



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 136 • NUMBER 054 • 2nd SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

**Tuesday, February 22, 2000
(Part A)**

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, February 22, 2000

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

• (1005)

[*Translation*]

POINT OF ORDER

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this House, the Leader of the Government in the House accused the Bloc Québécois of tabling “hundreds of clippings from old newspapers”, to enlighten the House on the infamous Bill C-20.

For his own personal information, the government House leader should have let the House authorize the tabling of these so-called old newspapers clipping. I think he should have read them, for his own benefit and that of all Quebecers.

I have here a very interesting article, particularly for our friends from the New Democratic Party. It is an article that was published in the December 2 issue of *La Presse*, under the title “Quebec alone should determine the clarity of the question, said McDough”.

Since the government wants to muzzle the committee, as it has done in this House with respect to this bill, I urge the House once again to authorize me to table this article, for its own benefit.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonnette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, further to the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of Bill C-20, a bill that denies the fundamental rights of Quebecers, I am asking for the unanimous consent of the House to table a document that will enlighten the House.

It is an article that was published in the February 10 issue of *Le Monde* concerning a text by Mrs. Louise Beaudoin entitled “The Quebec Sovereignist Philosophy”. I think I have the unanimous consent of the House to table this document.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have here an article entitled “Jacques Parizeau to *Le Devoir*: Canada Has no Other Choice but to Negotiate”.

I think it would be nice to have the consent of the House to table this document, which might enlighten all the federalist parties and all the federalist members of the House who want to deny Quebecers their most basic rights to freely decide their future and who are behaving like former Rhodesians.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

• (1010)

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think government members would benefit from having documents that would enlighten them on what Quebecers want with regard to their situation in the Canadian Confederation and at the same time enlighten the government on what today’s Quebec is all about.

I have here a document on Quebec’s political and constitutional status, which members would benefit from reading as they look for a possible solution in their relationship with Quebec.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent of the House to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ): Mr. Speaker, everybody in the House knows Félix Leclerc. I have here a document about the dignity of standing up as a people. I ask for the unanimous consent of the House—for denying it would be an insult

Point of Order

to Mr. Leclerc—to table this document to enlighten the House. I hope to get unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of a bill denying Quebecers their fundamental rights, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table a document that will enlighten the House. This is a document on the moral and legal right of a separated Quebec to use the Canadian currency.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent of the House to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of a bill denying Quebecers their fundamental rights, I have here a newspaper article about a visit of Mario Dumont to the Bois-Francs region, where he is quoted as saying that, in a democracy, a result of 50% plus one is in keeping with a principle recognized throughout the world.

I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table this article, which can enlighten the members of this House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, you know that Bill C-20 is currently being debated in committee. As we speak, Jean-François Lisée is testifying before the committee.

To enlighten all members of the House, I have here the results of a Léger & Léger poll on the referendum and on Bill C-20. If it is the pleasure of the House, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if I could table the results of this poll.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent of the House to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have here a text that our colleagues across the way

cannot object to, particularly my seatmate, the government House leader and member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.

It is a speech by Jean Charest. Our colleagues have to agree, because he is one of their own, a Liberal. This is the text of his television address on Bill 99 and the federal bill on referendum rules. I ask for consent to table this document.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of a bill denying the fundamental rights of Quebecers, I have here a document dealing with the Canadian dollar and Quebec secession. I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table this document, which will enlighten it in this debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

• (1015)

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said we were tabling old documents.

I would like to table an article from this morning's *La Presse* entitled "Trusteeship: Claude Ryan Speaks out Against the Federal Bill on Referendum Clarity". I think it is very topical.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of a bill denying the fundamental rights of Quebecers, I ask for unanimous consent to table a document for the information of the House.

The document is an article published in *Le Devoir* on December 4, entitled "Quebecers don't want Ottawa to get involved".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental

Point of Order

Affairs of a bill denying the fundamental rights of Quebecers, I ask for unanimous consent to table a document for the information of the House. I am counting on the usual propensity to learn of my colleagues opposite to get their unanimous consent.

The document is an article published in *Le Soleil* on December 4, entitled “Chrétien Preparing for Re-election”.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of a bill denying the fundamental rights of Quebecers, I ask for unanimous consent to table a document for the information of the House.

The document is an article published in *Le Soleil* on November 29, entitled “Chrétien Haggling”.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of legislation denying the basic rights of Quebecers, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table a document that will enlighten the House.

This is an article published on January 5, 2000, in *Le Droit* on the obstruction to the rules of democracy that Bill C-20 represents.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the announcement by the Prime Minister, who introduced a bill denying the most basic rights of Quebecers, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table a document that will enlighten the House.

This is a study on social union done by André Binette for the Secrétariat québécois aux Affaires gouvernementales. In this study, Mr. Binette concludes “With the signature of the social union agreement, a historical step was taken. Ottawa will no longer even pretend to respect Quebec’s autonomy or its traditional interpretation of the Constitution”.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction of the bill denying Quebecers their right to decide their future, I am asking for the unanimous consent of the House to table a document on a new Quebec-Canada partnership, a modern and exciting project.

This document will enlighten the House on a modern proposal that is truly better than the obsolete project of the government opposite.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have here an article published in *Le Devoir* on January 27, entitled “Ontario after a Yes Vote”.

• (1020)

The article states:

After a three year legal saga, Toronto’s *Globe and Mail* has obtained documents from Ontario’s Department of Finance, in which an assessment is made of the impact for Ontario of a yes victory in the 1995 referendum.

What was presented as a series of studies is merely notes jotted down for use by the Department of Finance. These documents list the Quebec-Ontario agreements—very few of them, in fact—that would be in jeopardy as a result of Quebec sovereignty.

By using estimates already made by various experts, there was an attempt at determining potential losses of employment caused by the breakup. However, these documents do not have much value as estimates and are rather more speculative. For example, there is half a line on the involvement of the Canadian army, without any explanation.

It is estimated that sovereignty could result in the value of the Canadian dollar going down to between 65 cents and 70 cents U.S., something which is presented as a catastrophe.

Since these notes were written, the Canadian dollar has—

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): As members know, it is impossible for the Chair to divine the intention of the hon. member, but I must ask if it is the hon. member’s intention to request unanimous consent to table the document.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand: Mr. Speaker, I only had a few lines left to read, relating to the 1995 referendum campaign and other data in this very interesting article, which could enlighten members of this House.

I would indeed ask for—

Point of Order

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Does the hon. member for Quebec East have unanimous consent of the House to table the document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[Translation]

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have not one, but two documents to table this morning.

Following the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of Bill C-20, which denies the Quebec people their fundamental rights, I ask for the unanimous consent of this House to table one of those two documents that will enlighten it.

It is an article from an important document, entitled “For Quebec, Time Is Running Out”.

My second document is the Quebec chief electoral officer’s report on the results of the 1995 referendum, in which 93%—

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I can see a slight escalation. It is bad enough we are depositing one document, but if each of us stands to describe two or more where will it end? Let us leave it at one document. Does the hon. member for Charlevoix have unanimous consent of the House to deposit the document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[Translation]

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction of Bill C-20, which is now called the gag law against the Quebec people, I ask for the unanimous consent of this House to table a very recent text from the February 22 issue—today’s issue—of *Le Devoir*. It is entitled “Clarity Bill: Ryan Criticizes The Federal Initiative”.

The article says “In attempting to have the federal parliament decide whether the question and the referendum results are clear, despite the prerogatives of the National Assembly prerogatives, the Chrétien government is going against the very principles—”

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We get the idea. Does the hon. member for Lotbinière have unanimous consent of the House to deposit the document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[Translation]

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I also have news for the government.

In the February 22 issue of the *Journal de Montréal*, we read that Claude Ryan would vote against the clarity bill, and he did not mince his words. He sharply criticized the bill on the referendum conditions, becoming the first federalist known both in Quebec and on the federal level to openly express his dissent.

I could give in detail all the reasons he opposes this bill. Some say that this bill will be a black mark on democracy in Quebec.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): If there were unanimous consent of the House to deposit the document we could all save ourselves a dollar by not buying the paper. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

• (1025)

[Translation]

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has introduced a bill denying Quebecers their fundamental rights, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to table a document that will enlighten it.

It is a short history of monetary unions between independent states; it deals with states where monetary union failed and others where it succeeded. There are very good examples, such as Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland, France, Italy, the United States, Panama and Liberia. I believe this document could enlighten the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent for the member to table the document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction, by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, of a bill denying the fundamental rights of Quebecers, I ask for, and will no doubt obtain, the unanimous consent of the House to table a document that will enlighten this House.

It is a document on Quebec’s political and constitutional status. With your permission, I would like to read the covering letter sent by the Quebec Minister of Canadian Intergovernmental Affairs, Joseph Facal.

It starts like this “This document focuses on the main events relating to the constitutional political status of Quebec. It shows the evolution of a federal system that has progressively moved away—”

Routine Proceedings

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent of the House to table that document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as you know, we are in the middle of a debate on a rather unfair bill that was introduced by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

I have here a study on the social union, which could enlighten my colleagues on the government side. This is a study by Jacques Frémont.

In his study, Mr. Frémont said—and I would like to quote him; it is only one sentence—“Instead, the signatories have chosen to adopt a clause that imposes obligations as well as severe restrictions on the signatory governments”. In any debate, one must show openness and draw from all possible sources of information.

I urge my colleagues on the government side to give their unanimous consent to the tabling of this study, so that they can draw from it in their debates.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ): Mr. Speaker, further to the introduction of a bill by the hon. member for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, I have here a copy of the speech made by Quebec Premier Lucien Bouchard on Bill 99, which was introduced at the National Assembly, and on Bill C-20 concerning referendum rules.

I seek the consent of the House to table this very interesting document.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent of the House to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the House, and with a view on enlightening the hon. members across the way, I would like to table an article published in the daily newspaper *La Presse* on January 26 on the advantages of Quebec's separation to Ontario. I seek unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ): Mr. Speaker, here is an excerpt from an article entitled “When Clarity Isn't”. It reads “Who do they think we are in Ottawa? Dunces who do not even know their French? To call a bill a clarity bill when nothing in it is clear, one must not have public information in mind”.

So, to clarify matters for certain people in this House, I would like to table this article published in *La Voix de l'Est* on December 31, 1999 and entitled, as I said, “When Clarity Isn't”.

• (1030)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand: Mr. Speaker, actually I would like to table a document, which I have here, published in *Le Soleil* on December 4, under the title—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Order, please. I appreciate that the hon. members wish to table as many documents as possible, but an hon. member may not speak twice on the same point of order. This will not be the rule today.

[*English*]

We will go to the daily routine of business.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could you seek unanimous consent to withdraw Bill C-20, which is unacceptable to Quebec? The best thing we could do is to withdraw it now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member seeks unanimous consent to withdraw Bill C-20. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am

Routine Proceedings

pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of order in council appointments which were recently made by the government.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(1), these are deemed referred to the appropriate standing committees, a list of which is attached.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Orders 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to ten petitions.

* * *

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. John Harvard (Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure and the honour to table today, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food on a farm income safety net.

Your committee reviewed the issue of a farm income safety net, as it pertains to the agriculture and agri-food sector, as part of its order of reference dated October 28, 1999. The committee travelled across the four western provinces to meet with and listen to farmers and some groups and organizations representing or working with farmers. It came up with a number of recommendations which are contained in the report.

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

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all committee members from all sides for their work, the committee staff and all the farmers who appeared before us to share their views and concerns.

• (1035)

[Translation]

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I move that the first report of the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs, tabled on Wednesday December 1, 1999, be concurred in.

Thank you for giving me the time this morning to debate this motion which is, in my opinion, an extremely important one.

It is important, first of all, because the budget, on which we will be required to vote in about two weeks, will no doubt include billions of dollars for National Defence.

The last budgets of that department were in the order of \$10 million or \$11 million. That is a very large portion of the budget. It accounts for a large part of the revenue of the Government of Canada.

