thereafter, I happened to hear the Minister of Health on TV saying that two years from now we would have real money for health care in Canada. I wonder if anybody thought what two years from now would mean to the Liberal government. It means, of course, an election. It will need all kinds of money to put that health budget before Canadians.

We are not complaining about health spending. In fact we have called for increased spending, but to hold it off for two years so that it can raid this pension and end up with the money for it seems to be kind of cynical. If I am rather cynical about it, I think it is understandable.

*Government Orders*

• (1535)

Any deficit that the Liberals have eliminated has not been through genuine cost reduction but through direct tax increases on the backs of Canadians and the raiding of public funds. First the Liberals chose the Canada pension plan. It took a number of years to bring it practically to its knees. Goodness knows whether the planned increases in premiums will make enough of a difference.

Employment insurance premiums are held at far too high a level while people on employment insurance are struggling to make ends meet. This just does not seem to be the way a government that cares for its people, as the Liberal government says it does, does things. Now it is turning to the public service pension plan.

Despite all of this the debt is still far too high. Taxes are far too high. In light of this \$30 billion take the finance minister still refuses to give Canadian taxpayers a tax break. All these raids on the backs of Canadians, combined with high marginal rates and bracket creep, give us the highest taxes of any country in the G-7.

What is next? The Liberals have established themselves as the most creative break and enter artists of our day. This audacious legislation is a good example. This is a break-in through the back door by way of legislation rather than through the front door by way of negotiation.

I want to talk about what the Liberals are proposing to do with the public service pension plan. In that regard Bill C-78 amounts to nothing more than another creative Liberal tax grab. They have been slowly liquidating the surplus in the pension plan over the past few years. That is just one of the ways they have been able to balance the books. It is not by cutting spending but by raiding surpluses and taxing Canadians higher and higher year after year.

Another claim the government makes is that it has been fiscally prudent, but the truth is that the finance minister is improving the health of the federal government's finances, among other things, by dipping into civil service pension piggybanks. Since 1996, I say rather cynically, \$10.1 billion has been saved by not making interest payments on the actuarial surplus. On another point which has nothing to do with fiscal prudence the civil service is overlooked in the disposal of excess funds.

These types of actions by the Liberals are not only becoming more common but are more than ever being seen for what they are: morally reprehensible behaviour on the part of the Liberal government. Yet the government attempts to justify its actions in the name of deficit reduction. The great scandal in this regard is that it is not at all about deficit fighting, as the Liberals would have us believe. Rather, it is about their continuing quest for a stream of taxes on overburdened taxpayers.

Sadly taxpayers are the odd men out in this equation. Taxpayers own the surpluses in the public service pension plans. Taxpayers in the past have covered \$13 billion worth of shortfalls in the public service pension plans. Taxpayers will be on the hook for future deficits. Therefore taxpayers must be protected.

The simple fact is that the surplus in the plan should be left alone. The Liberals should just take their hands off it. The government should not be using it for any other purpose than to ensure the plan remains solvent now and in the future. The bottom line is that any surplus in a pension plan should not be available to any employer, government or private. It should remain in the plan for the benefit of current and future retirees and act as a cushion against future deficits.

I will turn now to a discussion of some of the amendments dealing with the issue of conjugal relationships. These amendments are in response to lower court decisions which see certain benefits such as pension survivor benefits currently afforded to married and common law couples being extended to same sex relationships.

The central issue surrounds the definition of spouse. The government has rightly affirmed the traditional definitions of spouse and marriage. It is important that we begin with the proper definitions. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, a conjugal relationship is one of marriage or the relationship between husband and wife and conjugal rights are those rights, especially in reference to sexual relations, regarded as exercisable in law by each partner in a marriage.

• (1540)

Spouse and marriage have been given special status in Canadian law because of their distinctive characteristics and unique contribution to Canadian society. It is important therefore that the current definition of spouse be retained and that an appropriate range of benefits and obligations be afforded the marital relationship, really the marital home. However the criteria proposed in Bill C-78 for extended survivor benefits are unacceptably vague.

The bill defines a survivor as either one who is married to the contributor or one who can establish that he or she was cohabiting in a relationship of a conjugal nature with the contributor for at least one year immediately before the death of the contributor.

Conjuality is one of several criteria which establish that benefits and obligations for heterosexual conjugal relationships are among all forms of domestic partnerships unique in their capacity to procreate children. It is this kind of relationship that routinely involves the caring for and nurturing of children. As the House knows there is a cost incurred through child rearing. Benefits have been extended to the spousal relationship to enhance the stability of



*Government Orders*

the family relationship, as well to recognize the long term commitment and interdependence of the relationship.

Within Bill C-78 is the intent to extend benefits to same sex couples. When considering benefits for domestic relationships other than a spousal relationship, is sexual activity an appropriate criterion on which to extend benefits? What about other long term relationships of financial or emotional interdependency which do not involve sexual activity?

The new definition in Bill C-78 could include roommates who are sexually intimate once in the course of a year long cohabitation, yet exclude an unmarried adult brother and sister or two adult sisters who have lived together in a household for many years and are dependent one on another.

If the federal government plans to extend benefits beyond spousal or marital relationships to other types of relationships, it should consider the original rationale for giving the benefit to determine the basis on which non-spousal relationships should qualify. Furthermore, broad public debate should take place first before changes are made in a piecemeal fashion, the way the Liberals are doing with the bill.

We see again the government blindly going ahead with a policy that is not only questionable but completely unjustified since no debate has yet taken place with respect to altering the definitions of spouse and marriage as they are held within the law.

Before the government expands or changes the definition of spouse or marriage there must first be a proper debate in parliament and among all Canadians on such an important issue. We know that a strong majority of Canadians uphold and affirm the traditional definition and concept of marriage. The government's attempt to define conjugal relationships and explain who constitutes a survivor is a mess and impossible to determine from the wording in the bill.

In closing I find it interesting that the Liberals have recently begun a survey to understand why there is such low morale in the public service and why in the west people feel alienated from them. They are schizophrenic. What the Liberals are doing in the bill is only typical behaviour for them and offers the answer to their own question. Is it any wonder Canadians are increasingly skeptical of the government?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ):** Madam Speaker, *errare humanum est, perseverare diabolicum*, said the Romans. To err is human, but to persist is diabolical. One could not describe any better the bill before us.

After appropriating the employment insurance fund surplus, the government now wants to get its hands on the accumulated surplus

in the public sector pension plans. We have to face the facts. Relying on his docile majority, the Prime Minister has decided to grab everything within his reach and put it in his large pocket, whether it belongs to him or not.

It would not be so bad if this misappropriated money were to be used for legitimate purposes. But can we say the federal government's obvious intention to use this money to build a slush fund for the next election is a legitimate purpose? It wants to be able to tell people how good and how generous it is just before they cast their vote.

Of course, the federal government also wants to use this money to continue to fund its intrusion in provincial jurisdictions. That is certainly as bold, shameless and cynical as can be.

• (1545)

What scares me about this scheme is that people did nothing else but shrug in disgust and resignation. All those scandals in Ottawa have made them numb. They are no longer reacting.

This kind of passivity is dangerous because it encourages the government to continue with its actions. What is the use of democracy if the people, theoretically sovereign, give up their sovereignty, thereby allowing their leaders to act as dictators with impunity?

Why would we be surprised at this lack of public reaction, when, higher up, the provincial leaders, except Quebec's, provided a lamentable example? It is time to recall the history of the social union.

On February 4, at 24 Sussex Drive, nine premiers, abdicating their birthright to their area of jurisdiction in exchange for a dish of budget largesse lentils, agreed to the massive intrusion by Ottawa in their constitutional jurisdiction.

The most pressing duty of the members of the Bloc Québécois is to awaken the indignation of the electorate. Holy indignation, the salutary ability to react, to rise up, to cry out loud and long in the media and, if necessary, in the street, our disgust, our indignation, our satiation at this insulting scorn for the most elementary government ethics.

When parliamentary democracy is in crisis, elected representatives have no other choice but to advise their electors.

But, it is an ill wind that blows no good. By settling deeper and deeper into ignominy, this government will, I hope at least, one day soon convince all Quebecers that, to escape this foul mudhole that Canadian politics has become under it, sovereignty is the only way.

I would now like to introduce a motion. I began my speech by recalling the old proverb that to err is human, to persist in error is

*Government Orders*

diabolical. My colleagues opposite have twice rejected a motion asking them to withdraw from this debate, since they are the ones that imposed closure.

In the hope that, having made a mistake they will not want to persist in their error diabolically, I request the unanimous consent of the House for the following motion:

That all government members, since the government has imposed time allocation on consideration of Bill C-78, at report stage, be prevented from speaking during today's debate on this bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

[*English*]

**Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I will first make a comment with regard to the second attempt in essence to muzzle members of parliament simply because they represent the government side. That kind of thinking is a little dangerous. The reality is if we were not to speak on this issue, as has been requested, we would obviously hear one side of the issue and unfortunately we would hear the side that is not based on reality.

**An hon. member:** You haven't been listening.

**Mr. Steve Mahoney:** I have been listening.

It is nothing more than fearmongering and trying to get people upset. I want to give an example.

I received an e-mail from Mr. Greg Jones, a constituent of mine. Mr. Jones wrote "I am a retired police officer and if passage of this bill will negatively impact upon my pension plan or pension plan surplus, do not allow the bill to pass".

He sent along a copy of an ad that has been placed in one of the Toronto newspapers by the Public Service Alliance of Canada and a number of other union organizations. Who knows, there might have been some financial contribution from some party in this place, I say to the members of the New Democratic Party. The ad says "It is about the heist of the hard-earned dollars set aside by workers for their retirement benefits".

• (1550)

The government is guaranteeing their retirement benefits in this plan. The government is putting the pension for the public service employees into a state where exactly the opposite of what is being

said in the advertisement is the case. The pension plan is not being threatened in any way whatsoever.

The ad goes on to say that experts—and of course they do not say who they are; they might be certain opposition critics—warn that this legislation could set a dangerous precedent and encourage private employers to do the same thing. What is not pointed out is that any private sector pension plan must conform to the rules of the Income Tax Act. One of the rules says that the surplus buildup can be no greater than 10% and once it reaches 10% it must be dealt with in some way.

It makes sense to bring what is a very generous and well earned—I would not take anything away from the public service employees—pension plan into compliance with the Income Tax Act. It is a secure pension plan backed by what could obviously be one of the most secure institutions in our land, the Government of Canada. It is a very secure bill. In reality it does not conform to the rules under the Income Tax Act. This bill will allow the cabinet, the governor in council the flexibility to ensure that it does conform.

I want to say to Mr. Jones and all the retirees out there, do not be misled by the rhetoric in this place or by advertisements that tell a little bit of the story. This is not an attack or a grab in any way on the security of the pension plan that Mr. Jones and his other retired colleagues enjoy.

If government members were not allowed to put facts like that on the table, if we were to acquiesce to the members opposite and simply sit here and say nothing, then the kind of information that is being perpetrated in this ad in a close to fraudulent manner would simply be added to. People would get upset and rightfully so if they really thought that the government was in some way attacking their pension plan.

We are dealing with amendments in Group No. 3. The pension plan is secured and primarily funded by the taxpayer. Yes, the workers make a contribution, but the vast majority of the contributions made into this pension plan are made by the taxpayer, not by the worker. Of course I do not see that in the ad and I do not hear it in speeches by the opposition members.

The contribution rate to the pension plan is roughly 70:30 with 70% being contributed by the government, which is the taxpayer. In fact, if we were to extrapolate the existing pension plan over the next one and a half years, that contribution rate would change to 80:20 unless we did something about it. Does it seem to make sense that when an employer is contributing between 70% and 80% of the money that secures the pension plan and the employee is contributing 20% to 30%, that somehow that equates to an equal contribution?

That is the argument members of the NDP would put forward, that this is the money of the workers and somehow it would be increased wages if it was not put forward in a pension contribution. They know that is not true. They know that these contributions

*Government Orders*

were fought and won at the bargaining table. I do not have a problem with that.

• (1555)

I would say that if we are to allow the curve to continue to where the employer will be making an even more inordinate percentage of the contribution toward these plans, then the taxpayers would have a right to ask us, as a government, why we are doing that.

We cannot compare this in any way whatsoever to a private sector pension where the contribution rates are much more likely to be on a 50:50 basis rather than this large discrepancy. To compare this and to get people upset in thinking that this is the thin edge of the wedge and all the private sector companies that provide pension plans for their workers are going to threaten the security of the pension plan is fearmongering. It is misleading. It is putting out information that is not based on fact or truth. It is a serious bit of unfair propaganda being put before the retired people.

That is probably one of the most distasteful things about this. The opposition and some of the unions, the leadership not the rank and file, are putting out information that is getting people worried. Those people are relying on their pensions. Maybe they are a little bit worried about their economic situation. They have had to go through an enormous change. They are no longer earning a full salary and are now living on a pension. It is a time of life when they should be able to feel some comfort in my view. They should not feel that they are under siege.

For individuals here or in the labour movement to get people upset in some attempt to mobilize what we would fondly refer to as grey power is a misuse of the political process. It is an unfair tactic that they are using in getting these folks upset.

My point is it is vitally important that members on this side speak. I have no problem and would never suggest that members opposite should not partake in the democratic process in this place. When there is a bill or a resolution on the floor, whether or not there is time allocation, we all have a responsibility. I represent retired federal workers. I have a responsibility to tell them how I see this bill, to tell them why I support this bill, and not to simply sit here and allow those folks to mislead.

One of the amendments by the hon. member for St. Albert deals with the issue of requiring contribution rates to be in an act of parliament. This is a move that the opposition, primarily the Reform Party, is attempting to bring in to this place so that every bit of regulation, every bit of dotting the *i*'s and crossing the *t*'s, must be a full-fledged debate in parliament.

We all know that the process calls for the big picture. The legislation is to be debated, passed and enacted by parliament and the regulations are to be handled by the staff of the Government of Canada. We know that and we it is appropriate. To do it the way the hon. member is suggesting would create a gridlock. It would make

it impossible to make the changes that we think are vital to secure the future of the pension plan for all public sector employees.

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, the member we just heard from if a member of the ruling Liberal Party, and I emphasize the word ruling. It underlines how out of touch these people are. Here is a dispute and their solution is, "Oh, that is easy. We will solve it. We will just take it all". That is so one-sided, so lopsided.

With respect to the motions brought by our Bloc colleagues saying that those who stood up and voted to limit debate should forgo their right to debate, make a lot of sense. The Liberals use their majority to limit debate and then they use up the time for those of us who want to talk about these things and try to represent some common sense and fairness here.

I attribute that desire to all members on this side, the united alternative on this side. We are the alternative to that arrogant controlling government that says "Unless we control it and do it our way, it cannot possibly be right". That is a terrible false assumption. It cannot be true.

• (1600)

I want to talk a bit about the amendments which are proposed in this group because they have to do with the actuarial evaluation. What the Liberal government is missing entirely is the unfairness of what it is doing. The Liberals get up, they crow and puff up their chests like colourful peacocks trying to attract mates and they say that they just cannot do anything wrong, that they are guaranteeing these pensions so the people have no complaint. That may be true. However, they fail to recognize what a surplus means. It means that the amount of money paid in over the last 10, 15, 20, 40 or however many years since a person has been an employee was too high. Moneys are put in by the employer, which is the taxpayer, and the employee, the person in the plan. In other words, they have taken more money from them than they should have to sustain the plan. That is totally obvious. If it were not the case, there would not be a surplus. To whom does that money belong?

We have all of these different questions being asked. Some say 20%, some say 30%. I suppose what we should do is think about things like the MP pension plan to which the taxpayer contributes about 80%. The employees are the members of parliament and the senators. When given the opportunity in the last parliament, all but one Reformer opted out of the plan because we said that it was just not right. This bill also addresses the plan for members of parliament.

I do not have the numbers at my fingertips and I suppose that I should if I am going to talk about this. However, if we look at all of the money in this so-called fund, my conjecture is that the MP pension plan has already taken the total sum down. Ordinary civil servants and other members of the so-called ordinary working class have paid in more than they should have to compensate for the

*Government Orders*

members of parliament who are in this plan. I am not sure that it is all in the same fund and whether it is accounted for that way, so I need to be a little careful, but certainly in terms of the taxpayers' interests in the matter that would be the case.

We have a situation where we need to answer, before we get into any of this, a fundamental question. Who should pay for the livelihood of a person who has gone into retirement? That is the fundamental question which has never been answered.

Over the years we have had different plans. I remember when I was a little itty-bitty kid. That was a long time ago. Members will not believe it but I turned 60 this week, so when I say "when I was a little itty-bitty kid", it was a long time ago. I remember my grandfather skimping and saving to put money into a retirement fund. He said: "Mom and I will not always have the ability to work and earn money, so we had better put some away so we can look after ourselves".

It is ironic that when he finally did retire the Liberal government at the time brought in a pension plan which had some rules. It turned out that my grandfather was ineligible because he had made the mistake of not spending his own money. He had saved too much. As a result, he was not eligible for the supplemental benefits the government was offering. His looking after himself turned out to be a disadvantage. He would have been better off to have spent more money on his family, on himself and his wife.