It is important to address this matter because the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs has been looking at a number of aspects of military life over the past two years. The auditor general himself was interested in the way the army was spending the money allocated to it.

The committee has been looking at military life over the past two or three years. What sort of life do our military personnel have day to day? How do they feel when they are sent on missions abroad? How are they treated and with what sort of satisfaction do they enjoy daily on the bases, be they land, naval or air bases, where they are assigned, at home or abroad?

The committee was interested in this question because, for a number of years, especially since the government started its fight against the deficit, the army has been in large measure hit with budget restrictions. Our military personnel and our generals complained of it, and even NATO complained.

NATO, of which Canada is a member, criticized the fact that Canada was not investing enough in its share of the peacekeeping missions abroad, such as the ones in Kosovo, East Timor and Bosnia Herzegovina. According to NATO, Canada is one of the countries investing less, in terms of its gross domestic product, in the missions.

After doing studies and research, hearing dozens of witnesses, including experts—some from abroad, some from Canada—a number of members of the military, including soldiers, those most affected by the policies of the Government of Canada, on November 25, 1999, the committee tabled a motion on the revitalization and modernization of Canada's armed forces.

The 1994 white paper, mentioned in this resolution, was introduced six years ago.

The resolution read as follows:

Whereas the Government's White Paper on Defence from 1994 calls on the Canadian Forces to play a vital role in protecting Canadian sovereignty, maintaining collective defence through NATO and NORAD, providing support to United Nations peacekeeping operations, search and rescue, disaster relief and humanitarian assistance;

• (1040)

This resolution read further:

And whereas, the Department of National Defence budget has been reduced by 23 per cent against original projections since Budget '94;

Routine Proceedings

And 23% is a sizeable proportion of a budget.

And whereas, in comparison to our principal allies, Canadian defence expenditures have fallen sharply from 1.7 per cent of GDP

I referred to it earlier.

in 1993-94 to 1.15 per cent of GDP in 1999-2000 with the NATO average being 2.1 per cent of GDP;

The difference between what Canada and other NATO countries invest in national defence and peacekeeping operations is almost 1%.

And whereas, our international commitments—in places like Bosnia, Kosovo and East Timor—in support of peace and human security have increased to the point where we have one of the largest contingents of troops deployed abroad since the Korean War;

And whereas, the Canadian Forces continue to experience problems with respect to housing—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but the member for Ottawa Centre has risen on a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Mac Harb: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think my colleagues have confused the speeches today on first reading with second reading. My understanding is that when introducing private members' bills members have a few seconds to talk about what it is they are putting before the House, rather than giving long-winded speeches.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if it is possible for the hon. member to wind up his remarks so we can move on to the other items on the agenda.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It certainly would be if the hon. member for Joliette was introducing a private member's bill, but he is not. He is speaking to a motion.

I would mention that when members come into the House they should turn off their cellphones when they enter the Chamber. Cellphones are not to be used in the Chamber, which includes behind the curtains.

We are not dealing with private members' bills, we are debating a motion. The hon. member for Joliette has 20 minutes for debate and then there will be a 10 minute question and comment period. Then the opportunity for debate and response will go to the government side.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. At the beginning of Routine Proceedings today when the chairman of the agriculture committee tabled his majority report there were minority reports attached to it, including the report of the official opposition, the Reform Party of Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We are in debate on a motion by the hon. member for Joliette. I do not know if the

member for Selkirk—Interlake was standing at the time and I neglected to recognize him. If that is the case, as soon as we are finished with the member for Joliette, I will return to the member for Selkirk—Interlake. It may take a minute because we are going to go to a vote, but I will make sure that the member for Selkirk—Interlake has an opportunity.

The hon. member for Joliette has 11 minutes left on debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues opposite will just bear with me, they will see where I am headed. Members of the Canadian forces have been patient; for five, and in some cases even ten, years they have been waiting in vain for reform from the government. The member has been listening to me for only two minutes. He can listen a bit longer if he is interested in the point we are trying to make.

● (1045)

I was reading the final “whereas” in the resolution tabled before the standing committee on November 25, 1999, which states the following:

And whereas, the Canadian Forces continue to experience problems with respect to housing, quality of life issues, troop fatigue based upon increased deployments, ageing equipment in need of replacement and the loss of key capabilities;

It ought to be of interest to government members to hear about the shortcomings of the armed forces and what they are lacking.

Be it resolved that the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs (SCONDA) request the Government of Canada embark upon a five-year plan, commencing immediately, to substantially increase the budget of the Department of National Defence as a percentage of the GDP to revitalize, modernize and ensure an effective, combat capable Canadian Forces.

We have some comments on this. Moreover, we presented a dissenting report for the following reasons.

In committee we indicated that the resolution might have been acceptable to us if certain points were modified. We suggested that the government's objectives be reassessed. We called for the control over military spending to also be reassessed, and more attention focussed on it.

Why did we move this amendment and vote against the main proposal? In its first report, the committee asked that additional moneys be immediately provided to the Department of National Defence. The Bloc Québécois' position on the issue of supplementary estimates for national defence has always been the same and still is.

We are not opposed, in principle, to increasing the army's budget if we come to the conclusion that there is no other way to meet the needs of the army, and if the objectives of the government and of Canada regarding peacekeeping operations, including

Routine Proceedings

peacemaking and promotion of peace and democracy in foreign countries, are still within our means. We must have the means to fulfil our ambitions. Canada has ambitions; it wants to look good abroad, but can we still afford our ambitious objectives?

It might be advisable to ask ourselves that question once again. The white paper on defence was written in 1994, but the world situation has evolved enormously since. It has totally changed over the past six years. There are now 22 theatres of threatened peace or of war where countries are tearing each other or themselves to pieces, where democracy is in jeopardy. Canada is involved in most missions to these regions.

Now, in the year 2000, does Canada—even though it continues to be a promoter of peace—still have the means to participate in these missions? Do we have to take part in every mission, or should we be selective? Should Canada be involved in these missions if we decide to be present everywhere? Should we participate in the same way that all the other countries do, or should we specialize in a certain role?

For example, we could play a role relating to communications, diplomacy or health care. We must ask ourselves these questions once again. Does Canada still have the means to send aircraft, including F-18s, and heavy equipment abroad to fulfil these obligations?

• (1050)

We cannot let our allies think we will provide thousands, millions and billions of dollars to help maintain peace, when at home one child in five is starving. Peace starts at home.

If Canadians cannot live in peace at home because they do not feel secure and do not have bread to feed their children, if Canadians and Quebecers lack this assurance at home, how can they properly support a peacekeeping presence abroad? Charity begins at home.

Canada will enjoy influence and credibility abroad when the people there know that Canada treats its own people and their children well first, before attempting to look after the children of others.

This is a concern of the Bloc Québécois. We must be sure all the savings possible in the army have been made before new funds are injected. The auditor general has repeatedly pointed to mismanagement of funds in the army.

In November, 1999, in chapter 26, the auditor noted the following “The audit found that in some areas, controls over financial and material resources have weakened”. Therefore, before additional funds are injected, we must look into the present management, which is the source of the waste.

In this same chapter 26, the auditor general noted—in 1999, not ages ago, but quite recently—as follows “Allegations of such abuses of resources as unauthorized upgrading of official resi-

dences and misappropriation of government property have not always been dealt with adequately”. Let the government start by looking into this before considering whether there is a need to increase the budget.

That was not all the auditor general had to say. In chapter 27 of the same report, he commented that the Department of National Defence had not always put out calls for tender, “thus forgoing the benefits of price competition”. A total of \$3 billion, or 30%, of the national defence budget of \$10 billion is spent annually on untendered contracts. This is not negligible. It is an extremely large amount and they do not see anything wrong with operating this way.

DND authorities are authorized to make purchases using expenditure cards with which they are issued. Are those purchases always made at the best price? We do not know because there are no calls for tender. In the worst case scenario, some people may be using the system to indulge in patronage, to buy from friends, from people who are helping the government stay in power.

It is important that we be sure that this money is being properly spent before approving increases.

The other point that I wished to make is that we must review our international objectives. If Canada cannot afford to take part in international peacekeeping missions, it should re-examine its policies now, inform its allies accordingly, and tell them what role we intend to play in future and how much we are prepared to invest.

• (1055)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Before moving to questions and comments, I would like to give the floor to the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake for the tabling of the minority report on agriculture. We shall then go to questions and comments on the motion of the hon. member for Joliette.

[English]

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as vice-chair of the committee, I have a few comments to make with regard to the standing committee report that was tabled by the chairman, the member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia.

This report was a study of the effectiveness of long term national safety net programs. I commend the committee for travelling to the three western provinces plus one place in British Columbia. However, the committee voted down travelling to other parts of the country, in particular Ontario and the east. As a result, I would like the members of the House to know that the report is incomplete in the study of the national safety net effectiveness.

I hope that in the near future our committee will be travelling and talking to farmers in the rest of the country and in fact tabling a report that is national in scope.

Routine Proceedings

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I apologize for not recognizing the member earlier. I thank the House for its forbearance in allowing us to go back to this item.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague from Joliette for his presentation, and particularly on his knowledge of this matter.

If I have understood correctly, it seems to me that the armed forces are not much better off than the TJF. Could he enlighten me on this?

Mr. René Laurin: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his very pertinent question. I had not finished mentioning cases of mismanagement.

If the auditor general—the report does not mention it—had taken as sizeable a sampling as in the case of Human Resources Development Canada, he might have found an equivalent amount of mismanagement in the Defence files. We do not know this, because the auditor general settled for raising the most obvious cases of waste and mismanagement. I will give a few more.

For example, in answer to the question from my colleague, in the April 1998 Auditor General's Report, it was clearly indicated that the injection of additional funds would not solve the problems of the armed forces, as long as it is not clear where it is headed.

It is all very fine to say "There are complaints from the military, so we will add one or two billion dollars". However, if it is not clear where we are headed, it will never be known whether this additional money will solve the problem. There has to be a proper understanding of the situation, we have to be sure of the administrative methods used, we have to be sure this money has been spent before any more is injected.

Perhaps the money already allocated to the armed forces would be enough, if it were handled better. Perhaps no more investment would be necessary. This would enable us to put more money into other priorities of Canadians and Quebecers, such as combatting poverty and unemployment or helping out the provinces in the areas of health, education or welfare. This funding is not merely useful; it is necessary.

• (1100)

[*English*]

Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I agree with my hon. colleague. It is very important that the government reassess its objectives for our Canadian military. I am sure we have to look at our role internationally. However, I have various

concerns about our role in NATO and how we quite often blindly follow what the U.S. proposes for NATO.

At the same time, I feel it is very important that our military have proper resources and that there be sufficient funding to support the quality of life issues in terms of housing and pay issues, which our committee looked at and strongly supported. We know we have asked them to go further and further abroad into missions but when they come back home there is not the kind of support they need, particularly when they are suffering from medical ailments.

Does my hon. colleague not feel it is very important that there be sufficient funding for the military to support those quality of life issues and support the acquisition of badly needed search and rescue equipment so that our military will be able to properly perform most functions, both domestically and abroad?

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Laurin: Mr. Speaker, I admire the work done in committee by the hon. member. He shows that he is very interested. Even though he is also an opposition member, he always shows a great deal of interest in these issues.

We are in agreement. The Bloc Québécois has always said it: if we are sure that the moneys already allocated to the army are well spent, that they are spent for the purposes for which they were allocated, that they are strictly and meticulously monitored, and if we are sure that Canada is financially capable of participating in missions—it is true that we have a role to play abroad, but that role must be one that we are able to play—if we have the assurance that these objectives have been met, then we will agree to let the government invest more money, if necessary. But the government must first invest in the quality of life of military personnel.

When Canada goes abroad, the number of bombs or aircraft that it sends does nothing to promote its credibility with belligerent countries. Canada's reputation abroad has always been one of a promoter peace, of a creator of conditions promoting peace. These conditions are not created by increasing the number of aircraft or by making bombs.

What Canada must do is strengthen its credibility, first by ensuring comfort, good quality of life and stability to Canadians and Quebecers. This is the best way to establish its credibility as a peacekeeper abroad.

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is one management problem among those enumerated that has been glossed over. I am thinking of the action taken to ensure the best possible health conditions for our soldiers when they are on peacekeeping missions.

We have seen soldiers return from missions in ill health; there are problems determining exactly what they are suffering from. What I am talking about this morning is not Viagra. I am talking about real illnesses that our soldiers are suffering from when they return home.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. René Laurin: Mr. Speaker, my colleague is right. We too have been critical of this situation. We have even seen individual files with certain compromising information removed. Why? We have no idea.

Why was information removed? Was it because they were afraid that these soldiers would claim compensation? Was it because they were afraid that these soldiers would be entitled to settlements that would cost the government too much? Is this how they show respect for soldiers? Is this how they show respect for those who are going to defend the freedom in which we believe? Is this how we want those who represent us abroad treated?

Once again, Canada's credibility, its prestige as a peacekeeper, is predicated on our respect for the soldiers who represent us abroad.

• (1105)

It is predicated on respect for the individuals who remain in Canada, because these are the people who will pay for our peacekeeping missions abroad. When foreign countries see how much importance we attach to respecting people, to looking after their basic needs, when they see it is a priority for Canada they will respect us and we will have played a better role abroad than the one we play now by sending military equipment that is at times so heavy we lack the carriers needed to deliver them to a theatre of war abroad.

We have to turn to the American army for help in transporting certain heavy equipment. Counting on the help of another country to defend our ideas abroad is a very strange way of ensuring our sovereignty.

Once again, Canada would do well—even though the white paper is six years old, in international politics things change so quickly that six years can be a very long time—to re-examine its positions, especially when we are wondering if NATO should not alter its mission, when the new European Union is considering putting a structure called European security and defence identity in place and when everything is upside down and people think the world should act differently with respect to theatres of war across regions or nations.

We have to consider whether it is effective to retain the same objectives or whether we should not look at a new way for Canada to be part of these missions abroad and how it could ensure its military personnel enjoy a decent standard of living both at home and on missions abroad.

[*English*]

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the House do now proceed to orders of the day.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

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

• (1150)

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

(*Division No. 691*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Augustine
Axworthy	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaltwal
Dion	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)

Government Orders

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

BILL C-2—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

That in relation to Bill C-2, an act respecting the election of members to the House of Commons, repealing other acts relating to elections and making consequential amendments to other acts, 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, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time 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.

• (1155)

[Translation]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

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

• (1240)

[English]

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

(Division No. 692)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bélair

Alcock
Augustine
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger

McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
Normand
O'Reilly
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Saada
Serré
Shepherd
St. Denis
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wilfert

Mifflin
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Patri
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proulx
Reed
Robillard
Scott (Fredericton)
Sgro
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—136

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman
Cardin
Casson
Crête
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Laurin
Lefebvre
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marchand
Mayfield
Ménard
Meredith
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Robinson
Sauvageau
Solomon
St-Jacques
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Venne
Wayne

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Bigras
Borotsik
Brisson
Canuel
Casey
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Earle
Epp
Fournier
Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Lalonde
Lebel
Lill
Lunn
Marceau
Mark
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Perron
Reynolds
Rocheleau
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Stinson
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)—94

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

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

Government Orders

Bellemare	Bennett	Epp	Forseth
Bertrand	Blondin-Andrew	Fournier	Gagnon
Bonin	Bonwick	Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Boudria	Bradshaw	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Brown	Bryden	Goldring	Gouk
Bulte	Byrne	Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Calder	Cannis	Guay	Guimond
Caplan	Carroll	Hart	Harvey
Catterall	Cauchon	Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Chamberlain	Chan	Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Charbonneau	Clouthier	Jaffer	Johnston
Coderre	Collenette	Jones	Lalonde
Copps	Cotler	Laurin	Lebel
Cullen	DeVillers	Lefebvre	Lill
Dhaliwal	Dion	Loubier	Lunn
Dromisky	Drouin	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Marceau
Duhamel	Eggleton	Marchand	Mark
Finlay	Folco	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
Fontana	Fry	McNally	Mercier
Gagliano	Galloway	Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Godfrey	Goodale	Muise	Nystrom
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)	Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Grose	Guarnieri	Price	Reynolds
Harb	Harvard	Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Hubbard	Ianno	Schmidt	Solomon
Iftody	Jackson	St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
Jennings	Jordan	Stinson	Strahl
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson	Vautour	Venne
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka	Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
Lavigne	Lee	White (North Vancouver)—97	
Leung	Limoges		
Lincoln	Longfield		
MacAulay	Mahoney		
Malhi	Maloney		
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)		
Matthews	McCormick		
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)		
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague		
McWhinney	Mifflin		
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna		
Mitchell	Murray		
Myers	Nault		
Normand	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)		
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan		
Parrish	Patry		
Peric	Peterson		
Pettigrew	Phinney		
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri		
Proud	Proulx		
Redman	Reed		
Richardson	Robillard		
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)		
Serré	Sgro		
Shepherd	Speller		
St. Denis	St-Julien		
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)		
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo		
Telegdi	Thibeault		
Torsney	Ur		
Valeri	Vanclief		
Volpe	Whelan		
Wilfert	Wood—138		

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from February 14 consideration of Bill C-2, an act respecting the election of members to the House of Commons, repealing other acts relating to elections and making consequential amendments to other acts, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of Group No. 2.

● (1245)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): When the item was last debated the hon. member for Leeds—Grenville proposed amendments to Motions Nos. 90, 94 and 123. The Chair has determined that these amendments are in order and a revised voting chart is available at the table.

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we have to rise today to speak to this bill under the effects of closure but we will do our best.

I rise today to speak on the report stage of Bill C-2, an act which repeals and replaces, inadequately in my view, the Canada Elections Act.

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Blaikie	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Brison
Cadman	Canuel
Cardin	Casey
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Dumas
Earle	Elley

Government Orders

Initially, when I first heard that the government was going to repeal the Canada Elections Act, I was encouraged, for that was something our party has taken a firm position on. In fact, it can be found as a policy in our blue book, where it states under the section entitled Parliamentary Reform, subsection A:

The Reform Party supports repealing sections of the Canada Elections Act which make MPs beholden to their national party executive or leader rather than their constituents.

The Reform Party has taken a strong stand on political reform, believing that for too long Canada's political system has been out of touch with the common voter. We believe it is time to restore the confidence of Canadians in Canada's political system and federal representatives to make sound decisions about their future. We will do this through the introduction of real democratic representation in parliament and accountability for parliamentarians.

I firmly believe that it is time elected representatives be held accountable to the people who elect them and that the duty of elected members to their constituents should supersede their obligations to their political parties.

Sadly, as I learn more about the government's intentions, first in the form of Bill C-83 in the first session of this parliament, and now Bill C-2 in this session, I see that the Liberal government and, indeed, some of the other parties in the House, do not share Reform's commitment to openness and transparency in government.

Before I continue in any detail, I first want to compliment my colleague, the member for Vancouver North. I congratulate him for his tenacity, for his unfailing commitment to the principles of democratic reform that I outlined previously and for his undying belief in the equality of all people, regardless of their political affiliation. This member has almost single-handedly exposed this bill for the farce that it is, and I recognize him for that.

The efforts made by the government to change electoral legislation is inadequate. It has become clear to members of the House and members of the public that the government sent this bill to committee before second reading hoping to keep it hidden from public spotlight and thus isolate it from any meaningful public comment.

This arrogance is evidenced by the fact that no significant amendments were made in the committee in spite of numerous suggestions made by the official opposition, third party and media witnesses and witnesses from other political parties that are not represented in the House today.

It was with relief that I noted that some small parties did have an opportunity to make representation to the committee. Too often these parties, and the Canadians who voted for them, are ignored by

the traditional parties and the mainstream national media. In fact, the elections acts in Canada are so biased toward the parties with seats in the federal or provincial legislatures that it is normal for any changes to be slipped through quietly on a Friday afternoon lest any public scrutiny expose those political hijinks for what they are.

● (1250)

This time, however, Canadians are fortunate to have the Reform Party filling the role of Her Majesty's Official Opposition, and we will not let the government pull the wool over the eyes and the rug out from under the feet of the Canadian public. We will remain true to our democratic roots and true to Canadians.

In spite of repealing the current legislation, this new legislation repeats many of the same mistakes of the Canada Elections Act, doing nothing to address serious public concerns involving campaign financing, party registration requirements, the timing of byelections, third party spending issues and patronage appointments within Elections Canada. It should come as no surprise then when one discovers that these flaws were retained because of the advantage they give to the ruling party.

I want to speak to the issue of third party spending, which I believe goes beyond the context of this legislation and addresses the broader issue of free speech.

The government appears to be basing its tenuous position on a controversial decision made by the supreme court in *Libman v Quebec* which struck down the Quebec referendum act's third party spending limit as too restrictive, but left the door open to legislatures and parliament to determine reasonable spending limits that were not only desirable but constitutional.

However, this decision was not made in the context of a federal election where voters are faced with a multitude of issues, but in the context of a provincial referendum where the answer is either yes or no. This difference is very obvious to members of Canada's legal community, no matter what their politics are.

This issue has been before the courts on several occasions in Alberta and in both cases the court ruled that imposing spending limits on third parties is unconstitutional. A recent court case in British Columbia also addressed the issue of third party spending and decided that there were certain circumstances in which the goal of fairness in elections would support an argument for third party advertising.

If in a future election campaign all of the political parties were to agree on a significant policy point then the lack of third party advertising would mean that the people would be limited to the views of the major political parties and media commentators. The third party spending limits would effectively silence citizens who wish to express contrary views.

Government Orders

The Liberals must know that the bill does not have a chance of withstanding a constitutional challenge but I believe they have an ulterior motive in introducing the bill.

It is not a secret that the previous Liberal and Tory regimes have felt the sting of third party spending. The National Citizens' Coalition has publicly criticized the generous MP pension plan during election times and the Canadian Police Association paid for billboards that pilloried Liberal candidates for being soft on crime.

The government feels that the legislation is a way to level the playing field at election time, saying that if candidates have spending limits, lobby groups should also be limited. What is level about limiting lobby groups to a mere \$150,000, of which only \$3,000 can be targeted to any single riding, when the total election spending limit for the federal Liberal Party is close to \$30 million?

Far from levelling the playing field, the legislation gives a huge advantage to the Liberal government. Not only can the Liberals outspend their nearest political party opponents by a margin of nearly three to one, they can spend tens of millions of federal taxpayers' dollars to pat themselves on the back in the months preceding the election.

Restricting the ability of third parties to counter the barrage of government propaganda is an affront to the democratic traditions upon which this country was built.

Notwithstanding the fact that these limits are a clear attempt to muzzle free speech, there is not even evidence to prove that limiting campaign expenses influences the outcome of elections.

Let us consider the following: In 1993 Canadians were suffering under a bloated and arrogant government, one devoid of any new ideas and fundamentally out of touch with the electorate. This party had the highest spending limit of any political party, spending tens of millions of dollars only to return just two MPs to the House of Commons.

On the other hand, a young and vibrant new political party was offering common sense solutions to many challenging issues. It advocated such things as fiscal responsibility, social responsibility, reform of the federation and democratic accountability. This grassroots movement, funded by the \$10 and \$20 contributions of grassroots Canadians, sent 52 MPs to Ottawa.

• (1255)

Another example is the Charlottetown accord where the yes side outspent the no side by a margin of 10 to 1 and still lost.

These examples illustrate very clearly that there is absolutely no evidence at all that spending more money than an opponent guarantees a win.

Therefore, I submit that this is nothing but a bald-faced attempt by the governing party to curtail the freedom of expression of private citizens so that their views cannot be advanced forcefully enough to compete with the views of the media moguls and political parties. The government simply does not want to be reminded of its failures, weaknesses and broken promises during an election campaign, and that is enough reason for this bill to be scrapped.