That was a case where a person put money away. Many Canadians have a mixture. Probably all of us in this place have RRSPs, in addition to a pension plan in which we participate. I am one of those who at this stage has only an RRSP, but I do anticipate getting a small pension from the place where I worked when I finally retire. I am not getting that pension now, even though I would be eligible for it, but sometime in the future when my job here is done, 20 or 30 years from now, I expect to get some money from that. It represents money that I put in, but also money that my employer put in. I hope that money will be there, according to the contract.

• (1605)

The Liberals regularly say that the people who are in the plan will get their money. That is not the question. Of course they will get their money, but the Liberals like to talk about it because it totally deflects from the question of the surplus. The surplus exists because the people have paid too much.

I gave a speech a long time ago on a bill that came from the Senate which had to do with winding down pension plans and dealing with surpluses in pension plans in the private sector. It was a bill in which even our Minister of Finance had a fiduciary interest. Indirectly he has divested himself of these interests, temporarily, while he is a cabinet minister. I believe he must have

done that. However, in the end that legislation will affect him because the shares in the company continue to grow and there was a surplus of over \$110 million in the pension fund of his own company.

We were forced in this place to pass legislation that affected him, which said that an agreement would have to be reached between the two parties that paid into the fund, the employer and the employees. Quite clearly that is not bad legislation because if the employer said it wanted 100% of it the employees and the retirees would not agree and it would not happen. The employer would not get 100%. If the employees said that they wanted 100%, the employer would say no and there would be no agreement.

Clearly they would move to the middle. We, on the assumption that they would reach a deal somewhere around 50:50, said that the Minister of Finance had the potential of gaining \$50 million from that legislation. We raised a little stink about it. We said that the Minister of Finance should not have sponsored the legislation in the House since he could potentially benefit from it.

That is no different from the issue we have here. We are talking about pension money that is set aside to pay the pensions of civil servants, people in the armed forces and the RCMP. I will accept from government members that people will get the pension they are anticipating because it is a defined benefit. Sure, they will get it, but what about the fact that both the taxpayers, the government as the employer, and the employees have paid too much into it and we have this \$30 billion?

I outright reject the government's move to say that is all right, it will just take all of it. All of the money does not belong to it. It is not all taxpayer money. I concede that some of it is. The proportion has to be worked out. That can be done by actuaries very accurately.

Why do we not do that? Why do we not tell these people that we will give them back funds, either through enhanced benefits, reduced premiums or contributions? We will compensate contributors by the amount they have overpaid, and the part the taxpayers have given up. Sure, take that back and apply it to something that the taxpayers will benefit from. Let us be fair. That is what is missing.

Of course the government has invoked time allocation because, as any bank robber would say, "I ain't going to stick around until I get caught".

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lothbinière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, before going into Bill C-78, I would like to say that I have a great deal of difficulty understanding the behaviour of my colleagues across the way who, just hours ago, proposed a time allocation

*Government Orders*

motion, a highly undemocratic gesture, moreover. That revolts me, to start with.

It revolts me also to see that these people are capable of finding positive aspects to the dirty deal they are now handing to government pensioners.

This government deliberately attacked the unemployed a few years ago. It misappropriated the funds in the employment insurance fund, the surplus that had come from the unemployed and from employers, with not one cent coming from the federal government. Using all kinds of tactics, however, the Minister of Finance managed to get his hands on \$25 billion.

• (1610)

This Minister of Finance is so money-mad that he has now found a new source of supply. This time he is going after his own employees, those who helped keep the government running properly, those who have helped ensure the country's security—I refer to the RCMP—and those who made a contribution within the Canadian forces.

These three pension funds total \$30 billion, which the government wants to get its hands on, possibly for the purpose of again giving Liberal ministers a chance to create programs that will offer an opportunity for flag-waving and will, more importantly, stir up trouble with the provinces. That is their specialty.

They are very honest. In fact, they said very clearly in the September 1997 throne speech that they were increasingly aware of the fact that they needed money. Why? The Liberal ministers are certainly concocting other programs to show how good this government is and how sensitive it is to the current disaster, with the unemployed, young people without work and people who do not have access to adequate health care services because of the cuts in funding.

With the \$30 billion, the federal Liberals are preparing, for September or October, another marketing blitz and propaganda campaign to demonstrate how good a government they are, but once again, opposition members, particularly members of the Bloc Québécois, are being vigilant. We know what they are up to.

More and more, the government is shirking its responsibilities. Not too long ago, the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency was established, and it will allow the Minister of National Revenue to shirk his responsibilities. Questions will be asked of the minister responsible for this agency in the House, and I already know what the answer will be "I will investigate. I will ask the agency. I cannot interfere, because it is an independent agency".

This is false. It is not an independent agency. The people who were chosen, as all those who will be appointed to the new public sector pension investment board, are good Liberals. I will give some very important criteria that will be used by the Liberal

government to create what we call a possibly objective board of directors.

First criterion: they will check to see if these people are Liberal members with a paid up membership. Second criterion: they will check to see if they are good friends of the Prime Minister. Third criterion: they will look at their financial contribution to the Liberal Party of Canada. And, above all, they will check to see if these people are prepared to commit, unconditionally, to follow the Prime Minister's orders.

I am convinced that these are the four criteria that the government will use to appoint the board of directors of the new public sector pension investment board.

When we ask questions to the ministers opposite about this investment board if, unfortunately, it is established, they will hide behind the fact that it is an independent body. But this board will not be independent.

• (1615)

Now, all agencies are controlled by the Privy Council. This is where the real power lies. It is not in this House. The power is with the Privy Council, with the Prime Minister of Canada, the special advisers, the Minister of Finance and the President of the Treasury Board. These people do all sorts of things, at the expense of the poor in society.

I find it totally unacceptable to go after one's own employees, to hit people who have been working hard for 20 or 30 years. Today, the government will reward these people by taking unilateral action, by taking \$30 billion directly from them.

The government is trying to tell us that this is an honest proposal. I have a lot of trouble with this word. Yesterday I looked in the *Larousse* dictionary for synonyms that come close to what we cannot say, but I was not successful. It is a bit like a swindle. With this bill, the government is trying to show that it is being good to its employees. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I would like to go back to the very democratic incident of this morning. This bill affects many people, some of them retired. We have many comments to make, but this government has become an expert at imposing time allocation. When we want to speak the truth, we are gagged and forced to speed up the process. Why? Because the government is going to need money again in the fall because there is no longer a surplus in the EI fund. It has cleaned out the fund, and new money will be needed, this time for other partisan programs and propaganda.

I have travelled extensively, and I have seen the image that Canada projects, particularly at agricultural shows. All the countries focused on their products. Canada's image in Paris especially was something else. There were so many Canadian flags that it was hard to see the products. All the other countries knew that what matters is the products and the market. When Canada takes part in

*Government Orders*

an event, the dominant image is maple leaves. The names of vendor companies or organizations appear on the leaves.

One of the visitors asked me "Is this the Canadian pavilion?" I said no, it is just exhibitors who happen to be together inside the Canadian pavilion. Members can imagine the kind of image we are projecting on the international level. We are moving towards globalization and we should be promoting our products and all the provinces, and what do we see, when we get out of Ottawa? The maple leaf propaganda of the Liberals.

At the beginning of my remarks, I expressed some reservations about the actions of my friends opposite. To conclude, I would like to ask for unanimous consent to move the following motion:

That all government members, since the government has imposed time allocation on consideration of Bill C-78, at report stage, be prevented from speaking during today's debate on this bill.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

• (1620)

[*English*]

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

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The question is on Motion No. 16. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on Motion No. 16 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 39 and 47.

[*Translation*]

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

The deferred vote will also apply to motions Nos. 46 and 54.

[*English*]

We will now proceed to the motions in Group No. 4.

The mover for Motion No. 33 is not present. I will hold that one in case the mover should happen to arrive before I finish putting the question on the other three.

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP)** moved:

Motion No. 34

That Bill C-78, in Clause 95, be amended by deleting lines 20 to 44 on page 75 and lines 1 to 18 on page 76.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Again the mover for Motion No. 35 is not here.

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP)** moved:

Motion No. 36

That Bill C-78, in Clause 96, be amended by replacing lines 30 to 47 on page 79 and lines 1 to 28 on page 81 with the following:

"44.4 If, following the laying before Parliament of an actuarial valuation report pursuant to section 45 that relates to the state of the Public Service Pension Fund there is, in the Minister's opinion, a surplus in that Fund, the Minister shall use the surplus to improve the benefits of the pensioners who are members of the plan or their survivors."

**Mr. Ken Epp:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if you could seek unanimous consent to have those motions that have been placed by the member for St. Albert in my name.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent that the hon. member for Elk Island move the motions standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Albert?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** No.

*Government Orders*

• (1625)

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 37

That Bill C-78 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 81 the following new clause:

“96.1 Despite any other provision in this Act, subsection 9(9) and section 16 of the Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985 shall, with such modifications as the circumstances require, apply to a surplus in respect of a pension plan to which Act applies that is identified following the laying before Parliament of an actuarial validation report pursuant to section 45.”

Motion No. 41

That Bill C-78 be amended by deleting Clause 151.

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP)** moved:

Motion No. 42

That Bill C-78, in Clause 151, be amended by deleting lines 31 to 48 on page 129 and lines 1 to 27 on page 130.

Motion No. 44

That Bill C-78, in Clause 152, be amended by replacing lines 16 to 45 on page 134 and lines 1 to 11 on page 136 with the following:

“55.4 If, following the laying before Parliament of an actuarial valuation report pursuant to section 45 that relates to the state of the Public Service Pension Fund there is, in the Minister’s opinion, a surplus in that Fund, the Minister shall use the surplus to improve the benefits of the pensioners who are members of the plan or their survivors.”

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 45

That Bill C-78 be amended by adding after line 19 on page 136 the following new clause:

“152.1 Despite any other provision in this Act, subsection 9(9) and section 16 of the Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985 shall, with such modification as the circumstance require, apply to a surplus in respect of a pension plan to which Act applies that is identified following the laying before Parliament of an actuarial validation report pursuant to section 56.”

Motion No. 49

That Bill C-78 be amended by deleting Clause 198.

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP)** moved:

Motion No. 50

That Bill C-78, in Clause 198, be amended by deleting lines 39 to 46 on page 180 and lines 1 to 38 on page 181.

Motion No. 52

That Bill C-78, in Clause 199, be amended by replacing lines 18 to 46 on page 185 and lines 1 to 17 on page 187 with the following:

“29.4 If, following the laying before Parliament of an actuarial valuation report pursuant to section 45 that relates to the state of the Public Service Pension Fund there is, in the Minister’s opinion, a surplus in that Fund, the Minister shall use the surplus to improve the benefits of the pensioners who are members of the plan or their survivors.”

**Mr. Ken Epp:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe there has now been some consultation and I would again ask for

unanimous consent that the motions moved in the name of the member for St. Albert be put in my name.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent that we proceed in this fashion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** We will finish this motion first.

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 53

That Bill C-78 be amended by adding after line 25 on page 187 the following new clause:

“199.1 Despite any other provision in this Act, subsection 9(9) and section 16 of the Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985 shall, with such modification as the circumstance require, apply to a surplus in respect of a pension plan to which Act applies that is identified following the laying before Parliament of an actuarial validation report pursuant to section 30.”

• (1630)

**Mr. Ken Epp (for Mr. John Williams)** moved:

Motion No. 33

That Bill C-78 be amended by deleting Clause 95.

Motion No. 35

That Bill C-78 be amended by deleting Clause 96.

Motion No. 43

That Bill C-78 be amended by deleting Clause 152.

Motion No. 51

That Bill C-78 be amended by deleting Clause 199.

**The Deputy Speaker:** That completes the list of motions in Group No. 4.

**Mr. Ken Epp:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I may need correction, but I have checked in today’s order paper and there were several motions put by the member for St. Albert that you did not refer to, namely motions—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I can clear this up very quickly. All of the motions were identical to motions standing in the name of the hon. member for Saint-Jean. Every one of the motions in Group No. 4 has been put in one name or another. Where they were identical to the motions put by the member for Saint-Jean, they were put in his name.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** Mr. Speaker, we are nearing the end of a process which, in my mind, has lost some of its credibility and undermined democracy. I wanted once again to start by making this point.

The government has used closure 53 times since in this parliament, since 1997. Often, opposition members have little say either here in the House of Commons or in standing committees. As I said before, it is always the tyranny of the majority.

*Government Orders*

We are getting rather fed up with all this and the other opposition parties are starting to grumble. Basically, I think there are two types of members of parliament. There are those, like the Liberal members, who do exactly what their House leader tells them to do. When he says "We will now muzzle them", they all agree, one after the other.

What is most shocking is that government members will often let opposition members talk until they drop. They let them go on and on and they do not take part in the debate in order to speed things up. But what do they do when there is time allocation? They put their names down to take part in the debate, in order to limit as much as possible the time opposition members have at their disposal.

Time allocation is questionable from a democratic point of view, and doubly so, because we are being gagged, not only here in the House, but also in committee.

Moreover, the government's attitude is utterly arrogant. This morning, when he introduced the time allocation motion, the government House leader laughed and smiled as if to say "We are going to shut their mouths once and for all and we will do it with great pleasure". I find that attitude highly despicable.

But let me come back to the bill at hand. I read recently in the papers that the government is about to form an ad hoc committee, probably made up of psychologists, to look into why public service employees are unenthusiastic and uncompetitive. The government noticed that there was dissatisfaction among its employees and it wants to know why.

It is a bit absurd that the government would ask itself why its employees are so unfavourably disposed towards their employer and so demoralized. Let us take a look at the special laws passed recently, including the bludgeon law that forced employees back to work. At two o'clock in the morning, the President of the Treasury Board rose in this House to solemnly announce that an agreement in principle had been reached.

I was a trade unionist for 20 years and I consider that the President of the Treasury Board managed to add insult to injury.

• (1635)

He tells us at 2 o'clock in the morning that an agreement in principle has been reached. Usually, the agreement in principle is signed and the government says "Now that the agreement in principle has been signed, we will wait for the results of the general assemblies and we will sign once it is deemed acceptable".

That is not what the government did. Not only did it force workers back to work, but it ignored the agreement in principle as if it did not exist. Even though there was an agreement in principle, it decided to impose back to work legislation.

It is not surprising that there has been a slight decrease in the competitiveness of public servants, nor is it surprising that there is much recrimination and complaining within the federal public service.

I will now talk about another issue that I mentioned in my previous speeches, namely the management of public finances by this government. The last *Star Wars* movie having just been released, I would say the Minister of Finance is the Darth Vader of the House of Commons.

He hides behind a black costume and sends his troops to the front. When the time comes to make employment insurance cuts, he tells one of his valiant lieutenants to go to the front on his behalf and take money from the employment insurance fund, which generates between \$5 and \$6 billion a year. The fund had accumulated \$20 billion to \$25 billion. He tells his lieutenant to go and take it, and hand it over to the government, to settle the debt and the deficit.

These are really unethical tactics, ones that must be denounced.

Darth Vader then orders the President of Treasury Board, when pay equity comes up, when the time comes to pay women in the public service properly, not to do anything, to wait for the Bell Canada decision, and all kinds of decisions. They all came out in favour of the women, yet the President of Treasury Board continues to leave the matter unresolved. There are \$2 billion to \$5 billion that should be going to women in the public service.

I would remind him, women public servants are also voters. They are the constituents in Saint-Jean, in Jonquière, everywhere in Quebec. They are the voters in Louis-Hébert, Manicouagan, Argen-teuil—Papineau, Matapédia—Matane. They are in every riding.

These are not people who are earning a fortune. They earn about \$30,000 a year. This is not a lot of money, so members can imagine what another \$2,000 or \$3,000 a year would mean to these women. They will simply put more of it into the regional economy.

These are the people who keep the regional economy running. The federal government will get some of the money back in income and other taxes.

The government is doing this deliberately. It says "See what good administrators we are. Look at our public management, here is our report card". Darth Vader says "I put Canada back on the road to economic prosperity, I resolved the deficit and I am paying off the debt".

Who resolved the deficit? Women did. So did the people in the public service who invested their money in order to have a reasonable pension plan for their retirement years. Now they are being told "There is a surplus of \$30 million, we are going to take it".



*Government Orders*

But they do not answer the question. Suppose they take it and things do not work out, then what? The contributions of these people will be increased or the plans' payments will be limited.

There are basic problems. When I hear the House's Darth Vader, speaking through his lieutenants, say "We have put Canada back on the road to economic prosperity", I find it scandalous. What sort of image will we send to private sector employers if parliament sets the bad example of taking money from the pension funds?

We have used all the terms, because some we cannot use, the unparliamentary ones. Up to now we have talked of rip-off, abduction, control and raiding. We have used all the parliamentary terms, but it comes back to the word we have in our head but cannot say if we are to use parliamentary language.

So, the example has already been given. I recall the matter of concern to me, the case of the former employees of the Singer company.