In drafting this bill, the government virtually ignored the work of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. The government also ignored several decisions of various appeal courts and the Supreme Court of Canada. The government is very inconsistent in its approach to court rulings. Given its past reluctance to act against court decisions, by introducing this bill the government is saying that it is okay for the courts to make child pornography legal and to allocate access to fisheries according to race, but do not touch the provisions of the election act that favour the ruling party.

The government refused to hold committee meetings in cities across Canada. The public must know more about this bill.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to rise to speak to Bill C-2. However, before I do, I want to commend my colleague from North Vancouver who has done a tremendous amount of work on the bill. He has researched it at length and has come up with very serious flaws in the bill. It needs to be completely rejigged.

As my colleague, who just spoke before me, said, it is weighted to the governing side, in this case the Liberals but it could be another government at another time. What we want is a neutral act, an act that is fair to all sides of the House and to all people in an election.

It does not have the support of the public at the moment. It does not have the support of the Chief Electoral Officer. It does not have the support of all the members in the House. I believe that is critical. As I said earlier, we need to have a neutral bill, a bill that all people, including the Chief Electoral Officer, support. A neutral bill just makes common sense. We are talking about a 19th century bill when we are in the 21st century. It is bizarre that the government would want this. It shows that it is still a dinosaur trying to practise old style politics.

The committee should have travelled throughout Canada and people should have been able to talk to the government and opposition parties about the bill but that did not happen.

As my colleague has said, there are a number of areas of major concern: campaign financing, party registration requirements, timing of byelections. These are all up for grabs. Basically, they all weigh on the side of the government, and that is clearly wrong.

Government Orders

The courts have already struck down a number of points that are in the bill. Why would we have points within a bill that we know the courts will reject? That is ridiculous.

We have already had groups come forward saying that this was ridiculous. The National Citizens' Coalition has said "We're going to challenge it". It will be challenged. Why would we spend our effort in the House producing a bill that is not up to speed and one which we know will be challenged in court? Not only do we know it will be challenged, we also know it will lose. This is nuts.

One of the points I would like to talk about is the blackout poll. It is certain to be struck down. Court decisions have already said that it will not fly. They have already made rulings on it yet the government insists on putting this part of it in the bill. Why would it do that?

• (1300)

Then there is the registered party status requirement of 50 candidates. That is crazy. Two or three candidates should be enough, or pick a number such as a dozen. Most people are ready for 12. That is reasonable. Again the government is trying to force the playing field away from the average ordinary Canadian.

On the spending limits, think about the dollars the Liberals have in their pockets. I believe the last figure was \$30 million that they can spend on campaigns. They want to limit third party intervention, whether it be from police officers on justice issues, or from health care professionals, nurses and doctors, on our health program which we know is in trouble. At election time, these people through their organizations want to put their points forward, yet the government is saying "We do not want to have third party intervention because it will be against us". Again the government is trying to limit it.

And there is the actual machinery of running an election. Each of the 301 ridings has a returning officer. Returning officers should be appointed on merit; they should not be political appointments. There have been a number of situations where persons are either biased or just incompetent, not good at their jobs. We want the best returning officers we can have. The Chief Electoral Officer is there to make sure that the election machinery is run well, is fair and the results are credible. Bill C-2 does everything to fly in the face of that.

Something which is not in the bill is fixed election dates. That needs to be explored. Nobody is saying that the U.S. is perfect but it does have fixed election dates. It is known that four years down the road there will be an election for president in November.

In our country the governing party, whoever happens to be in power at the time, weighs all the situations and does the polls to see when the wind is in its favour to call an election. That is wrong. An

election should be held as municipal elections are, on fixed dates, so we all know when the next election will be.

There are glaring points in the bill, issues such as the courts already striking down sections of the bill. We know it will not pass. We know it will be challenged and rejected in the courts. Why would it be put in the bill? It is folly. We want a neutral bill.

I hope the bill can be redrafted to the point where it is a neutral bill and does not favour any party but favours all Canadians. In that way our party would be able to support the bill. The way it is now there is no way in the world we can support it.

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill C-2, the Canada Elections Act.

The very nature of Canada as a free and democratic country should be accurately reflected in a bill such as this. Unfortunately the government has failed miserably in this task. Rather than a non-partisan bill that will ensure that elections take place on a fair and equitable basis, the government has put forward a bill that creates further disparity and partisanship.

We live in a time when information and technology are moving forward at an incredible pace. As incredible advances take place, the world around us struggles to keep pace. I do not believe this bill fully attempts to keep pace with the communication expectations of Canadians.

I stress communication because that is what politics and indeed the House of Commons should be all about. The process should be a circular one where the electorate chooses their representatives to send a message to Ottawa. That message may be one that endorses past actions and legislation, or it may be one that calls for incredibly drastic change. Over the past number of elections we have seen both of these messages sent to Ottawa.

• (1305)

The next part of the communication network is to ensure that the member adequately represents his or her constituents. Is the member able to communicate the needs of the constituency clearly and concisely to the House of Commons and enact the solutions and legislation that are necessary?

Unfortunately our current system of governance seldom takes opposition members' points of view into account. This is true both here in the House and in our committee work. It is frustrating both to the members here and the electorate that voted for those members to see their good ideas thwarted because of partisan politics.

We have seen this in many instances of late. We have seen the government stall and hand-pick witnesses. We have watched as the government forced time allocation in one form or another over 60

Government Orders

times. Time allocation is only a means to stop opposition members from having a legitimate opportunity to express the concerns and the needs of their constituents. The government has grievously abused this procedure and should hang its head in shame.

Contrary to the thoughts of many, democracy does not rule here in the House. The government whip rules over that side of the House. Even with the slim majority number of seats representing only 38% of the people in Canada who voted, the elite few in and around the Prime Minister's office rule the country.

Note that I said rule and not run, for I believe that the Liberals rule in an autocratic manner. I know there are members on that side of the House who have disagreed with what the Prime Minister has said. I know that there are those who do not wish to vote in the government prescribed way. I have watched as these same members felt that they could not vote against the party line and thus were not able to adequately express their constituents' feelings on a given topic.

The close of the communication loop is for the government, after truly listening to the electorate, to be able to adequately pass new or revised legislation and communicate this back to constituents. All too often, especially with this government, it makes the claim that it is listening to the people only to turn around and do something exactly opposite to the will of the people.

I need only cite the recent deplorable manner in which the justice minister refused to listen to the people of Canada on their feelings about child pornography. Hundreds of thousands of people have signed petitions calling for the use of the notwithstanding clause thus negating the unnecessary cost and waste of time that has dragged on for over a full year. Canadians will not stand for that kind of abuse and the subsequent exploitation of our children while we stand around and do nothing.

For over a full year the justice minister stated that child pornography would not need to have the notwithstanding clause used, while those of us from British Columbia are still waiting for real action to take place. Right now and for over the past year the possession of child pornography has been legal in B.C. That is right, legal.

This is the ostrich method approach. And what is that? Government members stick their heads in the sand and wait for the danger to pass. Well I have news for them. The danger is mounting: child pornography, HRDC boondoggles, the hepatitis C tainted blood debacle, the Nisga'a agreement, the new elections act and a host of others. These dangers will not pass away. The only thing that will pass them by is the electorate in the next election.

The voters should be given the right to recall their current member of parliament if they feel they are being inadequately represented. If enough people in their riding agree with them, then the member loses his or her seat and the electorate has an

opportunity to select again. This would ensure that the electorate is not forgotten after the election is over, as the government does.

There are a whole series of other items which I believe should be addressed under this draft bill, but time will only allow me the opportunity to speak to a few of them.

Currently the returning officers are political appointees of the governor in council. This defeats the whole premise of a non-partisan election process. The Chief Electoral Officer himself stated during committee meetings that it was critical he be given the power to hire returning officers based upon merit.

The electorate of Canada should not have to be concerned with the Prime Minister tainting the election proceedings through his appointment of returning officers. If it were not such a serious issue, one would think that such a scene could only come out of some British farce on television.

It is most interesting that Canada is viewed as being a world leader when emerging third world countries are setting up their own electoral systems. Of note is that Elections Canada always recommends against a patronage system such as the Canadian method. It is indeed unfortunate that the Prime Minister is not able to take a lesson from Elections Canada.

• (1310)

One other item I would like to bring to the attention of the House is the selection of election day based on the whim of the Prime Minister when it is politically expedient. The premise of doling out cash and other pre-election goodies is so blatant that everyone is fully able to see exactly what is going on. When the Prime Minister's chequebook comes out, patronage appointments flow and extra HRDC grants are approved and announced by ministers who just happen to be in the neighbourhood, we all know that something is up: the election is in the air.

I question the government, why not set a date for every four years that is fair for everyone? The government enjoys a distinct advantage in knowing when the election call will come. If we believe in a system of fairness as I believe Canadians do, then we must ensure that the system is transparent. Bill C-2 would have been an excellent opportunity for the government to show Canadians that, but it has failed Canadians miserably.

I could go on and on and speak about the way the government sent the bill to committee before second reading thus keeping it out of the public spotlight. I could mention that the committee did not allow any significant amendments. We could go further and discuss the fact that the act is biased toward those parties that have seats in the House, thus limiting the governance choices available to the public.

In closing, I wish to put the government on notice that the electorate of Canada will remember Bill C-2 as one more partisan

bill by the Liberal government. The electorate notes that the government will do anything in its power to retain its power. However the electorate also understands that through the retention of power by the Liberal government the electorate's choices are limited.

I indicated at the start of my speech that communication was a key part of the governance system. Unfortunately this government feels it is able to fertilize the rest of Canada with anything it sees fit and that Canada will flourish. I have news for the government. Canada is flourishing in spite of the action of this government. My heart aches when I consider what Canadians could achieve if they did not have to endure the millstone of the Liberal government around their necks.

For all those reasons, I am unable to support Bill C-2 in its current form.

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, to speak to Bill C-2 is both an honour and a privilege. At the same time there is a certain sadness associated with it because one would have thought that a democratically motivated government would bring to bear legislation that reflects a commitment to democratic principles.

I wish to address three points in my presentation this afternoon. The first has to do with patronage appointments to prime positions in the electoral system. The second is the requirements in the proposed act for registering a party to have full political status. The third is voter identification.

In my presentation I wish to recognize in a special way the contribution of the Reform Party critic on the committee in the preparation of this attack on the bill. He did a good job analysing the provisions of the act and also gave us a clear indication of what ought to be happening.

The government is able to get away with as much as it does partly because there is a certain element of disinterest or apathy among the people of Canada who are not taking the time to recognize what is really at stake. Patronage appointment of key election officials is part of the problem. I would like to get into this in considerable detail.

At the present time returning officers are political appointees of the governor in council. The governor in council is run by the Prime Minister. This is outrageous in what is supposed to be a non-partisan electoral organization. The voters of Canada should not have to put up with the Prime Minister appointing Liberal Party hacks to prime positions.

The Chief Electoral Officer said during the committee hearings that it is critical, and he underlined the word critical, that he or she be given the power to hire returning officers based on merit. He also said that he would ideally like to adopt the provisions contained in a private member's bill put forward by the Reform

Government Orders

Party critic which would eliminate patronage at Elections Canada at all levels, but that was ignored.

The province of Quebec to its credit already has a system of merit selection for its returning officers. There is no reason that Canada should persist with a system of patronage appointments.

• (1315)

Under questioning during question period the minister said that there was nothing wrong with the present system of patronage because appointments in six provinces use the same system and therefore it is right. Just because six provinces make the same mistake does not make the system right. Canadians would rather have a 100% non-partisan electoral system in the provinces and in Canada than a patronage system. When Elections Canada helps third world emerging nations to set up their electoral systems it always recommends against a patronage ridden system like we find in Canada.

I found it most interesting that in committee under questioning the Chief Electoral Officer made it clear that he would not recommend this elections act to a third world country or an emerging democracy. His exact words were:

Obviously when I go out on the international scene I do not recommend that the Canadian system be emulated where it comes to the appointment of returning officers. I clearly indicate, as I do in Canada, that the appointment of returning officers under the present system is an anachronism.

That came out of the mouth of the Chief Electoral Officer. If that is not an indictment of our system, what could be?

Elections Canada has repeatedly asked the government to release it from the system of patronage, but that has not happened. The Chief Electoral Officer also indicated that it was extremely difficult for him to get rid of incompetent returning officers because he had to convince the Prime Minister to dismiss the employee. The Prime Minister does not want to dump one of his party faithful so things have to be almost in a state of emergency before action is taken.

There are 301 constituencies and the Prime Minister is purported to know the qualifications and competencies of each one of those people. It is an insult to suggest to the people of Canada that they cannot choose or that the Chief Electoral Officer cannot choose people based on merit who could do the job of returning officer in the particular constituencies where they are needed.

The system of patronage allows the parties to appoint people into positions. Often the understanding is that these people donate their earnings to the party that appointed them. That is filled with all kinds of difficulties that deny the democratic process to operate.

Formal competitions for returning officer positions should definitely be open to all Canadians, not just to a chosen few. The assistant returning officers and poll clerks should also be selected

Government Orders

on the basis of ability, experience and impartiality. Those positions should be publicly advertised. The current system of political appointments is contrary to the notion of a non-partisan electoral system.

Opposition MPs on the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs supported the Reform position, but the Liberals opposed it, proving that the government's position is politically motivated and not democratically motivated.

We have a democracy based on a philosophy of fairness, a philosophy that says the people shall speak and this shall be government of the people by the people for the people. It is not by the Liberals for the Liberals and in their best interest. It is time we had a change in the electoral act to take care of that.

My second point has to do with the requirements for registered party status. In March an Ontario court struck down the sections of the Canada Elections Act which require a party to run 50 candidates in an election to remain on the register and to have its candidates listed with party affiliation on the ballot. The court indicated that two candidates should be sufficient to be recognized as a party.

In a fine compromise, the Reform Party critic suggested that we make it 12. The number 12 is consistent with the House rules for party status and therefore has some logic in its application. The number 50 is arbitrary and has no basis in logic. If the government had bothered to consult with the affected parties an acceptable compromise could have been reached, but that was not the case.

The people of Canada were not consulted with regard to the provisions of the act. They were not asked if this was what they wanted. The government just decided what it was going to do, whether or not it made sense and was consistent with democratic philosophy and democratic principles. Those things were ignored. It is simply there to give advantage to the ruling party in Canada.

• (1320)

The minister has said that changing the 50 candidate rule while the appeal was in process would probably be questionable both as an idea and perhaps even ethically. He was referring to the court decision and saying that while it was in process we should not deal with this matter.

The minister is saying it would be wrong to go along with the court ruling. Yet, when the court decided that possession of child pornography should be legal in B.C. the government said the opposite. The government said it would be wrong not to go along with the ruling until the appeal process was complete. This is gross inconsistency. What kind of government do we have?

At one point we have to move ahead because the court has ruled in a particular way and we have to go along with it. The next time we say we had better not do that while the court is still dealing with

the matter. What is going on here? Is it any wonder people are saying that we do not have a justice system in Canada, that we have a legal system. These are very serious problems. The minister also said in committee:

Obviously, given that I'm the minister who suggested to have such an appeal, I'm of the opinion that it works just swell the way it is.

If he thinks it is working well, no wonder he does not want any changes. He will not propose any changes.

I have only touched on two points and already the Chair has indicated that my time has run out. These are only two points in a major electoral act which will affect the way elections are run, the way parties are registered and the way voters will be identified as being eligible to vote.

Every Canadian should be reading this act and asking themselves if they are getting a legal position, a piece of legislation that guarantees democracy, or if they are getting legislation that continues to promote a dictatorship between elections.

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. 87 in Group No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): A recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 89, 91 and 95 to 99.

• (1325)

The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 90. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Government Orders

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour of the amendment 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): I declare the amendment carried.

(Amendment agreed to)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The next question is on Motion No. 90, as amended. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 90, as amended, agreed to)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 90, as amended, carried. The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 94.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I am looking at the grouping. We are told that the vote on Motion No. 90 applies to No. 94. We have just voted on Motion No. 90, so you do not need to call Motion No. 94, if I understand correctly.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We are dealing with the amendment to Motion No. 94 and not with the motion.

• (1330)

Motion No. 90 has been voted on separately. We will now proceed with the amendment to Motion No. 94 and then we will vote on Motion No. 94, as amended or as not amended, depending upon the outcome of the vote. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour of the amendment 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): I declare the amendment carried.

(Amendment agreed to)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The next question is on Motion No. 94, as amended. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

Some hon. members: On division.

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

(Motion No. 94, as amended, agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The question is on Motion No. 100. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on Motion No. 100 stands deferred.

The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 112, 115, 117, 119, 132 and 134.

• (1335)

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 102. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 105. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. To clarify the process, I have an amendment which I wanted to put with respect to Motion No. 113, which would be a consequential amendment to that motion. I have discussed this with the other parties, at least to introduce the amendment. I am wondering when I should do this. Should I do it now or at another time that would be in order?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): This is a good time. It is either now or not at all. However, because we are voting, and I know the hon. member has discussed this with the other parties, we will do this in two stages. We have not taken the vote on Motion No. 105. First, we are going to ask for the unanimous consent of the House to allow the member to present his amendment.

The hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre has asked for the unanimous consent of the House to move an amendment. Is there consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): I thank members of all political parties who have given to me their unanimous consent to amend Motion No. 113 in my name, which would in effect correct an oversight pertaining to the disclosure of political contributions. I move:

That Bill C-2, in Clause 359, be amended by adding after line 17, page 149 the following:

“(b.1) in the case of a numbered company that is a contributor referred to in paragraph (b), the name of the chief executive officer or president of that company”

Basically what it does is apply Motions Nos. 113, 114, 116, 118 and others to the criteria respecting third party political contributions and disclosure thereof.

• (1340)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The House has given unanimous consent for the member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre to propose the amendment to his motion. The amendment will go to the table and the Speaker will report to the House as to whether it is in order.

Although it has been proposed and it is on the table, and the votes will proceed, it is not necessarily the case that the amendment will be in order. That still has to be determined.

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there are actually three consequential amendments. I have two more which I did not read into the record. Therefore, I move:

That Bill C-2, in Clause 359, be amended by replacing lines 39 and 40 on page 149 with the following:

“ferred to in paragraph (4)(a), it must list subject to paragraph (b.1) the names and addresses of every contributor who donated a”

[Translation]

The third amendment reads as follows:

That Bill C-2, in Clause 359, be amended by replacing line 15, page 149 with the following:

“ferred to in paragraph (a), subject to paragraph (b.1), their”

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It is a good thing that the House is in good humour because I distinctly remember the hon. member mentioning one amendment, not three.

All three of them will be taken under advisement.

Mr. Ken Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise to seek clarification. I ask the member whether this also applies to businesses which are operated in the name of unions?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): That sounds an awful lot like debate to me. The hon. member for Elk Island will have the opportunity to either accept or reject it, but we will not get into debate on it.

[Translation]

Mr. René Laurin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I realize that the interpreters, who did not get the text of the amendment in French or English, have not translated.

If we are to know the content of these amendments before we vote on them, it would be important to have the text.

Government Orders

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Joliette has raised a pertinent point. We have the proposed amendment in French at the table. For any members who wish to see the amendments, they will be deposited in both languages at the table. Before the final vote is taken it is appropriate that people know what they are voting on.

The question is on Motion No. 105. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The 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.

Some hon. members: On division.

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

(Motion No. 105 negatived)

[Translation]

Mr. René Laurin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. You called the yeas and the nays and indicated that the nays had it by indicating those who voted to your right. To your right were yeas, and not nays. I believe this has misled the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I said that, in my opinion, the nays had it. The nays were on this side, the yeas on that. There were more nays than yeas, in my opinion.

• (1345)

[English]

We will do this again. If members want a recorded division, we will do it again.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It is the Chair's discretion if the Chair wishes to be insulted or not. There is no one in the House with the ability to insult me unless I want to be insulted.

We will go back to do the vote again to ensure that we have the wish of the House and that people clearly understand.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

Some hon. members: On division.

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

(Motion No. 105 negatived)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The next question is on Motion No. 109. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 111.

Mr. Ted White: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sorry to do this to you again, Mr. Speaker, but because of the noise I did not hear the motion number and I need to keep track of those things.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It is Motion No. 111. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The point was made that if I do not hear no when I ask for the vote, then I am obligated to say that it is carried. However, if I am speaking in my first language which is English, and I know I am speaking through translation to other members whose first language is French, then I must do two things. I must be assured that the people to whom I am speaking in the other language understand the nature of the question and have time to respond. That is why it is appropriate to make sure that it is done right.

• (1350)

The next question is on Motion No. 122. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 123. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on the amendment stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 128. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 129. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on Motion No. 129 stands deferred.

• (1355)

The next question is on Motion No. 139. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

*S. O. 31**[English]*

The recorded division on Motion No. 139 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 140 and 141.

This is an appropriate time to make the transition to Standing Order 31 statements.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the member representing Waterloo—Wellington, a riding with over 30% of its economy rooted in agriculture and agri-food, and having been born and raised and still living on the family farm, I am especially proud of our Canadian food producers.

Our farmers and food producers have contributed greatly to our high standard of living by providing Canadians with food of excellent quality and value.

Thanks to the efforts of our agricultural community the average Canadian family spends only 9.8% of its income on food, much less than its American, British, French and Mexican counterparts who can spend up to 50% of their income on food.

Incredibly, Canadian families earned enough between January 1 and February 7 to pay for an entire year's worth of groceries.

The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD, has recognized the outstanding job of our agricultural community and so should all of us. Our farmers and food producers deserve our encouragement, appreciation and heartfelt thanks for helping make Canada the best place in the world in which to live.

* * *

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, did you know that we have a Pulitzer prize contender in the federal government? The commissioner of Correctional Service Canada, Ole Ingstrup, co-authored a how-to management book in August 1998. To date the book has sold a whopping 2,300 copies.

On the heels of the HRDC scandal, the solicitor general might find that he is the next minister in line to explain his actions. It was discovered recently that Ole's own department purchased 32% of those copies at a total cost to the taxpayer of \$22,500.

This week's lesson for the solicitor general is to learn from his colleague's mistakes. He and only he will be held accountable for spending taxpayers' money to purchase a how-to book for the commissioner's own department. That sounds a little like double dipping to me.

A word of caution, Mr. Speaker. Do not get in the wrong line. You might find yourself standing behind the 14 convicted criminals waiting for their taxpayer funded sex change operations.

* * *

[Translation]

MOUVEMENT DES JARDINS

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last weekend, the Mouvement des caisses Desjardins elected a new president, Alban D'Amours. Mr. D'Amours will officially take up his new duties on March 25.

When the Mouvement des caisses Desjardins was first formed, globalization and free trade were unheard of. Modernizing this financial institution has required skill and imagination.

Caisses Desjardins are an economic force in Quebec. Many regions in Quebec owe their development in part to this institution. It gave them access to credit denied them by other major financial institutions.

We therefore wish Mr. D'Amours good luck in his new position and the best of success in achieving the objectives of the Mouvement des caisses Desjardins.

* * *

[English]

HERITAGE DAY

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a nation we have a distinct and colourful history. During yesterday's Heritage Day and all throughout this week Canadians have the opportunity to rediscover the people, places and events that have shaped this country.

Heritage Kitchener has been working extremely hard to prepare a wide range of activities for the residents of the Kitchener—Waterloo community.

● (1400)

As part of this year's theme, Our Farming Heritage, a display highlighting rural designated heritage properties has been set up at Kitchener city hall. Local residents have been invited to bring in old photos of buildings and landscapes to be copied and placed in the city's archives.

Josef Schneider House is hosting a heritage multimedia project from local schools as part of a national initiative celebrating local history. That will be followed up by a National Heritage Fair in Ottawa this July.