• (1640)

A few years ago, yours truly asked several questions on behalf of these workers. The government was the trustee and allowed the company to take money from the employees' pension fund, with the result that these people are receiving a monthly pension ranging from \$20 to \$50. They could have had much bigger pensions if the government had been the watchdog that it said it would be.

When we asked these questions, the human resources development ministers—three of them provided replies over the years—would always say "No, we have nothing to do with this. We did nothing wrong".

What was on the mind of this government, of these directors and of Darth Vader? They all thought "Some day, we will get our hands on that surplus". They could see the surplus in the employees' fund, but they did not want to set an example and say "Sorry. We acknowledge our responsibility".

Today, we can understand why Singer workers were the first victims, but I think there will be others, considering the terrible example the government is giving to the private sector. We proposed amendments, but I am sure government members will never support them. Yes they listen to their parliamentary leader when the time comes to gag the opposition. They follow their orders. They will probably defeat everyone's amendments and stick to their arrogant behaviour.

The Bloc Quebecois and, I believe, most opposition parties, will vote against this bill because it is too despicable.

**The Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Halifax West, National Defence.

[English]

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for just a few minutes to the amendments that I have now moved. I thank the House for that indulgence.

I would urge all members to vote in favour of these amendments because they fix the problem that the government is creating with this legislation. The government is trying to get its big clammy meat hooks on money which does not belong to it. It is wrong for it to do that.

As I have said, there are several solutions to this. One of them is to just leave the money where it is. It assures the taxpayers. It protects the taxpayers against future losses as the demographics change, and they most likely will. It puts a bit of a security blanket on the fund. The motions put forward by the Reform Party will do just that. They will protect both the people who are the employees and the taxpayers via the government.

I urge all members to support the motions put forward in the name of the Reform Party and in my name because this is what will be accomplished.

I think it is very important for us not to support, as the government is doing, going ahead with the bill unamended and just ramming it through. It is just wrong. It is not the way to treat the employees of the government, the servants of the people. It is just unconscionable.

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, many of the motions that have been put forward in my name deal with trying to take out of the bill the language that would enable government to seize the \$30 billion pension plan. That of course is the whole goal of the bill.

If we look back at how this whole debate got started, we will see that it was framed around one simple statement made by Alain Jolicoeur, the chief negotiator for HRDC in these matters. About 18 months ago he said that employees and pensioners had no proprietary interest in any surplus in the pension plan.

This statement was further compounded when the President of the Treasury Board said, "The employees and the unions don't stand a chance in hell of getting their hands on the pension plan". That is a quote, Mr. Speaker. I am not trying to use language that is not correct. This is where we started from.

• (1645)

Obviously it is a basic tenet of the trade union movement and anybody involved with employee benefit plans that all pension surpluses are the exclusive property of the employees who paid into the plan because it is wages. It is part of the pay package and wage package.

*Government Orders*

As we look at this, it makes one wonder, if the President of the Treasury Board really believed that the employees have no right to claim that money, why then is he changing the legislation? Why then is he going to all this trouble of drafting 200 pages of legislation to get the enabling language to now say that the government can take the money out of the pension plan?

In the changes we have put forward, we are trying to challenge the myth being perpetrated that the employees do not have any right to any part of any surplus. That is certainly what we are being told by the minister's actions.

If one needs further evidence of the fact that the money is the employees' money, it is used that way at the bargaining table. Whenever the bargaining agents for the various public sector employees are at the table with the government, the government uses the whole pension package as part of the wage issue. It says "Well, we can't give you much of a raise this year, but don't forget that you have always got that lovely pension". When it is to its advantage, the government uses the pension as part of the wage package. Now we are being told it is something completely separate.

As I pointed out earlier, there was a handshake deal if you will, a longstanding recognition of an issue when back in the 1960s the government wanted pensions off the bargaining table. It did not want to negotiate pensions at the same time it was negotiating wages because it was far too complex. The deal was that if the pension issue was taken off the bargaining table, the government would never unilaterally alter the terms and conditions of the pension plan while this deal held, while this pact or accord was in place.

That has been violated. It has been shattered. It has been broken. Exactly what this bill does is it alters the terms and conditions of the pension plan without going to the other party and without negotiations.

There is further language in here that gives the President of the Treasury Board the right to further alter the contributions any time he sees fit. Any time an actuary says it had better crank up the contributions from the employees' side, that can be done without coming back to the advisory board or the House of Commons, which is where it should come back to because the terms are being changed unilaterally. It gives unprecedented powers to the minister that way.

Many of the amendments put forward by the Reform Party and by our party deal with this issue. They try to take that language out of the bill that enables the government to seize not only the current pension but all future pension surpluses generated by the new public sector pension investment board.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today because I wish to speak to Bill C-78, an act to

establish the Public Sector Pension Investment Board, to amend the Public Service Superannuation Act, the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act, and other related acts.

We are opposed to the bill now being debated for several reasons. First, because it is another indication of how this government manages the public purse, under the Minister of Finance, by helping itself here and there to any surplus, however small, and using the money to fund all sorts of projects, often in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

We are opposed to this way of doing things. We saw what happened with the surplus in the EI fund. The government helped itself to it. Insurance means just that. There must always be money left in the fund for hard times.

The Employment Insurance Act was amended so heavily that it became extremely difficult for people to qualify for benefits. They are subject to all sorts of investigations, which are fine in the normal course of things, but which often deprive those looking for work of the system they used to be able to rely on.

The amendments to the Employment Insurance Act have gone too far. Surpluses were used to pay down the deficit and to fund other programs as quickly as possible with no regard for the foundation of the EI fund system.

• (1650)

With what happened not too long ago, one has every right to be concerned and to say "It is no better to keep taking money from the surpluses in other funds".

The surplus in the public service plan is about \$15 billion. It is \$2.4 billion in the RCMP plan, and \$13 billion in the Canadian forces' plan. This adds up to \$30 billion, which are going to be used to pay for programs or reduce deficits here and there. The thousands—I repeat thousands—of workers who paid into the plan are getting shafted.

Currently there are around 275,000 Canadians and Quebeckers who have been contributing to the plan. There are 160,000 retirees and 52,000 surviving spouses.

Instead of helping workers, using the interests generated by these surpluses to improve their working conditions and their wages, the government decided to do something else, saying "From now on these surpluses will be part of a fund managed by the government. The government can dip into it as it sees fit, without any regard for the very reason the pension funds were established in the first place".

When we speak about public service employees, we speak mostly about women since they are the majority in the public sector. We are talking about employees who earn about \$30,000 a year and get an average pension of \$9,000 a year. These are not

*Government Orders*

people earning above the average, far from it. They are people who might be in need of that \$30 billion in the surplus to improve their living conditions, instead of seeing the money taken away from them.

In recent years these same employees have had all sorts of things done to them. They may seem to be a pretty tough lot, but beware. The women public servants may be patient for a time, but when that patience runs out, watch out, for they have had enough of being snubbed, after all the pay equity business.

There are people in my riding who have been waiting for years to see this problematic issue of pay equity solved. When there has been no solution to a problem for more than 10 years, this suggests the problem lies with the ones who are supposed to be finding the solution.

They were told that there were court decisions pending and we would have to wait and see what the outcome would be. There was even a decision pending in the private sector. So the public sector could not make a move because that could have a major impact on the private sector. All of these judgements have been brought down now, and the issue could have been solved.

It is true that several billion dollars are at stake, but that is because nothing has moved for years. Had the problem been settled at the right time, one year at a time, the figures would be far less and people would not be left with the same impression. There would not be these huge sums to be given back to public servants, because they would have been treated properly all along.

The matter is not yet settled. People are still waiting. I do not know if they are waiting for Godot, like in the play, but they are definitely still waiting, and the money keeps piling up. The workers are getting older, some are already retired. Imagine what a few thousand dollars would mean to these people who have been waiting 14 years to get it and who are receiving \$9,000 a year in pension benefits. These people have never earned enough money to brag and say "We are on top of it".

These people have been and are still being treated unfairly, because they are still waiting for a solution. Now the government is picking on these same people, by taking the surplus in their pension funds and in some way jeopardizing their secure old age and the future of their pension plan.

• (1655)

My hon. colleagues have talked about the government using and abusing closure. Of course, we live in a democracy, and our role in this place is to represent our constituents and defend their interests by opposing bills that could hurt them.

A lot of my constituents work for the government. Even if that were not the case, it would still make sense to me to defend the constituents of my colleagues and even those of the government members.

When we want to address numerous amendments in relation to a bill, closure is brought. This cynical government rises and says "The debate is over". This is what gagging the opposition is all about.

In this parliament, the government has resorted to closure more than 50 times. It might as well tell us right from the beginning if it does not want us to talk. We have something to say on each of these amendments.

There are things that are disturbing and one of them is how little the government cares about its employees. I am thinking in particular about public servants, because they form the largest group. We can identify with them more, since we have worked a lot with them on recent bills, and particularly on the pay equity issue. Still, this does not keep us from also caring about Canadian forces and RCMP personnel.

It is somewhat alarming to see that ordinary citizens count for so little. By citizens I also mean women, many of whom work with great dedication in the public service, that is for the government. They are watching us today and wondering how far this will go.

The government helped itself to the surplus in the employment insurance fund—public services also pay employment insurance. Now, it is helping itself to the surplus in their pension funds. There is no end to this. And, as I said, but I can never say it often enough, the government has not even settled the very sensitive issue of pay equity.

I will conclude by asking for the unanimous consent of the House to move the following motion:

That all government members, since the government has imposed time allocation on consideration of Bill C-78, at report stage, be prevented from speaking during today's debate on this bill.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to speak today. This sadness hangs over the opposition members.

This government's management style is unacceptable. Since my election in 1997, the Bloc Québécois and all the opposition parties have faced closure on many occasions.

What is closure? This government uses it to muzzle the opposition. Why muzzle the opposition? Because the government is not capable of legislating in a way consistent with the reality of Quebecers and Canadians.

I come from an extremely proud and a highly industrialized community. There are also many many public service employees in the riding of Jonquière.

*Government Orders*

• (1700)

There is a tax data centre there. What did they do recently to the Department of National Revenue? They set up another agency. I think they are trying to see how many agencies they can set up. Why is this government doing that? Because they have a whole lot of friends to thank.

I have always been in active politics. Elected the member for Jonquière, I was not expecting to be part of a circus here in the House. What is this government doing? Taking care of all its friends. Why must these people be compensated? Because the government has nothing to give the people. It has to look after its friends first of all.

What is going on right now with Bill C-78 is unacceptable. The government is doing the same thing it did with the EI fund. Too much is not enough, as they say, and so is too little. This government has no common sense.

On weekends I visit my riding. People say to me: "Jocelyne, are you going to tell the government that there is such a thing as common sense? If they do not know what it is, then they should pay us a visit, talk to people in factories. We will show them a thing or two".

They did not go to the same school as we did. They went to schools that taught them to reward their cronies, their friends.

What is going on is not fair to women, as my colleague, the member for Louis-Hébert, pointed out. Three quarters of the employees at the taxation data centre in my riding are women. They are constantly coming to see me to complain about how the President of the Treasury Board has insulted them yet again. They are insulted by his unwillingness to recognize pay equity.

Not only does the government not recognize pay equity, but it is dipping into the pension fund. In most cases, these women have sacrificed their health.

For many years now, the government has resorted to cutbacks in the public service in order to reduce the deficit. Where there used to be three or four women doing a job in the taxation centre, now there is only one. The workload has increased. Now the government is actually going to dip into their pension fund, when it is known that most of these women are single parents. They have children under their care. When they retire, they will get a meagre \$9,000 pension. It is a joke at their expense.

I do not think there are a lot of government members who know how it is in real life, how much it costs to buy a pound of butter or to buy clothes for children. I will gladly take them shopping to show them the day to day reality of ordinary people.

It is high time workers put the government in its place. They are sick and tired of paying when the government does anything it wants with their money. On top of that, it likes to reward its friends.

I am not proud today. It is May 13. Usually, 13 is my lucky number. Today is not a lucky day for Quebeckers and Canadians, for those people who gave their all to do their job well. They gave their all hoping to have a decent income when they retire.

The government has other ideas. Instead of increasing this decent income, it takes money from these people. Then it says that it is for their own good. Oh, sure.

My parents taught me that a person who takes something from another person must be judged. One of these days, the Liberals will be judged. We will be able to say that we told them not to do that. They will be condemned, and I will be there to applaud.

• (1705)

In closing, I would ask the unanimous consent of the House to move the following motion:

That all government members, since the government has imposed time allocation on consideration of Bill C-78, at report stage, be prevented from speaking during today's debate on this bill.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Vaudreuil—Soulanges advised me in writing that he would be unable to introduce his motion during Private Members' Business on Friday, May 14, 1999.

[English]

It has not been possible to arrange an exchange of positions in the order of precedence. Accordingly, I am directing the table officers to drop that item of business to the bottom of the order of precedence.

Private members' hour will thus be cancelled and the House will continue with the business before it prior to private members' hour.

\* \* \*

**PUBLIC SECTOR PENSION INVESTMENT BOARD ACT**

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-78, an act to establish the Public Sector Pension Investment Board, to amend the Public Service Superannuation Act, the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act, the Defence Services Pension Continuation Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Pension Continuation Act, the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and the Canada Post Corporation Act and to make a consequential amendment to

another act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Group No. 4.

**Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North—St. Paul, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the issue before us concerns the federal employees' pension plan. It is estimated that there is a surplus of about \$30 billion.

From time to time we should draw wisdom from the media. I have in my hand an editorial from the *Toronto Star* dated April 26, 1999. I could not do better than to quote profusely from this editorial.

What, for example, is the nature of the federal employees' plan? What is the amount they contribute from their earnings? They contribute a maximum of 7.5% of their earnings to this plan. Apparently it is a plan that is acceptable to them and it is indeed a very good plan.

What is the duty of the federal government to this plan?

**An hon. member:** How can you stand there?

**Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan:** I can stand here because this is a House of democracy. If the member of the Reform Party respects democracy, then he will respect freedom of speech.

**An hon. member:** You do not believe in democracy or you would not have shut down debate.

**Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan:** This is an example of a member of the Reform Party trying to make a travesty of democracy in Canada. I am not angered, I am saddened that it would be evinced by the member opposite.

The duty of government to this pension plan is not only that the federal government will match the contribution of federal employees, but as well it must be noted very clearly that the government will assume all the risk.

There are two points. The government matches the contribution of the employees and at the same time it makes up for any short fall.

What is the issue before us? I will read from the editorial which I mentioned previously:

Today, the plan is estimated to have a \$30 billion surplus, meaning that if the future pension entitlements for all employees and retirees were paid out today, the pension fund would have \$30 billion to spare.

Two weeks ago Ottawa introduced legislation. . . .

Complicating the debate is the fact that the pension fund and the surplus exist only on paper. In reality, the government has always used the employee contributions to help finance its programs. The benefits are funded on a pay-as-you-go basis from budget revenues. . . .

### *Government Orders*

So if the employees were to win the battle for even richer pension benefits, government spending would automatically go up.

• (1710)

I hope the Reform Party would agree with that. That would leave less money for social programs like health care and less money to reduce the personal income taxes of all Canadians.

I think it only follows that the surplus truly belongs to the Canadian people. Because we assume all the risk, it only follows that it belongs to the Canadian people. According to the *Toronto Star*, "The government is on solid ground".

I am surprised the Reform Party, which tries to say that it is about a cut to income tax, would miss the opportunity to find a source for the reduction of income taxes; that a party which would like to see a reduction in our debt would lose the opportunity to find a social fund so we could reduce our debt. More important, we can have a social fund to allocate expenditures for our health care program.

I think I have made the basic points on the issue. With the permission of the Speaker, I will answer any questions that members opposite would like to pose.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent that there be a period of questions and comments?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I was not planning on indulging in the debate today, but after the speech from my hon. friend I felt compelled to take part.

He talked about democracy and what this House is all about. I agree that presumably the House is all about democracy. However, this is now the 53rd or 54th time—

**Mr. Ken Epp:** The 52nd time.

**Mr. Dale Johnston:** My colleague from Elk Island informs me that this is the 52nd time that time allocation has been imposed on debate in the House.

I can recall a day when the rat pack sat on this side of House. The member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, who is now the government House leader, was one of the illustrious members of the rat pack. He used to go into absolute convulsions whenever the Conservatives moved time allocation or closure in the House. As a matter of fact, he used to say things like "Here comes the jackboots. Bring out the brown shirts. Here comes closure again". Over and over the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell would say things like that whenever debate was restricted in the House.

*Government Orders*

He is the very person who reared up on his hind legs with much authority, to the chagrin of people on this side, and today moved time allocation with a noticeable smirk on his face. He was very much pleased that he could do whatever he could to make sure that democracy did not take place. He limits debate time and time again in the House.

• (1715)

**The Deputy Speaker:** I have to interrupt the hon. member.

It being 5.15 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

The next question is on Motion No. 35. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

[*Translation*]

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The results of the vote will apply to Motions Nos. 45 and 53.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

[*English*]

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

[*Translation*]

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

## Government Orders

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

[English]

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

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

Call in the members.

• (1740)

**The Speaker:** The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 5 to 7, 14, 31, 40 and 48.

• (1745)

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

## (Division No. 426)

## YEAS

## Members

Alarie	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Cadman
Brisson	Casson
Canuel	Dalphond-Guiral
Crête	de Savoye
Davies	Desjarlais
Debien	Doyle
Desrochers	Dumas
Duceppe	Epp
Earle	Gauthier
Fourmier	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	
Godin (Châteauguay)	

Grey (Edmonton North)  
Hanger  
Hart  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Laliberte  
Laurin  
Lill  
Lunn  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McDonough  
Mercier  
Muisé  
Nystrom  
Perron  
Power  
Ramsay  
Ritz  
St-Jacques  
Strahl  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Vautour  
Wayne

Guimond  
Hardy  
Harvey  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hilstrom  
Johnston  
Konrad  
Lalonde  
Lebel  
Lowther  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Matthews  
McNally  
Meredith  
Nunziata  
Obhrai  
Picard (Drummond)  
Proctor  
Reynolds  
Solomon  
Stoffer  
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
Turp  
Vellacott  
Williams—80

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Copps	Cullen
Dhaliwal	Dion
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish

*Government Orders*

Patry  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
Pratt  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Speller  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Vanclief  
Whelan  
Wood—131

Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Reed  
Robillard  
Saada  
Sekora  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Julien  
Thibeault  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Wilfert

Laliberte  
Laurin  
Lill  
Lunn  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McDonough  
Mercier  
Muise  
Nyström  
Perron  
Power  
Ramsay  
Ritz  
St-Jacques  
Strahl  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Vautour  
Wayne

Lalonde  
Lebel  
Lowther  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Matthews  
McNally  
Meredith  
Nunziata  
Obhrai  
Picard (Drummond)  
Proctor  
Reynolds  
Solomon  
Stoffer  
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
Turp  
Vellacott  
Williams—80

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur  
Byrne  
Cardin  
Comuzzi  
Discepola  
Gagnon  
Guay  
Marchand  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
St. Denis  
Szabo  
Venne

Brien  
Cannis  
Chan  
DeVillers  
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
Grose  
Marceau  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Rocheleau  
St-Hilaire  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Volpe

Adams  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélangier  
Bennett  
Bevilacqua  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Bryden  
Caccia  
Caplan  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
Coderre  
Coppes  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Eggleton  
Folco  
Fry  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Harb  
Hubbard  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Keyes  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne  
Leung  
Lincoln  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchi  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
Pratt  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Speller  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Vanclief  
Whelan  
Wood—131

## NAYS

## Members

Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bélaïr  
Bellemare  
Bertrand  
Blondin-Andrew  
Boudria  
Brown  
Bulte  
Calder  
Carroll  
Cauchon  
Charbonneau  
Clouthier  
Collenette  
Cullen  
Dion  
Drouin  
Easter  
Finestone  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Guarnieri  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Jennings  
Karetak-Lindell  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Lee  
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Reed  
Robillard  
Saada  
Sekora  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Julien  
Thibeault  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Wilfert

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 5 to 7, 14, 31, 40 and 48 defeated.

● (1750)

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following: Motions Nos. 9, 16, 38, 33, 34, 35, 37, 41, 42, 43, 49, 50 and 51.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 431)*

## YEAS

## Members

Alarie  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Benoit  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Brisson  
Canuel  
Crête  
Davies  
Debien  
Desrochers  
Duceppe  
Earle  
Fournier  
Gilmour  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Guimond  
Hardy  
Harvey  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Hilstrom  
Johnston  
Konrad

Anders  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bergeron  
Bigras  
Cadman  
Casson  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Desjarlais  
Doyle  
Dumas  
Epp  
Gauthier  
Girard-Bujold  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Hanger  
Hart  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)



*Government Orders*

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Bellehumeur	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cardin	Chan
Comuzzi	DeVillers
Discepola	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon	Grose
Guay	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
O'Brien (Labrador)	Rocheleau
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
Szabo	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Volpe

(The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 434)*

**YEAS**

Members

Alarie	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Cadman
Brison	Casson
Canuel	Dalphond-Guiral
Crête	de Savoye
Davies	Desjarlais
Debien	Doyle
Desrochers	Dumas
Duceppe	Epp
Earle	Gauthier
Fournier	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Grey (Edmonton North)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Hanger
Guimond	Hart
Hardy	Herron
Harvey	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (Macleod)	Hoepfner
Hilstrom	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Johnston	Laliberte
Konrad	Laurin
Lalonde	Lill
Lebel	Lunn
Lowther	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	McDonough
Matthews	Mercier
McNally	Muise
Meredith	Nystrom
Nunziata	Perron
Obhrai	Power
Picard (Drummond)	Ramsay
Proctor	Ritz
Reynolds	St-Jacques
Solomon	Strahl
Stoffer	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Vautour
Turp	Wayne
Vellacott	
Williams—80	

**NAYS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Coppes	Cullen

Dhaliwal	Dion
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proud
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Speller	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—131	

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Bellehumeur	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cardin	Chan
Comuzzi	DeVillers
Discepola	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon	Grose
Guay	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
O'Brien (Labrador)	Rocheleau
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
Szabo	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Volpe

(The House divided on Motion No. 38, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 435)*

**YEAS**

Members

Alarie	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Cadman
Brison	Casson
Canuel	Dalphond-Guiral
Crête	

*Government Orders*

Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Doyle
Duceppe	Dumas
Earle	Epp
Fournier	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond	Hanger
Hardy	Hart
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoeppner
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lill
Lowther	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Matthews	McDonough
McNally	Mercier
Meredith	Muise
Nunziata	Nystrom
Obhrai	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Power
Proctor	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Solomon	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp	Vautour
Vellacott	Wayne
Williams—80	

Patry
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Speller
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—131

Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Thibeault
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cardin	Chan
Comuzzi	DeVillers
Discepolo	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon	Grose
Guay	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
O'Brien (Labrador)	Rocheleau St. Denis
St-Hilaire	Szabo
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Venne
Volpe	

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Copps	Cullen
Dhaliwal	Dion
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gallaway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish

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

(Division No. 436)

## YEAS

## Members

Alarie	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Cadman
Brisson	Casson
Canuel	Dalphond-Guiral
Crête	de Savoye
Davies	Desjarlais
Debien	Doyle
Desrochers	Dumas
Duceppe	Epp
Earle	Gauthier
Fournier	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Grey (Edmonton North)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Hanger
Guimond	Hart
Hardy	Herron
Harvey	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (Macleod)	Hoeppner
Hilstrom	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Johnston	Laliberte
Konrad	Laurin
Lalonde	Lill
Lebel	Lunn
Lowther	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	McDonough
Matthews	Mercier
McNally	Muise
Meredith	Nystrom
Nunziata	Perron
Obhrai	Power
Picard (Drummond)	Ramsay
Proctor	

*Government Orders*

PAIRED MEMBERS

Reynolds  
Solomon  
Stoffer  
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
Turp  
Vellacott  
Williams—80

Ritz  
St-Jacques  
Strahl  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Vautour  
Wayne

Bellehumeur  
Byrne  
Cardin  
Comuzzi  
Discepolo  
Gagnon  
Guay  
Marchand  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
St. Denis  
Szabo  
Venne

Brien  
Cannis  
Chan  
DeVillers  
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
Grose  
Marceau  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Rocheleau  
St-Hilaire  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Volpe

NAYS

Members

Adams  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélanger  
Bennett  
Bevilacqua  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Bryden  
Caccia  
Caplan  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
Coderre  
Copp  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Eggleton  
Folco  
Fry  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Hart  
Hubbard  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Keys  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne  
Leung  
Lincoln  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchi  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
Pratt  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Speller  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Vanclief  
Whelan  
Wood—131

Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bélair  
Bellemare  
Bertrand  
Blondin-Andrew  
Boudria  
Brown  
Bulte  
Calder  
Carroll  
Cauchon  
Charbonneau  
Clouthier  
Collenette  
Cullen  
Dion  
Drouin  
Easter  
Finestone  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Guarnieri  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Jennings  
Karetak-Lindell  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Lee  
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Reed  
Robillard  
Saada  
Sekora  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Julien  
Thibeault  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Willfert

(The House divided on Motion No. 34, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 437)*

YEAS

Members

Alarie  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Benoit  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac) Bigras  
Cadman  
Casson  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Desjarlais  
Doyle  
Dumas  
Epp  
Gauthier  
Girard-Bujold  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Hanger  
Hart  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Laliberte  
Laurin  
Lill  
Lunn  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McDonough  
Mercier  
Muise  
Nystrom  
Perron  
Power  
Ramsay  
Ritz  
St-Jacques  
Strahl  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Vautour  
Wayne

Anders  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bergeron  
Brison  
Canuel  
Crête  
Davies  
Debien  
Desrochers  
Duceppe  
Earle  
Fournier  
Gilmour  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Guimond  
Hardy  
Harvey  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hilstrom  
Johnston  
Konrad  
Lalonde  
Lebel  
Lowther  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Matthews  
McNally  
Meredith  
Nunziata  
Obhrai  
Picard (Drummond)  
Proctor  
Reynolds  
Solomon  
Stoffer  
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
Turp  
Vellacott  
Williams—80

NAYS

Members

Alcock  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélanger  
Bennett  
Bevilacqua

Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bélair  
Bellemare  
Bertrand  
Blondin-Andrew

*Government Orders*

Bonwick	Boudria	Canuel	Casson
Bradshaw	Brown	Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Bryden	Bulte	Davies	de Savoye
Caccia	Calder	Debien	Desjarlais
Caplan	Carroll	Desrochers	Doyle
Catterall	Cauchon	Duceppe	Dumas
Chamberlain	Charbonneau	Earle	Epp
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier	Fournier	Gauthier
Coderre	Collenette	Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Copps	Cullen	Godin (Châteauguay)	Grey (Edmonton North)
Dhaliwal	Dion	Guimond	Hanger
Dromisky	Drouin	Hardy	Hart
Duhamel	Easter	Harvey	Herron
Eggleton	Finestone	Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Folco	Fontana	Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Fry	Gagliano	Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Galloway	Godfrey	Konrad	Laliberte
Goodale	Graham	Lalonde	Laurin
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri	Lebel	Lill
Harb	Harvard	Lowther	Lunn
Hubbard	Ianno	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Jackson	Jennings	Matthews McDonough	McNally
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell	Mercier	Meredith
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Muise	Nunziata
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson	Nystrom	Obhrai
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka	Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Lavigne	Lee	Power	Proctor
Leung	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)	Ramsay	Reynolds
Lincoln	MacAulay	Ritz	Solomon
Mahoney	Malhi Maloney	St-Jacques	Stoffer
Manley	Marchi	Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Marleau	Massé	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Turp
McCormick	McGuire	Vautour	Vellacott
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)	Wayne	Williams—80
McTeague	McWhinney		
Mifflin	Milliken		
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna		
Mitchell	Murray		
Myers	Nault		
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly		
Pagtakhan	Paradis		
Parrish	Patry		
Peterson	Pettigrew		
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)		
Pillitteri	Pratt		
Proud	Redman		
Reed	Richardson		
Robillard	Rock		
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)		
Sekora	Speller		
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)		
St-Julien	Telegdi		
Thibeault	Torsney		
Valeri	Vanclief		
Wappel	Whelan		
Wilfert	Wood—131		

**NAYS****Members**

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Béclair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Copps	Cullen
Dhaliwal	Dion
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Bellehumeur	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cardin	Chan
Comuzzi	DeVillers
Discepola	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon	Grose
Guay	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
O'Brien (Labrador)	Rocheleau
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
Szabo	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Volpe

(The House divided on Motion No. 35, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 438)***YEAS****Members**

Alarie	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Cadman
Brisson	

*Government Orders*

Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
Pratt  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Speller  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Vanclief  
Whelan  
Wood—131

Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Reed  
Robillard  
Saada  
Sekora  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Julien  
Thibeault  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Wilfert

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Bellehumeur  
Byrne  
Cardin  
Comuzzi  
Discepolo  
Gagnon  
Guay  
Marchand  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
St. Denis  
Szabo  
Venne

Brien  
Cannis  
Chan  
DeVillers  
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
Grose  
Marceau  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Rocheleau  
St-Hilaire  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Volpe

(The House divided on Motion No. 37, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 440)*

**YEAS**

**Members**

Alarie  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Benoit  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Brisson  
Canuel  
Crête  
Davies  
Debien  
Desrochers  
Duceppe  
Earle  
Fournier  
Gilmour  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Guimond  
Hardy  
Harvey  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hilstrom  
Johnston  
Konrad  
Lalonde  
Lebel  
Lowther  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Matthews  
McNally  
Meredith  
Nunziata  
Obhrai  
Picard (Drummond)  
Proctor  
Reynolds  
Solomon  
Stoffer  
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
Turp  
Vellacott  
Williams—80

Anders  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bergerson  
Bigras  
Cadman  
Casson  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Desjarlais  
Doyle  
Dumas  
Epp  
Gauthier  
Girard-Bujold  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Hanger  
Hart  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Laliberte  
Laurin  
Lill  
Lunn  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McDonough  
Mercier  
Muise  
Nystrom  
Perron  
Power  
Ramsay  
Ritz  
St-Jacques  
Strahl  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Vautour  
Wayne

Adams  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Barnes  
Belair  
Bellemare  
Bertrand  
Blondin-Andrew  
Boudria  
Brown  
Bulte  
Calder  
Carroll  
Cauchon  
Charbonneau  
Clouthier  
Collenette  
Cullen  
Dion  
Drouin  
Easter  
Finestone  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Guarnieri  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Jennings  
Karetak-Lindell  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
Knutsen  
Lastewka  
Lee  
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Reed  
Robillard  
Saada  
Sekora  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Julien  
Thibeault  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Wilfert

**NAYS**

**Members**

Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Baker Bakopanos  
Beaumur  
Belanger  
Bennett  
Bevilacqua  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Bryden  
Caccia  
Caplan  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
Coderre  
Coppes  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Eggleton  
Folco  
Fry  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Harb  
Hubbard  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Keys  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne  
Leung  
Lincoln  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchi  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
Pratt  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Speller  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Vanclief  
Whelan  
Wood—131

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Bellehumeur  
Byrne  
Cardin  
Comuzzi  
Discepolo  
Gagnon  
Guay  
Marchand  
O'Brien (Labrador)

Brien  
Cannis  
Chan  
DeVillers  
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
Grose  
Marceau  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Rocheleau

*Government Orders*

St. Denis  
Szabo  
Venne

St-Hilaire  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Volpe

Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Eggleton  
Folco  
Fry  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Harb  
Hubbard  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Keys  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne  
Leung  
Lincoln  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchi  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patri  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
Pratt  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Speller  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Vanclief  
Whelan  
Wood—131

Dion  
Drouin  
Easter  
Finestone  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Guarnieri  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Jennings  
Karetak-Lindell  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Lee  
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Reed  
Robillard  
Saada  
Sekora  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Julien  
Thibeault  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Wilfert

(The House divided on Motion No. 41, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 441)***YEAS**

## Members

Alarie	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Cadman
Brisson	Casson
Canuel	Dalphond-Guiral
Crête	de Savoye
Davies	Desjarlais
Debien	Doyle
Desrochers	Dumas
Duceppe	Epp
Earle	Gauthier
Fournier	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Grey (Edmonton North)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Hanger
Guimond	Hart
Hardy	Herron
Harvey	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (Macleod)	Hoepfner
Hilstrom	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Johnston	Laliberte
Konrad	Laurin
Lalonde	Lill
Lebel	Lunn
Lowther	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	McDonough
Matthews	Mercier
McNally	Muise
Meredith	Nystrom
Nunziata	Perron
Obhrai	Power
Picard (Drummond)	Ramsay
Proctor	Ritz
Reynolds	St-Jacques
Solomon	Strahl
Stoffer	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Vautour
Turp	Wayne
Vellacott	
Williams—80	

**NAYS**

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Copps	Cullen

Bellehumeur  
Byrne  
Cardin  
Comuzzi  
Discepolo  
Gagnon  
Guay  
Marchand  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
St. Denis  
Szabo  
Venne

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Brien  
Cannis  
Chan  
DeVillers  
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
Grose  
Marceau  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Rocheleau  
St-Hilaire  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Volpe

(The House divided on Motion No. 42, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 442)***YEAS**

## Members

Alarie	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	

Bigras  
Cadman  
Casson  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Desjarlais  
Doyle  
Dumas  
Epp  
Gauthier  
Girard-Bujold  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Hanger  
Hart  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Laliberte  
Laurin  
Lill  
Lunn  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McDonough  
Mercier  
Muisse  
Nyström  
Perron  
Power  
Ramsay  
Ritz  
St-Jacques  
Strahl  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Vautour  
Wayne

Brisson  
Canuel  
Crête  
Davies  
Debien  
Desrochers  
Duceppe  
Earle  
Fournier  
Gilmour  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Guimond  
Hardy  
Harvey  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Hilstrom  
Johnston  
Konrad  
Lalonde  
Lebel  
Lowther  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Matthews  
McNally  
Meredith  
Nunziata  
Obhrai  
Picard (Drummond)  
Proctor  
Reynolds  
Solomon  
Stoffer  
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
Turp  
Vellacott  
Williams—80