S. O. 31

This Saturday a bus tour, entitled Rural Routes, will take place and participants will be treated to Kitchener—Waterloo's pioneer farmsteads and scenic roads.

I congratulate the region which decided once again to utilize the 1878 Governor's House and the 1852—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Lethbridge.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the action for struggling agriculture producers was launched by the official opposition late last year after Liberal, NDP and PC members of the standing committee on agriculture refused to support a Reform motion to travel across Canada to areas hit hard by the farm income crisis.

Since then, Reform MPs have held over 60 action meetings in five provinces, meeting with over 3,500 farmers, listening to their concerns and promising to take their messages back to Ottawa.

The message is loud and clear: 71% of farmers say that they want the freedom to make their own marketing decisions; 96% say that taxes and user fees imposed by the government are too high; and, a staggering 94% of farmers say that the government's AIDA program is a failure.

The facts speak for themselves. The government held nine meetings in three provinces. The official opposition has held over 60 meetings in five provinces and counting. Is there any doubt who speaks for farmers in this country.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN ECONOMY

Mr. Réginald Bélair (Timmins—James Bay, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Friday, Statistics Canada released an interesting snapshot of the Canadian economy.

It showed that Canada's annual balance of trade with other countries had reached \$34 billion in 1999, the highest level since 1996, and that exports had grown almost twice as fast as imports.

In 1999, Canada exported goods worth \$360 billion, an 11.9% increase over 1998. The results are encouraging, in part because conditions conducive to investment have been put in place.

The public has given us a clear mandate to improve its quality of life. We are sparing no effort to attain that objective.

[English]

GIRL GUIDES OF CANADA

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Girl Guides of Canada are proud to announce the debut of their first flag in this their 90th year of service.

The Girl Guides of Canada, Guides du Canada, is a movement for girls led by women. It challenges girls to reach their potential and empowers them to give leadership and services as responsible citizens around the world.

In Canada there are over 167,000 members between the ages of 5 and 17. In Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford the Maple Leaf and Champlain Divisions comprise many age groups. The Girl Guide movement is a non-discriminatory, worldwide organization with 10 million members.

I ask the House to join me and the Girl Guides immediately after question period in the Hall of Honour to celebrate the dedication of their special flag to the people of Canada.

* * *

SIMCOE—GREY

Mr. Paul Bonwick (Simcoe—Grey, Lib.): Good news, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make the House aware of a recent event in my riding of Simcoe—Grey. Namely, the announcement that the premiere four season resort developer in Canada, the Intrawest Corporation, has entered into a half billion dollar partnership with Blue Mountain Resorts.

Intrawest is truly an incredible Canadian corporate citizen. It is a company that makes peoples' dreams become reality. Couple this with Blue Mountain Resorts, a family owned business that has for over five decades been the premiere resort destination spot in Ontario. Its staff has a reputation that has consistently exceeded customer expectation.

Now imagine all this located on the south shore of Georgian Bay with the Niagara escarpment as a backdrop. Host to this incredible development is the best kept secret in Canada, the beautiful town of Blue Mountains located a few minutes west of Collingwood.

Mr. Speaker, to you, to the Prime Minister and to all members of the House, I extend an invitation to visit the most exciting place in Canada, Blue Mountain Resorts.

• (1405)

IRAN

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Reform Party of Canada I rise today to express our congratulations and encouragement to the people of Iran in light of their recent election.

The Iranian people have spoken. They have told the world that they are willing to seize an opportunity and institute structural democratic reform within their borders. The people of Iran are now looking forward. Although there are strong elements of the old guard within their government, the new reformers are committed to peace and stability.

This is an encouraging sign that the world must not ignore. Canada should support the Iranian government and its people in their move toward increasing tolerance. The new government has expressed strong support for basic human rights and an encouraging positive sign toward liberalizing its country.

On behalf of the Reform Party, I encourage Mr. Khatami and the new government of Iran to pursue their stated course. I urge our government to keep the diplomatic door open and help bring about democracy and freedom in Iran.

* * *

[Translation]

PILON LIMITÉE

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Pilon Limitée reopened in Hull.

Last week's announcement by Pilon Limitée of its intention to close its doors created a considerable stir. Messages of support were forthcoming from all sides. After 100 years, it was impossible to imagine this company closing.

This reversal of the decision is a relief to all the people in the Outaouais region, contractors, PAL dealers and customers. Pilon Limitée is a profitable company backed by a long reputation for quality and good service. Seventy jobs were at stake. Some of the employees had been with the company for as many as 55 years.

The good faith on both sides, union and management, the urgency to take action, and the issues at stake have overcome the labour conflict, which had gone on for several months.

The closing of this hundred year-old business was avoided by a hair's breadth. This goes to show that, with a bit of good will, anything is possible.

As the member for Hull—Aylmer, I wish to congratulate both parties on having found a common ground, thus saving—

S. O. 31

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

* * *

MOUVEMENT DES JARDINS

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to draw attention to the election of Alban D'Amours as the head of the Mouvement des caisses populaires Desjardins, succeeding Claude Béland, who had held that position since 1987.

Mr. D'Amours has been on the executive of the Mouvement Desjardins for 12 years. He was a Quebec public servant, holding the positions of Deputy Minister of Revenue and Associate Deputy Minister of Energy. He also taught at the University of Minnesota and the University of Sherbrooke, where he was involved in the creation of the Institut de recherche sur les coopératives.

The Mouvement des caisses populaires Desjardins is the top financial institution in Quebec and the sixth in Canada. Co-operatives educate. Co-operatives develop. Co-operatives democratize. Co-operatives create solidarity.

Congratulations Mr. D'Amours.

* * *

[English]

REVENUE CANADA

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, if a working person owes Revenue Canada \$100 it will hound the person to the ends of the earth to make him or her pay up. Yet, when the Bronfman family moved \$2.2 billion out of the country without paying a nickel in capital gains tax, the federal government did not seem interested. It has not lifted a finger to try to collect as much as \$750 million in back taxes that this wealthy family avoided paying, and time is running out. If it does not act soon it will not be able to collect at all.

Thank goodness a private citizen from Winnipeg, George Harris, is taking this matter to court. George speaks for all Canadians when he argues that we could all pay a little less taxes if the extremely wealthy paid their fair share.

Why is the government not trying to collect those taxes from the Bronfman family? Why is it spending a fortune in legal fees trying to make sure that this case is never heard in court?

Best wishes to Winnipegger George Harris in federal court on March 9. George is fighting a fight for tax fairness for all of us.

S. O. 31

BURNS BOG

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, Burns Bog is 10,000 acres of unique wetland in the heart of Vancouver's Delta. This 5,000 year old living laboratory is probably the most environmentally contentious area in the province.

Protecting this site is important to Canadians, yet the land is under constant urban development. With global warming we need to protect every bit of stored carbon. While peatlands, such as Burns Bog, cover half the area of tropical rain forests, they are capable of storing three and a half times more carbon.

Burns Bog is also crucial to the Fraser River. The bog acts as a filter for freshwater flowing to the mouth of the largest salmon-bearing waterway in the world.

The Minister of the Environment must do more than pay lip service to the Ramsar convention on the protection of wetlands.

I urge the environment minister to, at the least, visit the site, talk to the concerned citizens and appreciate firsthand how important it is. With the minister's support, stakeholders, like the Burns Bog Conservation Society, can successfully negotiate an end to this looming environmental tragedy.

* * *

• (1410)

EDUCATION

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Statistics Canada confirms Canada as a world leader in education.

Among OECD members, Canada had the highest percentage of population with post-secondary education in 1995. Canada's rate was 48%, much higher than the OECD average of 23%.

Canada also excels at the primary and secondary levels. As an example, Canadian students in grade eight placed well above the international average in both mathematics and science.

This level of success could not be achieved without the government's commitment to education. Per student expenditures on education in Canada, in the report, were \$6,396, far above the OECD average of \$4,717. Canada spent 7% of GDP on education, the highest among G-7 countries; higher than the OECD average of 5.6% and higher than the United States at 6.7%.

It is gratifying to see the results of this government's commitment to education.

* * *

[Translation]

BILL C-20

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the heavy-handed and ill-advised Bill C-20 perpetuates the confronta-

tion between Ottawa and Quebec City and establishes a veritable trusteeship for Quebec. It was in such clear terms that Claude Ryan, the former leader of the Liberal Party in Quebec, former head of the No camp during the 1980 referendum and avowed federalist, commented on Bill C-20 yesterday.

Mr. Ryan added furthermore that, by wanting to make parliament the arbiter of clarity in the referendum question and result, contrary to the prerogatives of the National Assembly, the Liberal government was contravening the very principles of democracy. The decision must be made by the National Assembly, and, once made, it must be implemented without interference.

This call joins the long list of democrats demanding the withdrawal of Bill C-20.

Like Mr. Ryan, we repeat the message to the government: Have faith in Quebec democracy.

* * *

[English]

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, sadly, again I want to bring to the attention of the House the deplorable situation of hepatitis C victims.

First, the government willfully chose to only acknowledge victims of hep C who fell into an arbitrary window of 1986 to 1990. It ignored the Krever inquiry recommendation that all blood injured people be compensated promptly and adequately.

In fact, over the past two years of negotiating the victims have received absolutely nothing, only their lawyers. Meanwhile the suffering continues.

The question of how children will be compensated in the future remains unanswered. Unfortunately, there will be many children who will meet the current criteria but who have not yet tested positive. Lawyers have said "don't worry", but hep C sufferers and their families find little comfort in this.

Questions have also been raised regarding the accuracy of blood tracebacks. With Red Cross records prior to 1980 destroyed, how on earth are people able to get accurate records?

Furthermore, there are many unanswered questions surrounding the use of prison blood from both Canada and the U.S. in our blood supply system.

The health minister needs to be fully accountable for his government's actions. When is he going—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

*Oral Questions***HEALTH CARE**

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the clouds over Canada's treasured health care system are getting darker.

Yesterday the Prime Minister tried to pretend that Liberal cuts to transfers have been fully restored. To quote from the Prime Minister himself, his words have no relation to reality. The truth is that the Liberal government still has not put back over \$4 billion it took out of health care in 1995.

The result: two-tier Americanized health care continues to get a foothold in this country. Just look at Alberta where the truth squads are out using public funds to explain why public health care should be dismantled, and still the federal government stays silent.

As Alberta has said "silence means acceptance". Canadians are saying to the government "Break the silence, find some backbone, contain the privatization virus before it contaminates health care across the country".

With days to go before the federal budget, the government must act and must act now. It has one choice and perhaps only one chance: to put back all the money it took from health care in 1995. Take back Canada's public health care system.

* * *

ST. JOHN'S WEST

Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC): Mr. Speaker, the people of St. John's West need a member of parliament to represent them in the House. Why is the Prime Minister dragging his heels on calling the byelection. Is it the Prime Minister's intention to leave this seat vacant until such time as he calls the federal general election? Perhaps the Prime Minister is having a problem getting a candidate for his party.

Whatever the reason, the Prime Minister was certainly very eager to create a vacancy in St. John's West. Prime Minister, we now have our vacancy, where is our byelection?

* * *

● (1415)

ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT

Mr. Hec Clouthier (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.):

That day of battle in the dusty heat
We lay and heard the bullets swish and sing
Like scythes amid the over-ripened wheat,
And we the harvest of their garnering.

Mr. Speaker, John McRae wrote those words 100 years ago to commemorate the brave Canadian soldiers who fought in the Battle of Paardeberg on February 27, 1900. The Boer War was Canada's

first overseas mission and the Royal Canadian Regiment became our first war heroes. At 2.15 a.m., under clear starlight and dead silence, six RCR companies crept toward the Boer trenches. Suddenly a shot was fired and the Canadians were swept by murderous fire. But we did not retreat and by dawn we had captured over 4,000 Boers.

This Saturday evening at 7 p.m., Hamilton's ONTV will broadcast *We Stand on Guard*, celebrating the 100th anniversary of the heroic Royal Canadian Regiment. Let us watch and learn more about our proud military history.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the HRD minister unveiled yet another showcase of shame. The latest blizzard of paper had thousands of pages of the Liberals' sanitized shopping list. It turns out that some of those Liberal votes are fairly expensive. At least \$1 billion out of that was bungled. It is not exactly a real deal and a bargain for Canadians.