## NAYS

Members

Adams  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopoulos  
Beaumont  
Bélanger  
Bennett  
Bevilacqua  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Bryden  
Caccia  
Caplan  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
Coderre  
Copp  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Eggleton  
Folco  
Fry  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Harb  
Hubbard  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Keys  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne  
Leung  
Lincoln  
Mahoney

Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bélair  
Bellemare  
Bertrand  
Blondin-Andrew  
Boudria  
Brown  
Bulte  
Calder  
Carroll  
Cauchon  
Charbonneau  
Clouthier  
Collenette  
Cullen  
Dion  
Drouin  
Easter  
Finestone  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Guarnieri  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Jennings  
Karetak-Lindell  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Lee  
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
MacAulay  
Malhi

## Government Orders

Maloney  
Marchi  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
Pratt  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Speller  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Vanclief  
Whelan  
Wood—131

Manley  
Marleau  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Miffin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Reed  
Robillard  
Saada  
Sekora  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Julien  
Thibeault  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Wilfert

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur  
Byrne  
Cardin  
Comuzzi  
Discepola  
Gagnon  
Guay  
Marchand  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
St. Denis  
Szabo  
Venne

Brien  
Cannis  
Chan  
DeVillers  
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
Grose  
Marceau  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Rocheleau  
St-Hilaire  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Volpe

(The House divided on Motion No. 43, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 443)

## YEAS

Members

Alarie  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Benoit  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Brisson  
Canuel  
Crête  
Davies  
Debien  
Desrochers  
Duceppe  
Earle  
Fournier  
Gilmour  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Guimond  
Hardy  
Harvey  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Hilstrom  
Johnston  
Konrad  
Lalonde  
Lebel  
Lowther  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Matthews

Anders  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bergeron  
Bigras  
Cadman  
Casson  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Desjarlais  
Doyle  
Dumas  
Epp  
Gauthier  
Girard-Bujold  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Hanger  
Hart  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Laliberte  
Laurin  
Lill  
Lunn  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)

*Government Orders*

McDonough	McNally
Mercier	Meredith
Muise	Nunziata
Nystrom	Obhrai
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Power	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Ritz	Solomon
St-Jacques	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Turp
Vautour	Vellacott
Wayne	Williams—80

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopoulos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Copps	Cullen
Dhaliwal	Dion
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proud
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Speller	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—131	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cardin	Chan
Comuzzi	DeVillers
Discepolo	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon	Grose
Guay	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
O'Brien (Labrador)	Rocheleau
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
Szabo	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Volpe

(The House divided on Motion No. 49, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 445)

## YEAS

## Members

Alarie	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Cadman
Brisson	Casson
Canuel	Dalphond-Guiral
Crête	de Savoye
Davies	Desjarlais
Debien	Doyle
Desrochers	Dumas
Duceppe	Epp
Earle	Gauthier
Fournier	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Grey (Edmonton North)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Hanger
Guimond	Hart
Hardy	Herron
Harvey	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (Macleod)	Hoeppner
Hilstrom	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Johnston	Kennedy
Konrad	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lill
Lowther	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mathews	McDonough
McNally	Mercier
Meredith	Muise
Nunziata	Nystrom
Obhrai	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Power
Proctor	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Solomon	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp	Vautour
Vellacott	Wayne
Williams—80	

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker



*Government Orders*

Bakopanos  
 Beaumier  
 Bélanger  
 Bennett  
 Bevilacqua  
 Bonwick  
 Bradshaw  
 Bryden  
 Caccia  
 Caplan  
 Catterall  
 Chamberlain  
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
 Coderre  
 Copps  
 Dhaliwal  
 Dromisky  
 Duhamel  
 Eggleton  
 Folco  
 Fry  
 Gallaway  
 Goodale  
 Gray (Windsor West)  
 Harb  
 Hubbard  
 Jackson  
 Jordan  
 Keyes  
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
 Kraft Sloan  
 Lavigne  
 Leung  
 Lincoln  
 Mahoney  
 Maloney  
 Marchi  
 Massé  
 McGuire  
 McLellan (Edmonton West)  
 McWhinney  
 Milliken  
 Minna  
 Murray  
 Nault  
 O'Reilly  
 Paradis  
 Patry  
 Pettigrew  
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
 Pratt  
 Redman  
 Richardson  
 Rock  
 Scott (Fredericton)  
 Speller  
 Stewart (Northumberland)  
 Telegdi  
 Torsney  
 Vanclief  
 Whelan  
 Wood—131

Barnes  
 Bélaïr  
 Bellemare  
 Bertrand  
 Blondin-Andrew  
 Boudria  
 Brown  
 Bulte  
 Calder  
 Carroll  
 Cauchon  
 Charbonneau  
 Clouthier  
 Collenette  
 Cullen  
 Dion  
 Drouin  
 Easter  
 Finestone  
 Fontana  
 Gagliano  
 Godfrey  
 Graham  
 Guarnieri  
 Harvard  
 Ianno  
 Jennings  
 Karetak-Lindell  
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
 Knutson  
 Lastewka  
 Lee  
 Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
 MacAulay  
 Malhi  
 Manley  
 Marleau  
 McCormick  
 McKay (Scarborough East)  
 McTeague  
 Mifflin  
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
 Mitchell  
 Myers  
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
 Pagtakhan  
 Parrish  
 Peterson  
 Phinney  
 Pillitteri  
 Proud  
 Reed  
 Robillard  
 Saada  
 Sekora  
 Stewart (Brant)  
 St-Julien  
 Thibeault  
 Valeri  
 Wappel  
 Wilfert

St. Denis  
 Szabo  
 Venne

St-Hilaire  
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
 Volpe

(The House divided on Motion No. 50, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 446)*

**YEAS**

**Members**

Alarie	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Cadman
Brison	Casson
Canuel	Dalphond-Guiral
Crête	de Savoye
Davies	Desjarlais
Debien	Doyle
Desrochers	Dumas
Duceppe	Epp
Earle	Gauthier
Fournier	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Grey (Edmonton North)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Hanger
Guimond	Hart
Hardy	Herron
Harvey	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (Macleod)	Hoeppner
Hilstrom	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Johnston	Laliberte
Konrad	Laurin
Lalonde	Lill
Lebel	Lunn
Lowther	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	McDonough
Matthews	Mercier
McNally	Muise
Meredith	Nystrom
Nunziata	Perron
Obhrai	Power
Picard (Drummond)	Ramsay
Proctor	Ritz
Reynolds	St-Jacques
Solomon	Strahl
Stoffer	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Vautour
Turp	Wayne
Vellacott	
Williams—80	

**NAYS**

**Members**

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Copps	Cullen

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Bellehumeur	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cardin	Chan
Comuzzi	De Villers
Discepola	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon	Grose
Guay	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
O'Brien (Labrador)	Rocheleau

*Government Orders*

Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Eggleton  
Folco  
Fry  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Harb  
Hubbard  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Keys  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne  
Leung  
Lincoln  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchi  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
Pratt  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Speller  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Vanclief  
Whelan  
Wood—131

Dion  
Drouin  
Easter  
Finestone  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Guarnieri  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Jennings  
Karetak-Lindell  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Lee  
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Reed  
Robillard  
Saada  
Sekora  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Julien  
Thibeault  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Wilfert

Bigras  
Cadman  
Casson  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Desjarlais  
Doyle  
Dumas  
Epp  
Gauthier  
Girard-Bujold  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Hanger  
Hart  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Laliberte  
Laurin  
Lill  
Lunn  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McDonough  
Mercier  
Muisse  
Nystrom  
Perron  
Power  
Ramsay  
Ritz  
St-Jacques  
Strahl  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Vautour  
Wayne

Brison  
Canuel  
Crête  
Davies  
Debien  
Desrochers  
Duceppe  
Earle  
Fournier  
Gilmour  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Guimond  
Hardy  
Harvey  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hilstrom  
Johnston  
Konrad  
Lalonde  
Lebel  
Lowther  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Matthews  
McNally  
Meredith  
Nunziata  
Obhrai  
Picard (Drummond)  
Proctor  
Reynolds  
Solomon  
Stoffer  
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
Turp  
Vellacott  
Williams—80

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur  
Byrne  
Cardin  
Comuzzi  
Discepolo  
Gagnon  
Guay  
Marchand  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
St. Denis  
Szabo  
Venne

Brien  
Cannis  
Chan  
DeVillers  
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
Grose  
Marceau  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Rocheleau  
St-Hilaire  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Volpe

(The House divided on Motion No. 51, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 447)

## YEAS

## Members

Alarie  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Benoit  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

Anders  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bergeron

Adams  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélanger  
Bennett  
Bevilacqua  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Bryden  
Caccia  
Caplan  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
Coderre  
Coppes  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Eggleton  
Folco  
Fry  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Harb  
Hubbard  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Keys  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne  
Leung  
Lincoln  
Mahoney

## NAYS

## Members

Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bélair  
Bellemare  
Bertrand  
Blondin-Andrew  
Boudria  
Brown  
Bulte  
Calder  
Carroll  
Cauchon  
Charbonneau  
Clouthier  
Collenette  
Cullen  
Dion  
Drouin  
Easter  
Finestone  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Guarnieri  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Jennings  
Karetak-Lindell  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Lee  
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
MacAulay  
Malhi

*Government Orders*

Maloney  
Marchi  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
Pratt  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Speller  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Vanclief  
Whelan  
Wood—131

Manley  
Marleau  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Reed  
Robillard  
Saada  
Sekora  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Julien  
Thibeault  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Willfert

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur  
Byrne  
Cardin  
Comuzzi  
Discepolo  
Gagnon  
Guay  
Marchand  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
St. Denis  
Szabo  
Venne

Brien  
Cannis  
Chan  
DeVillers  
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
Grose  
Marceau  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Rocheleau  
St-Hilaire  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Volpe

**The Speaker:** I declare Motions Nos. 9, 16, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 49, 50 and 51 defeated. I therefore declare the following motions defeated: Motions Nos. 10, 13, 39, 45, 46, 47, 53 and 54.

The next question is on Motion No. 2. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 12.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that those members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting nay.

[*English*]

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no, and I would like you to remove the name of the member for St. Albert from that tally.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, NDP members present today vote yes on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party will be voting against this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of York South—Weston I would vote no.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, I also need to exclude the member for South Surrey—White Rock—Langley from that vote.

**The Speaker:** So ordered.

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

(*Division No. 427*)

## YEAS

## Members

Alarie	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Canuel
Bigras	Dalphond-Guiral
Crête	de Savoye
Davies	Desjarlais
Debien	Duceppe
Desrochers	Earle
Dumas	Gauthier
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Girard-Bujold	Hardy
Guimond	Lalonde
Laliberte	Lebel
Laurin	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Lill	Mercier
McDonough	Perron
Nystrom	Proctor
Picard (Drummond)	Stoffer
Solomon	Turp
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	
Vautour—40	

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brison	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Caplan

*Government Orders*

Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Copps	Cullen
Dhaliwal	Dion
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finestone
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harb
Hart	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoeppner
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)	Lincoln
Lowther	Lunn
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi Maloney Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	Matthews
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nunziata	Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Power
Pratt	Proud
Ramsay	Redman
Reed	Reynolds
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Speller
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Strahl	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Vellacott
Wappel	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—169	

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 2 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 12 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 3.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 428)*

## YEAS

## Members

Alarie	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Canuel
Bigras	Dalphond-Guiral
Crête	de Savoye
Davies	Desjarlais
Debien	Duceppe
Desrochers	Earle
Dumas	Gauthier
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Girard-Bujold	Hardy
Guimond	Lalonde
Laliberte	Lebel
Laurin	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Lill	Mercier
McDonough	Perron
Nystrom	Proctor
Picard (Drummond)	Stoffer
Solomon	Turp
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	
Vautour—40	

## NAYS

## Members

Bellehumeur	Brien	Adams	Alcock
Byrne	Cannis	Anders	Anderson
Cardin	Chan	Assad	Assadourian
Comuzzi	DeVillers	Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Discepola	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Baker	Bakopanos
Gagnon	Grose	Barnes	Beaumier
Guay	Marceau	Bélair	Bélanger
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Bellemare	Bennett
O'Brien (Labrador)	Rocheleau	Benoit	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
St. Denis	St-Hilaire	Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Szabo	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Blondin-Andrew	Bonwick
Venne	Volpe		

*Government Orders*

Boudria  
Brison  
Bryden  
Caccia  
Calder  
Carroll  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
Coderre  
Copp  
Dhaliwal  
Doyle  
Drouin  
Easter  
Epp  
Folco  
Fry  
Galloway  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Hanger  
Hart  
Harvey  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Hilstrom  
Hubbard  
Jackson  
Johnston  
Karetak-Lindell  
Keys  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Konrad  
Lastewka  
Lee  
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
Lowther  
MacAulay  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchi  
Massé  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McNally  
McWhinney  
Milliken  
Minna  
Muisé  
Myers  
Nunziata  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Pratt  
Ramsay  
Reed  
Richardson  
Robillard  
Saada  
Sekora  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Jacques  
Strahl  
Thibeault  
Torsney  
Vanclief  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Wood—169

Bradshaw  
Brown  
Bulte  
Cadman  
Caplan  
Casson  
Cauchon  
Charbonneau  
Clouthier  
Collenette  
Cullen  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Eggleton  
Finestone  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Gilmour  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Guarnieri  
Harb  
Harvard  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Ianno  
Jennings  
Jordan  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
Knutson  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne  
Leung  
Lincoln  
Lunn  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
Matthews  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Murray  
Nault  
Obhrai  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
Power  
Proud  
Redman  
Reynolds  
Ritz  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Speller  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
St-Julien  
Telegdi  
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
Valeri  
Vellacott  
Wayne  
Wilfert

Marchand  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
St. Denis  
Szabo  
Venne

Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Rocheleau  
St-Hilaire  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Volpe

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 3 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 4. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 11.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting nay.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

• (1755)

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

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will be voting against this motion.

[English]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, NDP members present this evening vote yes on this motion.

[Translation]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party will vote yes on this motion.

[English]

**Ms. Val Meredith:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to be added to the list of the official opposition, please.

**Mr. John Nunziata:** The independents in the House vote yes.

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

(Division No. 429)

## YEAS

## Members

Anders  
Benoit  
Brison  
Casson  
Desjarlais  
Earle  
Gilmour  
Hardy  
Harvey  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Hilstrom  
Johnston  
Konrad  
Lill

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Cadman  
Davies  
Doyle  
Epp  
Grey (Edmonton North) Hanger  
Hart  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Laliberte  
Lowther

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur  
Byrne  
Cardin  
Comuzzi  
Discepola  
Gagnon  
Guay

Brien  
Cannis  
Chan  
DeVillers  
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
Grose  
Marceau

*Government Orders*

Lunn  
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
 McDonough  
 Meredith  
 Nunziata  
 Obhrai  
 Proctor  
 Reynolds  
 Solomon  
 Stoffer  
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
 Vellacott

MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
 Matthews  
 McNally  
 Muise  
 Nystrom  
 Power  
 Ramsay  
 Ritz  
 St-Jacques  
 Strahl  
 Vautour  
 Wayne—53

Minna  
 Murray  
 Nault  
 O'Reilly  
 Paradis  
 Patry  
 Peterson  
 Phinney  
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
 Pratt  
 Redman  
 Richardson  
 Rock  
 Scott (Fredericton)  
 Speller  
 Stewart (Northumberland)  
 Telegdi  
 Torsney  
 Turp  
 Vanclief  
 Whelan  
 Wood—157

Mitchell  
 Myers  
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
 Pagtakhan  
 Parrish  
 Perron  
 Pettigrew  
 Picard (Drummond)  
 Pillitteri  
 Proud  
 Reed  
 Robillard  
 Saada  
 Sekora  
 Stewart (Brant)  
 St-Julien  
 Thibeault  
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
 Valeri  
 Wappel  
 Willert

## NAYS

## Members

Adams  
 Alcock  
 Assad  
 Augustine  
 Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
 Bakopanos  
 Beaumier  
 Bélanger  
 Bennett  
 Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
 Bertrand  
 Bigras  
 Bonwick  
 Bradshaw  
 Bryden  
 Caccia  
 Canuel  
 Carroll  
 Cauchon  
 Charbonneau  
 Clouthier  
 Collenette  
 Crête  
 Dalphond-Guiral  
 Debieu  
 Dhaliwal  
 Dromisky  
 Duceppe  
 Dumas  
 Eggleton  
 Folco  
 Fournier  
 Gagliano  
 Gauthier  
 Godfrey  
 Goodale  
 Gray (Windsor West)  
 Guimond  
 Harvard  
 Ianno  
 Jennings  
 Karetak-Lindell  
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
 Knutson  
 Lalonde  
 Laurin  
 Lebel  
 Leung  
 Lincoln  
 Mahoney  
 Maloney  
 Marchi  
 Massé  
 McGuire  
 McLellan (Edmonton West)  
 McWhinney  
 Mifflin  
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)

Alarie  
 Anderson  
 Assadourian  
 Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
 Baker  
 Barnes  
 Bélair  
 Bellemare  
 Bergeron  
 Bevilacqua  
 Blondin-Andrew  
 Boudria  
 Brown  
 Bulte  
 Calder  
 Caplan  
 Catterall  
 Chamberlain  
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
 Coderre  
 Copps  
 Cullen  
 de Savoye  
 Desrochers  
 Dion  
 Drouin  
 Duhamel  
 Easter  
 Finestone  
 Fontana  
 Fry  
 Gallaway  
 Girard-Bujold  
 Godin (Châteauguay)  
 Graham  
 Guarnieri  
 Harb  
 Hubbard  
 Jackson  
 Jordan  
 Keyes  
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
 Kraft Sloan  
 Lastewka  
 Lavigne  
 Lee  
 Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
 MacAulay  
 Malhi  
 Manley  
 Marleau  
 McCormick  
 McKay (Scarborough East)  
 McTeague  
 Mercier  
 Milliken

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur  
 Byrne  
 Cardin  
 Comuzzi  
 Discepola  
 Gagnon  
 Guay  
 Marchand  
 O'Brien (Labrador)  
 St. Denis  
 Szabo  
 Venne

Brien  
 Cannis  
 Chan  
 De Villers  
 Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
 Grose  
 Marceau  
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
 Rocheleau  
 St-Hilaire  
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
 Volpe

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 4 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 11 defeated.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following: Motion No. 8 and Motion No. 32.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

(Division No. 430)

## YEAS

## Members

Anders  
 Benoit  
 Brison  
 Casson  
 Desjarlais  
 Earle  
 Gilmour  
 Hanger  
 Hart  
 Herron  
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
 Hoepfner  
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
 Laliberte  
 Lowther  
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
 Matthews  
 McNally  
 Muise

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
 Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
 Cadman  
 Davies  
 Doyle  
 Epp  
 Grey (Edmonton North)  
 Hardy  
 Harvey  
 Hill (Macleod)  
 Hilstrom  
 Johnston  
 Konrad  
 Lill  
 Lunn  
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
 McDonough  
 Meredith  
 Nunziata

*Government Orders*

Nystrom  
Power  
Ramsay  
Ritz  
St-Jacques  
Strahl  
Vautour  
Wayne—53

Obhrai  
Proctor  
Reynolds  
Solomon  
Stoffer  
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
Vellacott

Speller  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Turp  
Vanclief  
Whelan  
Wood—157

Stewart (Brant)  
St-Julien  
Thibeault  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Wilfert

## NAYS

## Members

Adams  
Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélanger  
Bennett  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Bertrand  
Bigras  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Bryden  
Caccia  
Canuel  
Carroll  
Cauchon  
Charbonneau  
Clouthier  
Collenette  
Crête  
Dalphond-Guiral  
Debien  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Duceppe  
Dumas  
Eggleton  
Folco  
Fournier  
Gagliano  
Gauthier  
Godfrey  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Guimond  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Jennings  
Karetak-Lindell  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
Knutson  
Lalonde  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Leung  
Lincoln  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchi  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Perron  
Pettigrew  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Reed  
Robillard  
Saada  
Sekora

Alarie  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bélaïr  
Bellemare  
Bergeron  
Bevilacqua  
Blondin-Andrew  
Boudria  
Brown  
Bulte  
Calder  
Caplan  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
Coderre  
Coppes  
Cullen  
de Savoye  
Desrochers  
Dion  
Drouin  
Duhamel  
Easter  
Finestone  
Fontana  
Fry  
Galloway  
Girard-Bujold  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Graham  
Guarnieri  
Harb  
Hubbard  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Keyes  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lastewka  
Lavigne  
Lee  
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Mercier  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
Pratt  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur  
Byrne  
Cardin  
Comuzzi  
Discepola  
Gagnon  
Guay  
Marchand  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
St. Denis  
Szabo  
Venne

Brien  
Cannis  
Chan  
DeVillers  
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
Grose  
Marceau  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Rocheleau  
St-Hilaire  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Volpe

(The House divided on Motion No. 32, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 432)

## YEAS

## Members

Anders  
Benoit  
Brisson  
Casson  
Desjarlais  
Earle  
Gilmour  
Hanger  
Hart  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Laliberte  
Lowther  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Matthews  
McNally  
Muisé  
Nystrom  
Power  
Ramsay  
Ritz  
St-Jacques  
Strahl  
Vautour  
Wayne—53

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Cadman  
Davies  
Doyle  
Epp  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Hardy  
Harvey  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hilstrom  
Johnston  
Konrad  
Lill  
Lunn  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McDonough  
Meredith  
Nunziata  
Obhrai  
Proctor  
Reynolds  
Solomon  
Stoffer  
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
Vellacott

## NAYS

## Members

Adams  
Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélanger  
Bennett

Alarie  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bélaïr  
Bellemare  
Bergeron

*Government Orders*

Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bevilacqua
Bertrand	Blondin-Andrew
Bigras	Boudria
Bonwick	Brown
Bradshaw	Bulte
Bryden	Calder
Caccia	Caplan
Canuel	Catterall
Carroll	Chamberlain
Cauchon	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Charbonneau	Coderre
Clouthier	Copps
Collenette	Cullen
Crête	de Savoye
Dalphond-Guiral	Desrochers
Debien	Dion
Dhaliwal	Drouin
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duceppe	Easter
Dumas	Finestone
Eggleton	Fontana
Folco	Fry
Fournier	Galloway
Gagliano	Girard-Bujold
Gauthier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Godfrey	Graham
Goodale	Guarnieri
Gray (Windsor West)	Harb
Guimond	Hubbard
Harvard	Jackson
Ianno	Jordan
Jennings	Keys
Karetak-Lindell	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kraft Sloan
Knutson	Lastewka
Lalonde	Lavigne
Laurin	Lee
Lebel	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Leung	MacAulay
Lincoln	Malhi
Mahoney	Manley
Maloney	Marleau
Marchi	McCormick
Massé	McKay (Scarborough East)
McGuire	McTeague
McLellan (Edmonton West)	Mercier
McWhinney	Milliken
Mifflin	Minna
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Murray
Mitchell	Nault
Myers	O'Reilly
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Paradis
Pagtakhan	Patry
Parrish	Peterson
Perron	Phinney
Pettigrew	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Picard (Drummond)	Pratt
Pillitteri	Redman
Proud	Richardson
Reed	Rock
Robillard	Scott (Fredericton)
Saada	Speller
Sekora	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stewart (Brant)	Telegdi
St-Julien	Torsney
Thibeault	Turp
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Vanclief
Valeri	Whelan
Wappel	Wood—157
Wilfert	

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Bellehumeur	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cardin	Chan
Comuzzi	DeVillers
Discepola	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon	Grose
Guay	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)

O'Brien (Labrador)	Rocheleau
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
Szabo	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Volpe

**The Speaker:** I therefore declare Motions Nos. 8 and 32 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 15. This is in Group No. 2. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 17 to 23, 26, 28 and 30.

• (1805)

(The House divided on Motion No. 15, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 433)

**YEAS****Members**

Anders	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Cadman
Casson	Doyle
Epp	Gilmour
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Hart	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad
Lowther	Lunn
Matthews	McNally
McTeague	Meredith
Nunziata	Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Steckle	Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Vellaott
Wappel	Wayne—36

**NAYS****Members**

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blondin-Andrew	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brison	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Canuel	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	



*Government Orders*

Chamberlain  
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
 Coderre  
 Copps  
 Cullen  
 Davies  
 Debien  
 Desrochers  
 Dion  
 Drouin  
 Duhamel  
 Earle  
 Eggleton  
 Folco  
 Fournier  
 Gagliano  
 Gauthier  
 Godfrey  
 Goodale  
 Gray (Windsor West)  
 Guimond  
 Hardy  
 Harvey  
 Hubbard  
 Jackson  
 Jordan  
 Keyes  
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
 Kraft Sloan  
 Lalonde  
 Laurin  
 Lebel  
 Leung  
 Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
 MacAulay  
 Mahoney  
 Maloney  
 Marchi  
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
 McCormick  
 McGuire  
 McWhinney  
 Mifflin  
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
 Mitchell  
 Murray  
 Nault  
 O'Reilly  
 Paradis  
 Patry  
 Peterson  
 Phinney  
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
 Power  
 Proctor  
 Redman  
 Richardson  
 Rock  
 Scott (Fredericton)  
 Solomon  
 Stewart (Brant)  
 St-Jacques  
 Stoffer  
 Thibeault  
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
 Valeri  
 Vautour  
 Wilfert

Charbonneau  
 Clouthier  
 Collenette  
 Crête  
 Dalphond-Guiral  
 de Savoye  
 Desjarlais  
 Dhaliwal  
 Dromisky  
 Duceppe  
 Dumas  
 Easter  
 Finestone  
 Fontana  
 Fry  
 Gallaway  
 Girard-Bujold  
 Godin (Châteauguay)  
 Graham  
 Guarnieri  
 Harb  
 Harvard  
 Herron  
 Ianno  
 Jennings  
 Karetak-Lindell  
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
 Knutson  
 Laliberte  
 Lastewka  
 Lavigne  
 Lee  
 Lill  
 Lincoln  
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
 Malhi  
 Manley  
 Marleau  
 Massé  
 McDonough  
 McLellan (Edmonton West)  
 Mercier  
 Milliken  
 Minna  
 Muise  
 Myers  
 Nystrom  
 Pagtakhan  
 Parrish  
 Perron  
 Pettigrew  
 Picard (Drummond)  
 Pillitteri  
 Pratt  
 Proud  
 Reed  
 Robillard  
 Saada  
 Sekora  
 Speller  
 Stewart (Northumberland)  
 St-Julien  
 Telegdi  
 Torsney  
 Turp  
 Vanclief  
 Whelan  
 Wood—174

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 15 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 17 to 23, 26, 28 and 30 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 36.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the House would agree I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no. I would like you to remove the name of the hon. member for Calgary Northeast from that roll.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will be voting against this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, NDP members present would like to vote yes to this fine motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party will vote yes on this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, I would vote nay to this motion, no.

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

(*Division No. 439*)

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur  
 Byrne  
 Cardin  
 Comuzzi  
 Discepola  
 Gagnon  
 Guay  
 Marchand  
 O'Brien (Labrador)  
 St. Denis  
 Szabo  
 Venne

Brien  
 Cannis  
 Chan  
 DeVillers  
 Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
 Grose  
 Marceau  
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
 Rocheleau  
 St-Hilaire  
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
 Volpe

## YEAS

## Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Brisson	Davies
Desjarlais	Doyle
Earle	Hardy
Harvey	Herron
Laliberte	Lill
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)

*Government Orders*

Matthews	McDonough
Muise	Nystrom
Power	Proctor
Solomon	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vautour	Wayne—26

McCormick  
 McLellan (Edmonton West)  
 McTeague  
 Mercier  
 Mifflin  
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
 Mitchell  
 Myers  
 Nunziata  
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
 Pagtakhan  
 Parrish  
 Perron  
 Pettigrew  
 Picard (Drummond)  
 Pillitteri  
 Proud  
 Redman  
 Richardson  
 Robillard  
 Saada  
 Sekora  
 Steckle  
 Stewart (Northumberland)  
 Strahl  
 Thibeault  
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
 Valeri  
 Vellacott  
 Whelan  
 Wood—182

McGuire  
 McNally  
 McWhinney  
 Meredith  
 Milliken  
 Minna  
 Murray  
 Nault  
 Obhrai  
 O'Reilly  
 Paradis  
 Patry  
 Peterson  
 Phinney  
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
 Pratt  
 Ramsay  
 Reed  
 Ritz  
 Rock  
 Scott (Fredericton)  
 Speller  
 Stewart (Brant)  
 St-Julien  
 Telegdi  
 Torsney  
 Turp  
 Vanclief  
 Wappel  
 Wilfert

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anders
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bevilacqua
Bertrand	Blondin-Andrew
Bigras	Boudria
Bonwick	Brown
Bradshaw	Bulte
Bryden	Cadman
Caccia	Canuel
Calder	Carroll
Caplan	Catterall
Casson	Chamberlain
Cauchon	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Charbonneau	Coderre
Clouthier	Copps
Collenette	Cullen
Crête	de Savoye
Dalphond-Guiral	Desrochers
Debien	Dion
Dhaliwal	Drouin
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duceppe	Easter
Dumas	Epp
Eggleton	Folco
Finestone	Fournier
Fontana	Gagliano
Fry	Gauthier
Galloway	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Godin (Châteauguay)
Godfrey	Graham
Goodale	Grey (Edmonton North)
Gray (Windsor West)	Guimond
Guarnieri	Hart
Harb	Hill (Macleod)
Harvard	Hilstrom
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hubbard
Hoepfner	Jackson
Ianno	Johnston
Jennings	Karetak-Lindell
Jordan	Keyes
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Konrad
Knutson	Lalonde
Kraft Sloan	Laurin
Lastewka	Lebel
Lavigne	Leung
Lee	Lincoln
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)	Lunn
Lowther	Mahoney
MacAulay	Maloney
Malhi	Marchi
Manley	Massé
Marleau	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur	Brien
Byrne	Canniss
Cardin	Chan
Comuzzi	DeVillers
Discepola	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon	Grose
Guay	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
O'Brien (Labrador)	Rocheleau
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
Szabo	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Volpe

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 36 defeated.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following: Motions Nos. 44 and 52.

**The Speaker:** Is there agreement to proceed in that fashion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 44, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 444)

## YEAS

## Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Brisson	Davies
Desjarlais	Doyle
Earle	Hardy
Harvey	Herron
Laliberte	Lill
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Matthews	McDonough

*Government Orders*

Muise  
Power  
Solomon  
Stoffer  
Vautour

Nystrom  
Proctor  
St-Jacques  
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
Wayne—26

McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McTeague  
Mercier  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
Nunziata  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Perron  
Pettigrew  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Redman  
Richardson  
Robillard  
Saada  
Sekora  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Strahl  
Thibeault  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Valeri  
Vellacott  
Whelan  
Wood—182

McNally  
McWhinney  
Meredith  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
Obhrai  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  
Pratt  
Ramsay  
Reed  
Ritz  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Julien  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Turp  
Vanclief  
Wappel  
Wilfert

**NAYS**

Members

Adams  
Alcock  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bélair  
Bellemare  
Benoit  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Bertrand  
Bigras  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Bryden  
Caccia  
Calder  
Caplan  
Casson  
Cauchon  
Charbonneau  
Clouthier  
Collenette  
Crête  
Dalphond-Guiral  
Debien  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Duceppe  
Dumas  
Eggleton  
Finestone  
Fontana  
Fry  
Galloway  
Gilmour  
Godfrey  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Guarnieri  
Harb  
Harvard  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Ianno  
Jennings  
Jordan  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  
Knutson  
Kraft Sloan  
Lastewka  
Lavigne  
Lee  
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)  
Lowther  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
McCormick

Alarie  
Anders  
Assad  
Augustine  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélangier  
Bennett  
Bergeron  
Bevilacqua  
Blondin-Andrew  
Boudria  
Brown  
Bulte  
Cadman  
Canuel  
Carroll  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
Coderre  
Coppes  
Cullen  
de Savoye  
Desrochers  
Dion  
Drouin  
Duhamel  
Easter  
Epp  
Folco  
Fournier  
Gagliano  
Gauthier  
Girard-Bujold  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Graham  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Guimond  
Hart  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hilstrom  
Hubbard  
Jackson  
Johnston  
Karetak-Lindell  
Keys  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Konrad  
Lalonde  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Leung  
Lincoln  
Lunn  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchi  
Massé  
McGuire

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Bellehumeur  
Byrne  
Cardin  
Comuzzi  
Discepola  
Gagnon  
Guay  
Marchand  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
St. Denis  
Szabo  
Venne

Brien  
Cannis  
Chan  
De Villers  
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  
Grose  
Marceau  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Rocheleau  
St-Hilaire  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Volpe

(The House divided on Motion No. 52, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 448)*

**YEAS**

Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Brison  
Desjarlais  
Earle  
Harvey  
Laliberte  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Matthews  
Muise  
Power  
Solomon  
Stoffer  
Vautour

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Davies  
Doyle  
Hardy  
Herron  
Lill  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McDonough  
Nystrom  
Proctor  
St-Jacques  
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  
Wayne—26

## Government Orders

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anders
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Canuel
Caplan	Carroll
Casson	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Dalphonf-Guiral	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Dromisky	Drouin
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Easter
Eggleton	Epp
Finestone	Folco
Fontana	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri	Guimond
Harb	Hart
Harvard	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoeppner	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)	Lincoln
Lowther	Lunn
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Mercier	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault

Nunziata	Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Perron	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proud	Ramsay
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Speller
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Strahl	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Turp
Valeri	Vanclief
Vellacott	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—182	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cardin	Chan
Comuzzi	DeVillers
Discepola	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon	Grose
Guay	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
O'Brien (Labrador)	Rocheleau
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
Szabo	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Volpe

**The Speaker:** I therefore declare Motions Nos. 44 and 52 defeated.

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

• (1815 )

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

(Division No. 449)

## YEAS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Copps	Cullen
Dhaliwal	Dion
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone

Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proud
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Speller	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Valeri
Vanciel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—122

## NAYS

### Members

Alarie	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Cadman
Brisson	Canuel
Calder	Crête
Casson	Davies
Dalphond-Guiral	Debien
de Savoye	Desrochers
Desjarlais	Duceppe
Doyle	Earle
Dumas	Fournier
Epp	Gilmour
Gauthier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Girard-Bujold	Guimond
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hart
Hardy	Herron
Harvey	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (Macleod)	Hoeppner
Hilstrom	Johnston
Hubbard	Konrad
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lalonde
Laliberte	Lebel
Laurin	Lowther
Lill	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Lunn	Matthews
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McNally
McDonough	Mercier
McTeague	Muise
Meredith	Obhrai
Nystrom	O'Reilly
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Picard (Drummond)
Perron	Proctor
Power	
Ramsay	

## Private Members' Business

Reynolds	Ritz
Solomon	Steckle
St-Jacques	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Turp
Ur	Vautour
Vellacott	Wappel
Wayne—85	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Bellehumeur	Brien
Byrne	Cannis
Cardin	Chan
Comuzzi	DeVillers
Discepola	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon	Grose
Guay	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
O'Brien (Labrador)	Rocheleau
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
Szabo	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Volpe

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

The House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

### YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

The House resumed from March 19 consideration of the motion that Bill C-260, an act to amend the Young Offenders Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, discussions have taken place between all parties and the member for Surrey North concerning the taking of the division on Bill C-260 scheduled at the conclusion of Private Members' Business today. I believe you would find consent for the following:

That at the conclusion of today's debate on Bill C-260, all questions necessary to dispose of the said motion for second reading shall be deemed put, a recorded division deemed requested and deferred until Tuesday, May 25, 1999, at the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders.