She can roll her eyes, but I would like to ask either her or the fellow in charge of it all, if they had to do it all over again, would they again endorse such a billion dollar boondoggle?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member go ask all of the people who have received grants, which have created jobs in all of the communities of Canada, if they agree or do not agree.

The reality is that through all of the programs of this government we have managed to reduce the level of unemployment from 11.5% to 6.8%, the lowest in 25 years, and 1.9 million jobs have been created in this country since we formed the government.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if this government had lowered taxes substantially we would see a lot better unemployment rate.

The HRD minister and the Prime Minister make a great couple. Not since Imelda Marcos have we seen anyone with such a nose for a bargain than the Prime Minister. This couple is spending other people's money.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Miss Deborah Grey: Let us look at the list that the Prime Minister talks about—

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Edmonton North.

Oral Questions

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister forgot to mention the \$12 million lost on 51 companies that went belly up. They went bankrupt, so I would like to ask, in what way is spending 12 million irretrievable dollars such a great bargain for Canadian taxpayers?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we deal with the private sector—and they are supposed to be the advocates of the private sector—we know, for example, that the banks lose more than 1% of the money they loan to small and medium size enterprises every year. Of course, in a market economy some people fail. But what is good about Canada is that so many are successful that we have a lot of prosperity in Canada today.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): That is right, Mr. Speaker, but the banks are in the business of banking and it is not taxpayers' money which they are responsible for. This government is responsible for the taxpayer.

Let me say it again: \$12 million was lost. It went into thin air on 51 companies that went belly up. Those grants were supposed to create more than 2,800 long term jobs. Do you know what the answer is, Mr. Speaker? They created exactly zero sustainable, permanent jobs.

For what reason, other than vote buying, could this government waste so many millions of dollars?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member knew a bit about business she would know that when banks lose money, for every million dollars they lose, we lose half of that in taxes. When they make a profit we are happy because we collect half of it in taxes.

If I recall, an economy where there is no failure is called the communist system. I do not think the hon. member is in favour of that.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting to see what Canadians make out of that bit of logic.

• (1420)

Yesterday the government released thousands of pages listing cheques written by the human resources minister. It shows that the Liberals are very good at handing out other people's money. But the minister failed to provide any evidence about how she managed the billions a year she was shovelling out the door.

When will she give Canadians full evidence showing what they got for all that money?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we issued exactly what the members of parliament on the standing committee asked for. They

wanted to know what the grants and contributions were that went to the ridings.

But the hon. member asked about external evaluations. We do them.

Let me point to the 1998 Ekos Research Associates' evaluation on the transitional jobs fund, which said that an estimated 30,000 jobs were created and 80% of the jobs created were permanent, year-round jobs.

Let us look at the 1998 PricewaterhouseCoopers' evaluation of EI active measures, which said that for 1997-98 120,000 unemployed Canadians—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary—Nose Hill.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, what I asked the minister for 10 days ago was how much of the billions she spent which was not supported by proper documentation, which was misused or which was paid out before project information was in place.

She has never answered that question. She cannot tell us what the money was really used for.

Is it not true that the Liberals' so-called job creation numbers are just pulled out of thin air?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me say again that this money went to community organizations and individuals in ridings right across the country.

If the hon. member wants to talk about value for money, perhaps she would take the time to visit some of these investments in her own riding. We know that Gina Cameron, the program co-ordinator for the Beddington Heights Community Association, said that this member has not been in their doors. She has no concept of what goes on there. Perhaps she could do that to see how well our money is being invested.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in her desperate attempts to manage the crisis in her department, the Minister of Human Resources Development has flooded the department's Internet site with a list of projects from the transitional jobs fund.

What we fail to understand, because we refuse to believe that the minister is trying to hide the truth—this cannot be what she is trying to do—is why, in the list she is so proud of, the dates on which grants were paid out have suddenly disappeared.

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me clarify: payments did not

disappear. Payments are found in the organizations and with individuals in this member's riding and in the ridings of many others.

What we showed yesterday was exactly where the \$1 billion is to be found. These investments are making differences in the lives of Canadians in the province of Quebec and in every other province and territory of this country.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as the minister said, let me clarify. Either the minister does not understand the questions, or else she does not want to answer them.

I clearly asked her why the dates on which grants were paid out, which were indicated in the previous documents, had suddenly disappeared in the documents presented to us. The reason is because there was a problem with these dates. In some cases, the grants had been paid out two years before they were approved.

I am not asking the minister to tell us the story of her life. I am asking a simple question. Can she answer that question? Why are the dates on which the grants were paid out no longer shown in these documents? Is the question not clear enough?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the information that we have provided gives considerable data on all of the projects that are available.

One of the important pieces of the undertaking is also to provide an opportunity for individual members of parliament who want more information on individual projects to make a request, and that information will be provided to them in writing.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, before the scandal on the management of grants at Human Resources Development Canada hit the fan, there was never any mention of "pockets of poverty" as a criterion for the transitional jobs fund.

Can the minister tell us when "pockets of poverty" were introduced as a criterion for transitional jobs fund projects?

• (1425)

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a matter of public policy we included flexibility in the transitional jobs fund. From our point of view it was extraordinarily important for local managers to have the opportunity to respond to local needs.

Oral Questions

This has always been part of the program. The hon. member may have wanted us to pick a one size fits all strategy, to have Ottawa make all the decisions, but that was not the approach we took.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, what is the minister waiting for to release the document identifying the criteria she used and to tell the House when she introduced them?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, details were provided yesterday to the hon. member and to others about how the transitional jobs fund works.

I quote from a 1996 brochure, which, in answer to the question "Who Can Participate?", says:

To participate in (the transitional jobs fund) projects, individuals must be facing labour market difficulties as a result of high unemployment in their area.

It was very broad because the program was flexible to allow communities to respond to their local needs.

* * *

CANADA HEALTH AND SOCIAL TRANSFER

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. When the Liberals took office in 1993 health and social transfers to the provinces were \$19 billion. Today those transfers are \$14.5 billion, and yet the Prime Minister stood in the House yesterday and claimed that the federal government has "restored the level of transfers to the provinces to the level it was in 1993-94".

How could the Prime Minister stand in the House and state something that is so wildly inaccurate?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member should check her files. She will understand that when we established the transfer payments in the 1970s it was clearly defined that the transfer of money was to be twofold: some had to be in tax points, some had to be in cash.

The tax points have been tailored to the needs of different provinces because the tax points do not produce exactly the same amount of money in every province. The tax points are constantly adjusted to make sure that the transfer is adequate and that is why we have—

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

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, how can the Prime Minister be so out of touch? He must understand that the tax points argument does not cut it.

Oral Questions

One of his Liberal premiers, in fact the only Liberal premier still standing in the country, stated recently that Canadians are becoming fed up, frustrated and frightened by what is happening to health care.

Tell the patients crammed into emergency rooms that everything is fine. Tell the patients lined up on waiting lists that everything is fine.

When will the government once again become a full partner in health care?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we formed the government in 1993-94 transfers to the provinces, including cash, tax points and equalization payments, were \$37.4 billion. In 1999-2000 they are \$38.5 billion

That is the reality. These are the figures used by all of the ministers of finance. We are paying more today than in 1993-94.

* * *

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

There are grave concerns across the country about the allocation formula that is in place for the new 21st century research chairs to be included in next week's budget.

In the formula, only 2% or 40 of the 2,000 chairs will be allocated to the Atlantic region. Will the Prime Minister assure the House that these much needed chairs will be distributed in a fair and even manner so as not to further disadvantage small and medium size universities in Canada?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we intend to do.

* * *

• (1430)

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, today the Prime Minister told truckers that the solution to their problems was to raise their rates for goods. This is the same Prime Minister who told Canadians if they did not like paying high taxes, they should just move.

Clearly the Prime Minister does not understand the impact his simplistic responses has on the cost to consumers. Did the Prime Minister consult with his finance minister before he came up with that one?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very evident that the hon. member is really confused. I did not understand what he meant at all.

I keep repeating to the Canadian people that here in Canada the government has provided a situation that when the Tories left there

was a \$42 billion deficit and now we have a balanced budget. When the Tories left, unemployment was at 11.5% and now it is at 6.8%. I could go on and on and I know why the Canadian—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Medicine Hat.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we always hear so many new and different stories from the human resources minister. Over the last several days we have heard many times that she delegated authority for approval of grants in her riding to her own deputy minister. But yesterday she told the House and the leader of the Bloc that really she did not have to do that, that there was no requirement to delegate that.

Which is it? She says on one day that she delegated that authority but now she is telling the leader of the Bloc that she does not have to do that. Which story is it?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my response is consistent. Yes indeed, I did not have to delegate that authority but I did.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, that would be a great new story again except for the fact that according to the terms and conditions she cannot delegate that authority. It is not for her to do that. Maybe that will come as a surprise to someone who thinks that the money is her personal money to throw around. She should learn after blowing \$1 billion on this boondoggle that Canadians will not accept that type of attitude.

Given that the terms and conditions do not allow the minister to delegate that, how could she tell the leader of the Bloc yesterday that in fact that is the case when the terms and conditions make it very clear she does not—

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

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me try again.

It was not necessary for me to delegate the authority. I did delegate the authority. Of course as minister I remain accountable for all the things that happen in my department. In this particular case the proof is in the pudding. I have not approved any programs or projects in my riding.

[Translation]

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development was very self-assured as she tabled her department's documents in an attempt to limit the damage caused by the Human Resources Development Canada grants scandal.

Oral Questions

How does the minister explain that the first list obtained from her department through access to information showed \$20 million in funds received in the riding of Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, while the new list shows \$25 million?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find the question very strange because the hon. member herself is on the standing committee for human resources development that asked for this information which we provided yesterday.

With particular reference to Anjou, let me say that this is one of the largest industrial parks in Quebec. By making wise investments in that riding we found spinoff opportunities for many constituencies around that area.

[Translation]

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. The figures provided by her department to access to information with respect to funds distributed differ from the documents received yesterday by \$5 million. That is the problem.

I ask the minister whether her cover-up operations have not discredited both access to information and her department because now we believe neither.

• (1435)

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not clear what the question was but let me try to explain again. In the information we provided, approved amounts and approval dates were on the list. If the hon. member is interested in actual expenditures, she can turn to the estimates of my department.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister of Human Resources Development tried to dodge responsibility for approving grants to her own riding. She said that she delegated that authority to her deputy minister. When we showed her access documents which proved that she did not delegate that authority, she said a letter would prove otherwise. It did not.

Yesterday the minister told us that the authority was delegated according to Treasury Board guidelines and 10 minutes later she said there were no guidelines. Which is it?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will try it again. Treasury Board allows me to delegate these authorities to my deputy and I did that. It was not necessary that I do that. I chose to do it.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify this. Yesterday the member for Edmonton

North asked a question to which the minister responded “in accordance with Treasury Board guidelines, it was the deputy minister who approved Canada jobs fund money in the riding of Brant in November”. Then to a question from the leader of the Bloc she responded “there is no requirement to undertake this, to create this delegation of authority”.

The minister’s credibility is on the line. Will the minister table the legal instrument used to delegate approval authority to her deputy minister?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in my view the right thing to do was to delegate the authority for approval of projects in my riding. Is the hon. member saying that he does not think this was the appropriate thing to do?

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Minister of Human Resources Development why her predecessor had not signed a letter similar to hers delegating signing authority to the deputy minister. She did not answer me.

I am therefore asking the same question of the minister today. Can she explain to us why her predecessor did not sign such a letter?

The Speaker: The question as put is somewhat ambiguous—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the minister can know a fact, but I do not think she can know a reason. If the minister wishes to respond, she may.