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

• (1820)

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise tonight to say a few words on behalf of my colleague from Surrey North in support of his private member's bill, Bill C-260.

*Private Members' Business*

I say at the outset that I find it absolutely incredible that the government can move so expeditiously as it just did to shut down debate on an important piece of legislation. For the 53rd time the government moved time allocation, a form of closure. It closed down the debate on Bill C-78, the government pension bill. It rams through the House legislation that we see is of real importance to Canadians.

I am specifically speaking now in favour of Private Member's Bill C-260, which is votable. We see foot dragging which takes up valuable time in the House, when for all intents and purposes this is a very simple and straightforward bill which makes a minor change to the Young Offenders Act. This bill could be put through quickly with all-party support.

In fact, one would think that would happen, because ironically enough the justice minister and the justice department have seen fit to pick up the idea of my colleague from Surrey North. Basically the content of Bill C-260 is included in the justice minister's new youth justice act, Bill C-68, which is also being debated in the House.

What does Bill C-260 do? As I said, it is very simple and straightforward. It involves a minor change to section 7.2 of the Young Offenders Act. It would move that from a simple summary conviction offence to a dual procedure or hybrid offence.

For the benefit of those at home viewing the debate tonight, we have to ask what this bill would accomplish. It would hold parents, guardians or others more accountable, the people who sign contracts with the courts to take on the responsibility for youth who have been charged with criminal offences.

Rather than incarcerating those youths, the courts would grant bail. The youths would be out in the community but under certain conditions imposed by the courts. Those conditions, once imposed, are meant to be respected. Adults, often parents but sometimes guardians or others, sign a contract with the courts and take on the responsibility of ensuring that the youths follow those conditions.

What exactly does the bill do to hold the parents or guardians more accountable? It would simply change the present possible penalty from six months imprisonment to two years less a day. Nothing else would change.

The justice minister has paid my colleague from Surrey North the ultimate compliment that can be given to a private member, certainly to a member from an opposition party. She has included his Bill C-260 virtually verbatim in her new youth justice act, Bill C-68.

We have heard from members on the government side during the preceding debate on this bill. This is the third hour of a votable private member's bill. In the preceding two hours of debate

members from all parties congratulated my colleague from Surrey North for accomplishing that, for bringing forward a bill that has actually been included in government legislation.

• (1825)

Another question would have to be asked. Why would my colleague from Surrey North not simply withdraw Bill C-260 since it is included in the government's new youth legislation?

Unfortunately we have seen time and time again that government legislation for many reasons can take a considerable amount of time to get passed, especially omnibus bills that are not like Bill C-260 that contain clauses that are certainly arguable as to their worth to Canadian society and to the general public. The new Bill C-68, the youth justice act, is going to be one of those bills. There is going to be some very contentious parts to that legislation if it ever comes before the House.

There is another thing hanging over all this legislation. We keep hearing rumours that the government is going to prorogue parliament in June. Legislation on the Order Paper will die. We are very concerned that the youth justice act could be one of those pieces of legislation that dies at the end of this session. Then it is of little benefit to anyone that one of the sections in Bill C-68 that we support is in effect Bill C-260 put forward by my colleague.

In our estimation there is some need to push this forward. My colleague was fortunate enough to begin with to win the lottery and have his name drawn to debate the bill. Then he was successful in convincing the subcommittee which deems certain private members' legislation votable that his bill was important enough to be made votable. Obviously it met all the criteria for a votable item. He was able to argue sufficiently and it was made votable.

The bill is now before the House for its third hour of debate and it will be votable. We just heard the hon. government whip say that although it will be deferred, there will be a vote on Bill C-260. All members will be able to vote on it.

It is important that we vote and that we push this issue along and that we have that opportunity to pass this very important change into law as quickly as possible, rather than wait to have it brought forward some day in Bill C-68.

Some people have said that this bill is too harsh because it will hold parents accountable. It is important to point out, as I did earlier, that the only thing it changes is the possible maximum sentence that can be levelled by the court against parents or guardians who do not live up to their responsibility, who do not fulfil the contract they sign with the courts when they take the responsibility for youth who have been charged for criminal activities.

**An hon. member:** It is already in the legislation.

*Private Members' Business*

**Mr. Jay Hill:** The reality is that the bill as it is presently constituted will accomplish that. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice was heckling a moment ago saying that it is already in the act.

Of course it is in the act, but as has been pointed out by previous speakers, being able to hold the parents accountable with more deterrence that will be provided by the possibility of a two year sentence is not in the act. That is the reason we must push this through to a vote. I expect that members from all sides of the House, including government members who obviously intend to support Bill C-68 which includes this change, would want to support Bill C-260.

• (1830)

Unless they would want to be called hypocrites, which I am sure no member would want to be called, I am sure they will actually support the legislation when it comes to a vote.

**Mr. Gar Knutson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak in the House of Commons this evening.

As most hon. members know, the government fully supports the concept behind the bill. We have incorporated it completely into the proposed legislation, Bill C-68, the youth criminal justice act which currently is at second reading in the House. The Reform Party member for Surrey North should take some credit for that inclusion.

Let me first look at the current situation under the Young Offenders Act. It provides that young people who are denied bail can be released to a responsible adult who undertakes in writing to care for the youth and ensure compliance with the conditions set by the court. Currently a wilful failure by the responsible adult to comply with the undertaking is a summary conviction offence.

Bill C-260 would amend the Young Offenders Act to make the offence of wilfully failing to comply with an undertaking a hybrid rather than a summary conviction offence, that is give an option for the offence to be treated as a summary conviction or as an indictable offence with the possibility of a prison term for up to two years at the discretion of the crown. The new youth criminal justice act also provides for the same hybrid offences treatment.

The government feels that a wilful failure to comply with an undertaking to act as a responsible adult in relation to youth is very serious. It is useful to allow a prosecutor to use discretion as to what charge to bring forward.

It is no secret that we greatly appreciate the hon. member's important contribution to the new youth criminal justice act. However, the motion put forward by the government at this time

would allow parliament to deal with the issue in the more comprehensive government youth justice bill that is already before the House.

Once again it is important to note that the concept behind Bill C-260 has been completely incorporated in Bill C-68. While Bill C-260 seeks to amend the Young Offenders Act, Bill C-68 seeks to replace the Young Offenders Act with an entirely new act, an important element of the government's youth strategy. Therefore I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following therefor:

"Bill C-260, an act to amend the Young Offenders Act, be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time this day six months hence".

**The Deputy Speaker:** The question is on the amendment.

When the bill was before the House on March 15, at the conclusion of the time for debate the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough had the floor and had six minutes remaining in his speech.

The bill was subsequently debated on March 19 and the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough did not on that occasion use his six minutes. I understand he is seeking the floor floor now, and since he is rising on the amendment he may take ten minutes.

• (1835)

**Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the amendment to the main motion. The amendment keeps in mind that Bill C-68 has borrowed from and incorporated much of the intent the hon. member for Surrey North had in mind when the bill was originally brought forward.

I acknowledge the ongoing efforts of the member for Surrey North in this regard. Through no fault of his own and through no desire of his own, he joined a very exclusive group in the country, and that is being the survivor of a murdered victim. As a parent I think the bill and the incorporation of the bill into the Criminal Code serves as a tribute to his son Jesse.

This is a very commendable focus of what in most circumstances would be a very bitter and negative energy. He has put forward what is a very positive motion which will hopefully help to prevent, perhaps in some way, matters such as this where a parent is not being held accountable and not making significant efforts to supervise a young person who is bound by a court order.

There has been much discussion throughout the debate on Bill C-260 about the new youth criminal justice act that has also been debated in the Chamber. We in the Progressive Conservative Party like all Canadians were looking forward to the changes that were

*Private Members' Business*

coming about as a result of deliberations and as a result of the long delay endured on the issue of changes to the Young Offenders Act.

As has been stated time and time again in the House, in the media, in the coffee shops and in general debate throughout the country, the Young Offenders Act was not serving its purpose, not serving our criminal justice system, and not serving Canadians at large.

Unfortunately the new bill is a disappointment. There was an opportunity, which the minister chose not to exercise, to make changes that would have had a more significant effect. That is not to say that commendable changes have not come about. Certainly there is an element through some effort on the part of the member for Surrey North to bring in some form of parental responsibility. It is a positive measure to have the ability now to identify certain dangerous young offenders and the ability to transfer certain types of offences. That would be seen in a positive light.

However other offences have been excluded for some reason from consideration. Although we are not through the final stages of the bill, there will be an opportunity to propose amendments. At least there will be an opportunity to fix some of the glaring omissions on the part of the Department of Justice. Time will tell.

The introduction of the new bill was given a great deal of focus in the media. There was a great deal of hype and much discussion outside the Chamber by the minister. It is with sort of a heavy heart that we are facing a situation where this change to the Young Offenders Act does not exactly hit the mark.

Some of the areas where obviously there is a downturn or a failing is the inability to lower the age of criminal responsibility to 10. There is also an omission in the area of focusing on the use of weapons in the commission of a criminal offence and making mandatory minimum sentences for young offenders in situations where weapons have been used.

The focus of the bill was to be on violent versus non-violent offences. There was much discussion and acrimony about the fact that young people should be given an opportunity and should be treated differently under our criminal justice system. That is the philosophy of the old bill, of the juvenile delinquents act, and of the bill before the House.

There is difficulty in saying that we have to be more pro-active and pre-emptive when it comes to treating young people under our criminal justice system. There has to be an acknowledgement that the resources also have to be allotted.

● (1840)

The enforcement and administration of the legislation have to acknowledge that currently there is a funding shortage and that currently the federal government is not holding up its end of the

bargain. The original intent of the old legislation, the Young Offenders Act, was that the federal government would pick up 50% of the cost of administration. Similarly the new legislation would have the same fiscal or monetary attachment. That is not the case.

We also know that the present social services are in many cases the first line of defence, that is child welfare offices, offices that have to deal with the protection of children. These offices are drastically underfunded, yet at the same time the bill will put a greater emphasis on those agencies.

I would be reticent not to mention the fact that the police are given greater powers of discretion under the new bill. It is a very laudable intention that police officers be allowed to exercise greater discretion in the field and perhaps on occasion, rather than formally charging a young person, be permitted to take the young person to his or her parents or back to the station and administer a tongue lashing, for lack of a better word. Sometimes that will have a better impact on the young person than having them go through the very formal and very sterile court process.

With all of that in mind, if the intent of the new legislation is to have this proactive attempt by police to circumvent more formal processes, there also has to be an acknowledgement that it will be a very onerous task for police in terms of taxing their time, their effort and their current resources.

They simply do not have those resources. We know that because time and time again we hear it from the policing community and from the chiefs of police. We know that the RCMP is drastically underfunded at this time. We know that its budgets have been cut time and time again. In general terms we have seen billions cut out of transfer payments to provinces that go to the administration of justice in individual provinces.

It is nothing short of lip service. It is very lame for the government to suggest that it will give more responsibility to the police and the frontline agencies which will be tasked with administering the new bill and at the same time tell them not only that they will not get more money to do so but that they will not get the same amount they used to have to administer the Young Offenders Act. There is an absolutely hypocritical nature to the bill.

With respect to what some other justice ministers in the provinces have said, I will quote from the Alberta Minister of Justice, Jon Havelock, who said in relation to contemplating the tougher spin which has been put on the legislation that to increase penalties, increase the jail time and ensure that those who were repeatedly committing offences are dealt with more appropriately under the act, the money will have to be in place.

New Brunswick justice minister, Greg Byrne, said that he could not remain partisan when speaking about the new bill. He said that it should be tougher on violent offenders. This creates an interest-



ing dilemma for the Minister of Justice because she has cautioned Canadians that the provinces will have to come on side and enforce the provisions of the bill which will become law before the year 2000.

During the minister's year long consultation process with many of the provinces she stated continually that they were being properly consulted. Consulted is one thing but being actually listened to is another. It has become patently obvious that the ministers of justice of many of provinces, including Alberta, Ontario, Prince Edward Island and even New Brunswick, are sorrowfully disappointed with the outcome and the final draft of the bill.

It demonstrates to me that it is another example of broken promises. If this is the consultation that takes place, and yet at the end of the day the provinces are ignored, it is not something that will further good relations.

The federal government and the provincial governments agreed a long time ago that they would divide the cost of administering the Young Offenders Act. This is certainly the intention of the provinces today. They are still asking the federal government to pick up its fair share of the cost of the administration. No where have we ever seen the commitment of the federal government to do so.

• (1845)

The minister's attempt to please all of the provinces by taking bits and pieces of the suggestions and implementing them into the bill will eventually please no one, and I would suggest that includes the hon. member for Surrey North.

With the introduction of Bill C-68 we saw a lot of bells and whistles and a lot of publicity about what it is going to accomplish, but at the end of the day we saw a very cumbersome bill that will be extremely difficult to administer. The bill is twice as lengthy and includes twice as many clauses as the old Young Offenders Act. We know that the old Young Offenders Act was a very cumbersome piece of legislation. This will be a field day for lawyers, a nightmare for judges, and it will not accomplish for Canadians what we had hoped it would.

**Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it was going to be a pleasure to rise to speak to this bill and to talk about the great things that my colleague from Surrey North has done in this House, and about how even the government has inserted what the member has in this bill into its legislation.

We heard the government whip say "Let's defer the vote", and we all thought that was fine, but in the middle of the debate the member for Elgin—Middlesex—London moved a motion to hoist the bill. The people who are listening probably do not understand that the motion to hoist will delay the bill for six months in order

### *Private Members' Business*

that we can have a look at it. Maybe they think that is a good idea. However, in parliamentary terms the government has killed this private member's bill. The bill is dead.

**An hon. member:** Not true.

**Mr. John Reynolds:** The parliamentary secretary said that it has not been killed. She should walk down to the clerk's table and find out a little about parliament because this bill is dead. That is what they did on the other side. The Liberals have killed this young offenders bill which would have benefited this country. It is a shame.

What is really a shame about it is that we have the government interfering in Private Members' Business. This was not done by a backbencher; it was done by the government with a plan to kill this private member's bill.

The public may not understand what the bill addresses. It calls for parents and guardians of young offenders to be held accountable when they fail to discharge their responsibilities. It could have been law in this country by May 26, when we return, but the government has killed the bill. It has killed this great idea, which even it admits is a great idea because it included it in its legislation.

Liberals might say that we should just wait until their legislation comes along, but we know that the government does not intend to pass Bill C-68 in this session. The House is going to prorogue before the bill ever sees the light of day because the government has taken so much heat over the fact that certain things are not in the bill that should be there. It will let the bill drag on. The government House leader has not brought the bill back into the House for debate. We have had 20 minutes here, an hour there, two hours there, but there is no government behind Bill C-68.

We do not even see it on our agenda of "must haves" before we break for the summer. That is a shame. It is an absolute shame that the government spent a couple of million bucks on PR for the bill to try to make the minister and the government look good and it is not even on the agenda as an item to be considered before we leave for summer holidays. The government could have had the bill of the member for Surrey North which would have made that part of it law before the summer, but it has not done that.

Democracy is really great on the other side. The Liberals have killed this bill. They have killed this young offenders section. They just do not want to see a member from this side getting credit for doing it. They will pay the price for that. What is even worse is that young people will pay the price. They will pay the price because this was a good bill. Even the Minister of Justice said that when she brought down her legislation. She said that this was incorporated in Bill C-68 because it was a good idea, but then they killed this bill today. They are going to kill Bill C-68.

*Adjournment Debate*

**An hon. member:** That is why we incorporated it.

**Mr. John Reynolds:** They are sitting over there yapping away. A little yapping here and a little yapping there, but it makes no sense.

This bill could have passed. We could have supported it, we could have voted for it and it would have been part of the present bill because we are not going to see Bill C-68 for a long time.

They can talk all they want, but what they have done is killed democracy and killed this member's bill. That is what a hoist means. If they do not understand that, they should sit with you, Mr. Speaker, to get a few lessons on parliamentary democracy. If they have been conned by their own House leader that this will not kill the bill, they do not understand how parliament works.

I say shame on the government for hurting democracy tonight and for killing this private member's bill.

• (1850)

**The Deputy Speaker:** If the hon. member for Surrey North speaks now, he will close the debate.

**Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, there is not much to say. I was prepared to thank the hon. members for supporting the bill all the way through, as far as it got, but now we see what the government is really up to.

The bill was meant to amend the Young Offenders Act, which is the current law of the country. I understand and appreciate the fact that the minister did choose to use it in the new legislation, but we do not know where that legislation is going to wind up. It has been pushed back and pushed back. We do not know if it is ever going to see the light of day. I am not prepared to take a pig in a poke and act on faith alone.

I am disappointed about this, but I have dealt with more severe things in my life. I think most members can attest to that.

This piece of legislation was an idea that was prompted by some personal experience. It would have been good legislation for the country. It would have allowed the crown an opportunity to increase the sanctions on parents who fail to supervise their children properly.

In effect, my bill is dead. That is fine. That is part of the deal here. All I can hope for is that Bill C-68, the new youth justice legislation, does come into force sometime. Judging by what I have seen, I do not anticipate that will happen.

There is not an awful lot more I can say on this other than—

**Mr. Jay Hill:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not see a quorum in the House to listen to my hon. colleague's final comments on this important legislation.

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

• (1900)

*And the bells having rung:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to order made earlier today, all questions necessary to dispose of the motion are deemed put and a recorded division deemed demanded and deferred until Tuesday, May 25, 1999, at the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

### NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, on March 5, I raised the issue of charges pending against Mike Kipling and the pursuit of these charges against this man.

There are many issues surrounding the government's administration of the anthrax vaccine to Canadian forces personnel last spring in the Persian Gulf. A vaccine researcher corresponded with my office earlier this year and raised some very interesting issues.

This researcher was informed by the Department of National Defence that it was a matter of military policy that forces personnel were to be provided with specific written disclosure of contraindications and possible adverse effects associated with immunization. As well, prior to immunization, forces personnel should be briefed as to the risks of the diseases the vaccination is supposed to prevent.

Sergeant Kipling was left with serious and unanswered questions after reading the acknowledgement form. This vaccine researcher claims that there is no data addressing how carcinogenic this vaccine may be nor about any possible reproductive effects.

*Adjournment Debate*

The Nuremberg Code of 1947 clearly states that in terms of following orders:

The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential.

Is the government able to say without a doubt that voluntary consent was given? I think not.

I would like to hear from the government, in response to my comments, why the Liberal administration supports people losing their right to decide what goes into their bodies simply by virtue of the fact that they have joined the Canadian forces?

It appears, from the Food and Drug Administration in the United States, that the company which provided the anthrax vaccine in question may have re-labelled a lot of outdated drugs. Furthermore, the government did no independent testing of the chemical package it wanted so desperately to inject into the body of Sergeant Kipling and other Canadian forces personnel.

Will the government commit here and now that it will review policies concerning vaccinations to allow for individual choice and the possibility of waiving vaccinations and whether some quarantine during testing might suffice to meet the goal of protecting the population at large?

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last year Canada responded to the threat posed in the gulf by Saddam Hussein. We dispatched the HMCS *Toronto*, aircraft and personnel from 435 squadron in order to do our part as a member of the international community.

• (1905 )

Our maritime personnel provided escort duties for a U.S. navy carrier battle group and contributed to maritime interdiction operations. Our aviators and support personnel provided technical air to air refuelling in support of the allied air effort in the region. Our maritime and air personnel did an excellent job.

The dangers faced by the approximately 360 Canadians in the gulf were very real. They included the possibility that biological weapons could be used against our personnel.

In all good conscience, we could not send our people into a potentially dangerous situation without ensuring they were properly protected. Part of this protection was inoculating them against anthrax. As we all know, anthrax is a very deadly disease in which individuals are not aware they are sick until it is too late to treat them. We had to protect Canadian personnel against the use of such biological weapons. To do otherwise would be both irresponsible and unconscionable.

The government has worked in good faith and in the best interests of the men and women of the Canadian forces to provide them with the best protection possible in what we must remember was a potentially dangerous operation.

We recognize that Sergeant Kipling and his family have no doubt experienced considerable stress over this situation. However, cohesion and discipline are fundamental elements in an effective armed force. For that reason, disobeying an order, any order, is a serious offence that should be treated appropriately by the military justice system.

Sergeant Kipling has been charged with wilfully disobeying an order under section 126 of the National Defence Act. The decision to charge Sergeant Kipling and to proceed to a court martial was made after very careful examination of the case and is in accordance with current military law.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the parliamentary secretary, but the time provided for the answer has now expired.

The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.07 p.m.)



# CONTENTS

Thursday, May 13, 1999

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Adams ..... 15105

### Committees of the House

#### Canadian Heritage

Mr. McWhinney ..... 15105

#### Procedure and House Affairs

Motion for concurrence ..... 15105

Mr. Adams ..... 15105

(Motion agreed to) ..... 15105

### Petitions

#### Immigration

Ms. Augustine ..... 15105

#### Impaired Driving

Mr. Adams ..... 15105

#### Kidney Disease

Mr. Adams ..... 15105

#### Immigration

Mr. Malhi ..... 15106

#### Canada Post

Mr. Hubbard ..... 15106

#### Immigration

Mr. Cullen ..... 15106

Ms. Minna ..... 15106

### Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Adams ..... 15106

Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) .....	15115
Mr. Myers .....	15117
Mr. Casson .....	15118
Mr. Perron .....	15120
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) .....	15120
Mr. Lebel .....	15120
Mr. Loubier .....	15120
Mr. Loubier .....	15121
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) .....	15121
Mr. Knutson .....	15121
Mr. Perron .....	15121
Mr. Herron .....	15122
Mr. Stoffer .....	15123
Mr. Stoffer .....	15124
Mr. Ritz .....	15124
Mr. Ritz .....	15125
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) .....	15126
Mr. Coderre .....	15127
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) .....	15127
Mr. Coderre .....	15127
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) .....	15127
Mr. Coderre .....	15127
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) .....	15127
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) .....	15128
Mr. Earle .....	15128
Mr. Earle .....	15129
Mr. Bretkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	15130
Mr. Harb .....	15131
Mr. Bailey .....	15132

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Public Sector Pension Investment Board Act

#### Bill C-78—time allocation

Mr. Boudria ..... 15107

Motion agreed to ..... 15107

#### Report Stage

##### Speaker's Ruling

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland) ..... 15108

Mr. Williams ..... 15108

#### Report Stage

Mr. Epp ..... 15109

Mr. Williams ..... 15110

Mr. Bretkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) ..... 15111

Division on Motion No. 15 deferred ..... 15112

Mr. Williams ..... 15112

Motion No. 16 ..... 15112

Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) ..... 15112

Motion No. 38 ..... 15112

Mr. Williams ..... 15112

Motion No. 39 ..... 15112

Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) ..... 15112

Motion No. 46 ..... 15112

Mr. Williams ..... 15112

Motion No. 47 ..... 15112

Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) ..... 15112

Motion No. 54 ..... 15112

Mr. Williams ..... 15113

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) ..... 15114

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Jim Williams

Mr. Lastewka ..... 15132

### Calgary Foothills Hospital

Mr. Kenney ..... 15132

### Harriston Kinsmen Club

Mr. Myers ..... 15133

### Canadian Centre for Mineral and Energy Technology

Mr. St-Julien ..... 15133

### Nunavut

Mrs. Karetak-Lindell ..... 15133

### Tartan Day

Mr. Anders ..... 15133

### National Mining Week

Mr. Cullen ..... 15134

### Drummondville's Légendes fantastiques

Mrs. Picard ..... 15134

### Land Mines

Mrs. Finestone ..... 15134

### Julie Payette

Mrs. Ablonczy ..... 15134

### Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Mr. Sekora ..... 15135

<b>Canadian Nurses</b>	
Ms. Desjarlais .....	15135
<b>The Late Marcel P��pin</b>	
Mrs. Lalonde .....	15135
<b>Kosovar Refugees</b>	
Ms. Folco .....	15135
<b>Quebec Family Week</b>	
Ms. St-Jacques .....	15135
<b>Milton Wong</b>	
Mr. McWhinney .....	15136
<b>Resignation of Member</b>	
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar) .....	15136

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

<b>Impaired Driving</b>	
Miss Grey .....	15136
Ms. McLellan .....	15136
Miss Grey .....	15136
Ms. McLellan .....	15136
Miss Grey .....	15137
Ms. McLellan .....	15137
Mr. Reynolds .....	15137
Ms. McLellan .....	15137
Mr. Reynolds .....	15137
Ms. McLellan .....	15137
<b>Minister of Human Resources Development</b>	
Mr. Duceppe .....	15137
Mr. Chr��tien (Saint-Maurice) .....	15137
Mr. Duceppe .....	15137
Mr. Pettigrew .....	15138
Mr. Cr��te .....	15138
Mr. Pettigrew .....	15138
Mr. Cr��te .....	15138
Mr. Pettigrew .....	15138
<b>Immigration</b>	
Ms. McDonough .....	15138
Ms. Robillard .....	15138
Ms. McDonough .....	15139
Ms. Robillard .....	15139
<b>National Defence</b>	
Mrs. Wayne .....	15139
Mr. Eggleton .....	15139
Mrs. Wayne .....	15139
Mr. Eggleton .....	15139
<b>Supreme Court of Canada</b>	
Mr. Lowther .....	15139
Mr. Chr��tien (Saint-Maurice) .....	15139
Mr. Lowther .....	15139
Ms. McLellan .....	15140
<b>Minister of Human Resources Development</b>	
Mr. Gauthier .....	15140
Mr. Pettigrew .....	15140
Mr. Gauthier .....	15140
Mr. Pettigrew .....	15140
<b>Arts and Culture</b>	
Mr. Strahl .....	15140

Ms. Copps .....	15140
Mr. Strahl .....	15140
Ms. Copps .....	15141
<b>Minister of Human Resources Development</b>	
Mr. Duceppe .....	15141
Mr. Pettigrew .....	15141
Mr. Duceppe .....	15141
Mr. Pettigrew .....	15141
<b>National Defence</b>	
Mr. Hanger .....	15141
Mr. Eggleton .....	15141
Mr. Hanger .....	15142
Mr. Eggleton .....	15142
<b>Bill C-77</b>	
Mr. Guimond .....	15142
Mr. Collenette .....	15142
<b>Employment</b>	
Mr. Mahoney .....	15142
Mrs. Bradshaw .....	15142
<b>Aboriginal Affairs</b>	
Mr. Cummins .....	15142
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	15142
Mr. Cummins .....	15142
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	15143
<b>Grain Transportation</b>	
Mr. Proctor .....	15143
Mr. Collenette .....	15143
Mr. Proctor .....	15143
Mr. Collenette .....	15143
<b>Newfoundland Act</b>	
Mr. Doyle .....	15143
Mr. Eggleton .....	15143
Mr. Doyle .....	15143
Mr. Eggleton .....	15144
<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Mr. Pratt .....	15144
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	15144
<b>British Columbia</b>	
Mr. Lunn .....	15144
Mr. Eggleton .....	15144
<b>Bill C-77</b>	
Mr. Asselin .....	15144
Mr. Collenette .....	15144
<b>Kosovo</b>	
Mr. Earle .....	15144
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	15145
<b>National Defence</b>	
Mr. Price .....	15145
Mr. Eggleton .....	15145
<b>Canadian Beef</b>	
Mr. McCormick .....	15145
Mr. Vanclief .....	15145
<b>Business of the House</b>	
Mr. Bailey .....	15145
Mr. Boudria .....	15145
<b>GOVERNMENT ORDERS</b>	
<b>Public Sector Pension Investment Board Act</b>	
Bill C-78. Report stage .....	15145

Mr. Bailey .....	15146
Mr. Wilfert .....	15146
Mr. Crête .....	15148
Mr. Konrad .....	15149
Mr. Mercier .....	15151
Mr. Mahoney .....	15152
Mr. Epp .....	15153
Mr. Desrochers .....	15154
Division on Motion No. 16 deferred .....	15156
Division on Motion No. 38 deferred .....	15156
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) .....	15156
Motion No. 34 .....	15156
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) .....	15156
Motion No. 36 .....	15156
Mr. Epp .....	15156
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) .....	15157
Motions Nos. 37 and 41 .....	15157
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) .....	15157
Motions Nos. 42 and 44 .....	15157
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) .....	15157
Motions Nos. 45 and 49 .....	15157
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) .....	15157
Motions Nos. 50 and 52 .....	15157
Mr. Epp .....	15157
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) .....	15157
Motion No. 53 .....	15157
Mr. Epp .....	15157
Motions Nos. 33, 35, 43 and 51 .....	15157
Mr. Epp .....	15157
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) .....	15157
Mr. Epp .....	15159
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) .....	15159
Ms. Alarie .....	15160
Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15161

**Business of the House**

The Deputy Speaker .....	15162
--------------------------	-------

**Public Sector Pension Investment Board Act**

Bill C-78. Report stage .....	15162
Mr. Pagtakhan .....	15163
Mr. Johnston .....	15163
Mr. Epp .....	15163
Mr. Johnston .....	15163
Division on Motion No. 33 deferred .....	15164
Division on Motion No. 35 deferred .....	15164
Division on Motion No. 37 deferred .....	15164
Division on Motion No. 41 deferred .....	15164
Division on Motion No. 43 deferred .....	15164
Division on Motion No. 49 deferred .....	15165
Division on Motion No. 51 deferred .....	15165
Motion No. 1 negatived .....	15166
Mr. Kilger .....	15166
Motion No. 9 negatived .....	15177
Motion No. 16 negatived .....	15177
Motion No. 38 negatived .....	15177
Motion No. 33 negatived .....	15177
Motion No. 34 negatived .....	15177
Motion No. 35 negatived .....	15177
Motion No. 37 negatived .....	15177
Motion No. 41 negatived .....	15177
Motion No. 42 negatived .....	15177

Motion No. 43 negatived .....	15177
Motion No. 49 negatived .....	15177
Motion No. 50 negatived .....	15177
Motion No. 51 negatived .....	15177
Mr. Kilger .....	15177
Mr. Strahl .....	15177
Mr. Bergeron .....	15177
Mr. Solomon .....	15177
Mr. Harvey .....	15177
Mr. Nunziata .....	15177
Mr. Strahl .....	15177
Motion No. 2 negatived .....	15178
Mr. Kilger .....	15178
Motion No. 3 negatived .....	15179
Mr. Kilger .....	15179
Mr. Strahl .....	15179
Mr. Bergeron .....	15179
Mr. Solomon .....	15179
Mr. Harvey .....	15179
Ms. Meredith .....	15179
Mr. Nunziata .....	15179
Motion No. 4 negatived .....	15180
Mr. Kilger .....	15180
Motion No. 8 negatived .....	15182
Motion No. 32 negatived .....	15182
Motion No. 15 negatived .....	15183
Mr. Kilger .....	15183
Mr. Strahl .....	15183
Mr. Bergeron .....	15183
Mr. Solomon .....	15183
Mr. Harvey .....	15183
Mr. Nunziata .....	15183
Motion No. 36 negatived .....	15184
Mr. Kilger .....	15184
Motion No. 44 negatived .....	15186
Motion No. 52 negatived .....	15186
Motion for concurrence .....	15186
Mr. Massé .....	15186
Motion agreed to .....	15187

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Young Offenders Act**

Bill C-260. Second reading .....	15187
Mr. Kilger .....	15187
Motion .....	15187
(Motion agreed to) .....	15187
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	15187
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	15189
Mr. Knutson .....	15189
Amendment .....	15189
Mr. MacKay .....	15189
Mr. Reynolds .....	15191
Mr. Reynolds .....	15192
Mr. Cadman .....	15192
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	15192
Division deemed demanded and deferred .....	15192

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

**National Defence**

Mr. Earle .....	15192
Mr. Bertrand .....	15193

**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**03159442**

**Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*

Canadian Government Publishing,

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

*En cas de non-livraison,*

*retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:*

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons**

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes**

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:**

**Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :**

**<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9**

**Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.**

**On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9**

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9**