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as minister I am responsible for the decisions made in my riding. It was my choice to delegate the authority for approval for Canada jobs funds in my riding to the deputy. It is not necessary that that be done.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, by her reply, is the minister implying that her predecessor did not sign such a letter?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will respond again. As minister I am responsible for the decisions that are made but I felt it appropriate to delegate the authority to my deputy in this particular regard.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, apart from putting up the occasional Liberal caucus meeting, hotels in the Prime Minister’s riding are more in

Oral Questions

the government grant racket than in the accommodation business. Take the Hôtel du Boisé. It received \$300,000 but no investments were made and no jobs were created.

• (1440)

Is the Prime Minister so unaware of normal business practices, like providing services and sales, that he thinks that \$300,000 was a good investment for Canadian taxpayers?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear here. The hon. members opposite can play politics and pick and choose on individual projects. They can undermine—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order. We have heard the question. I am sure all hon. members would like to hear the answer. The hon. Minister of Human Resources Development.

Hon. Jane Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that of the well over 1,000 projects that were part of the transitional jobs fund in the Prime Minister's riding, in my riding and the riding of members of parliament across the country, people are working that would not have had the opportunity otherwise.

That party suggests that everybody can do it on their own, but we do not feel that way. We believe there is a role for the Government of Canada to play in helping areas of high unemployment define opportunities, to encourage diversity in their economies, to provide opportunities for people.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we could talk about lists, but I have a list here of companies that went bankrupt, \$900,000, \$260,000, \$920,000, none of them providing any jobs.

One example is New Source Bottling run by a good Liberal from Kenora that created only 7 out of 18 jobs that it was supposed to be providing. It went belly up after it got \$200,000. The list that I read from goes on and on and on.

In what way is pouring good money down the drain—

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

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member and the hon. member for Edmonton North talk about \$12 million that did not result in sustainable jobs.

We are talking about a program of \$300 million that leveraged \$2.7 billion, that helped create 30,000 jobs for men and women who did not have opportunities in areas where there was no hope. From our point of view, it is the responsibility of the Government of Canada to provide hope, to provide opportunities. In this particular case, we have done that.

[Translation]

AUDIOVISUAL PRODUCTIONS

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the heritage minister, who described as gratuitous allegations the revelations by the Bloc Québécois in the matter of film and television productions, will have to admit she was wrong and face the music.

Now that CINAR itself acknowledges that the Bloc's revelations were founded, should we see operation CINAR as a new tactic by the Liberal Party to protect its friends, as we saw in the Corbeil affair, that is, when they get caught, they acknowledge their error, pay the fine and bury the whole thing?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I said that the member's allegations were important enough that, the very day he made them here in the House, I called for an RCMP investigation, which is continuing.

* * *

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Yesterday Beijing issued a statement in which it threatened that it would resort to all possible drastic measures, including war, if Taiwan refused to set a date to start negotiating a return to communist control. In view of the seriousness of this threat, can the Minister of Foreign Affairs advise the House of Canada's response to the escalation of tensions by mainland China?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question.

We have long urged both Beijing and Taipei to settle their differences through negotiation by peaceful means. We believe that in the present circumstances, the resumption of negotiations is absolutely imperative to reduce any threat of destabilization in the area. We will certainly bring this point of view once again to the attention of Chinese authorities.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the shopping list that the human resources development minister provided yesterday tells us about the government's targets but it says nothing about what actually happened. That is because the government does not know what actually happened. The assistant deputy minister confirmed this yesterday.

Oral Questions

Why does the human resources minister care so little about taxpayers' money that she does not bother to track it?

• (1445)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will take the floor because I want to use the occasion to prove how carefully members of the opposition are looking into this file.

In the case of Hôtel du Boisé in my riding, the project was withdrawn and no money was given to the project. They should do their homework before getting up in the House of Commons.

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we received 10,000 pages of job creation lists but no tracking information or follow-up details. My question is for the minister. Were these actually job creation lists or where they actually creative job lists?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, they were lists of programs in the ridings of every member of the House. I ask the hon. member to take the time to read his list to see where investments are being made and to understand the people who are being helped.

They go from project to project. They cast aspersions and make politics. What they forget is that these projects are focused on people, on individuals. Very often no one else will help those who are unemployed, who do not have the education or who do not have the diversity of opportunity in their community other than the Government of Canada. We are there to help.

* * *

GASOLINE PRICING

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, soaring energy prices are badly hurting Canadian truckers, agricultural producers and consumers. When they turn to their government for some action, for some help and even some understanding, what do they get? The industry minister says let the provinces do it. He passes the buck. The junior finance minister says not to blame his fuel taxes. The Prime Minister says there is nothing we can do.

Why is it that the U.S. energy secretary can find 17 things to do to help Americans, but the Prime Minister cannot think of one thing to help Canadians?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we should recognize that when the NDP government was in power in Ontario it raised the Ontario excise tax on fuel twice, taking it from 10.9 cents to 14.3 cents. As well, it increased the provincial excise tax on gasoline

twice, taking it from 11.3 cents to 14.7 cents. I do not think we need to take any lessons from the NDP on excise taxes on fuel.

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that a cartel of oil producing countries, designed to fix and maintain the price of an essential commodity like energy, is being held up by the minister and the government as a shining example of competition in the marketplace. Either energy costs will be passed on to consumers or truckers will go bankrupt. Either way it hurts the Canadian economy.

Again my question is for the Prime Minister. What is the Liberal action plan to protect Canadians and the economy from soaring energy prices and the international OPEC cartel?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just to set the record clear, the hon. gentleman should know that Canada is not a member of OPEC and we do not support that approach to the marketplace.

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Mr. Speaker, over the last year diesel fuel prices have doubled. As a result some truckers have been forced to leave their trucks at home and some are protesting up and down the highways of Canada. Meanwhile, the department has increased the tax on diesel fuel to over a \$100 million increase per year.

• (1450)

Will the minister reverse some of the \$100 million tax increase per year that has been applied to the trucking industry? Will he reduce it so the pressure being experienced by the truckers can be alleviated?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here we have the Tories calling upon the government to reduce the excise tax on fuels. Let us just look at what they did when they were in office. Between 1983-84 and 1993 they raised the excise tax on gasoline not once, not twice but six times. They not only introduced the excise tax on diesel fuel but they then raised it twice.

That party was in power for nine years and raised the excise tax on fuels nine times. Would it be out of order to call it hypocritical when it calls for a tax cut like that?

The Speaker: In answer to your question, yes.

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Mr. Speaker, there is no fuel like an old fuel, but anyway I want to point out that the minister is trying to go back a decade. He is responsible. That party is responsible today. In the last five years—

The Speaker: Order, please. Dismiss the first part and you can go on.

Oral Questions

Mr. Bill Casey: Mr. Speaker, the government has increased fuel taxes by in excess of \$900 million a year over the last five years. That government has done it, and I am asking it to reduce the increase a little so the trucking industry can survive, so that people can pay their wages and pay for their groceries.

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is so anxious to see us cut the excise taxes on fuels then why did his party's finance critic in its prebudget tax plan not call for cuts to the fuel taxes? Is it because he is spent fuel?

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Fanshawe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Recently there have been concerns about the health of Canadian forces members who may have been exposed to depleted uranium.

Would the minister explain to the House why the government has now made a decision to offer independent tests to current and former CF members who may want to avail themselves of such tests?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have offered independent testing for those who may be affected by depleted uranium, those troops who served in overseas missions, because we want to get to the truth of the matter. We want to know if their health is being affected by any exposure to depleted uranium. First and foremost we will look after the health needs of our troops.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, HRDC spent millions of tax dollars on TJF and CJF grants to companies based on projected job creation and not on actual jobs created. The 10,000 documents released yesterday said nothing about actual jobs.

In fact the minister's department said it had no way to prove that jobs had been created. Yet the minister stated in the House that 30,000 jobs have been created as a result of these programs. Could the minister prove that 30,000 jobs have been created as a result of these programs?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the party opposite is always asking where are our independent reviews. Let us look at what we have here. A reputable, highly regarded private company, Ekos Research

Associates, undertook a full review of the transitional jobs fund using sound, widely accepted and often used methodologies to analyze and assess the results of this program. It identified that 30,000 jobs would be created.

* * *

• (1455)

[Translation]

TAXATION

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, by refusing to index the tax tables, the government pockets annually some \$3 billion to \$5 billion unbeknownst to its taxpayers.

Will the Minister of Finance acknowledge that, without full indexation of tax measures, the upcoming tax cuts he will be announcing will be artificial and will in fact be net tax increases instead?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member need only wait. A budget will be brought down in this House on Monday.

I can see that the opposition is a little nervous because it knows we are in a very good position. We have eliminated the deficit, and many Canadians, myself included, hope that the Minister of Finance will be able to reduce taxes.

* * *

[English]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for close to three weeks now in the House we have asked the government for two simple things on HRDC: a full accounting of the funds spent and full and clear disclosure on what are the rules for disbursements.

So far we have neither, only the revelation that the rules are so vague and open to political Liberal manoeuvring that the government has to rely on a pocket defence. Will the minister now admit that the transitional jobs fund and other programs are based on political consideration and not on the need for and value of jobs?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me again repeat that there was flexibility built into the transitional jobs fund. As a result of that flexibility we see that well over 300 projects were approved in areas of less than 12% unemployment. Over half of those were in opposition ridings.

* * *

GASOLINE PRICING

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, the junior finance minister is not fuelling Canadians with his explanations.

There is a lot of exhaust coming from that side of the House about gas prices.

The fact is that the Liberal government increased gas taxes by 1.5 cents per litre, saying it was a deficit reduction measure back in 1995. The deficit is gone. Why is the deficit reduction tax not gone?

The Speaker: The hon. Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is coming from the party that increased the excise tax on gasoline from 1.5 cents to 8.5 cents. They are the ones who increased it on diesel fuel from zero cents to 4 cents.

They left us in such a mess that we have been faced with very high taxes across the board. This is why the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have committed that we will reduce taxes. We will reduce them in a way that will increase Canada's competitive position on a global basis.

The Speaker: It seems to me normal that when we ask a question we cannot start heckling right away until we at least hear what is being said.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. The minister should know what court orders are being made requiring non-custodial parents to support their adult children as they study for a masters, bachelors or even a Ph.D degree.

I would like the minister to tell the House whether the 1996 child support guidelines were intended to create a class of adult graduate students who are still supported by court order as children of a marriage.

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, we introduced new child support guidelines in 1997 to make child support calculations fairer and more consistent in the best interest of the child.

The hon. member should also be aware that in the Divorce Act there is provision for a court to award support for a child over the age of majority, but it is not automatic. A court only makes that determination on the basis of what is reasonable in the circumstances of the family. Provinces and territories have similar legislation. The hon. member should also be aware that the House—

The Speaker: That will bring to a close our question period for today.

Government Orders

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1500)

[Translation]

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-2, an act respecting the election of members to the House of Commons, repealing other acts relating to elections and making consequential amendments to other acts, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I will now put the motions in Group No. 3 to the House.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-2, in Clause 13, be amended by replacing lines 12 to 16 on page 10 with the following:

“of the House of Commons approved by a majority of the members of all opposition parties. He or she may be removed for cause by resolution of the House of Commons approved by a majority of the members of all opposition parties.”

[English]

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-2, in Clause 13, be amended by adding after line 16 on page 10 the following:

“(1.1) In subsection (1), “resolution of the House of Commons” means a motion of the House of Commons that has been adopted by at least three quarters of the members of that House.”

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-2, in Clause 14, be amended

(a) by replacing line 21 on page 10 with the following:

“while Parliament is dissolved, a substitute”

(b) by replacing lines 29 and 30 on page 10 with the following:

“shall act as Chief Electoral Officer until 15 days after the beginning of the first session of the next”

(c) by adding after line 3 on page 11 the following:

“(5) If the Chief Electoral Officer dies while the House of Commons is adjourned or prorogued or, if the Chief Electoral Officer is unable or neglects to carry out the duties of the position for more than five days when the House of Commons is adjourned or prorogued, the House shall meet within five days following the end of that period to appoint a new Chief Electoral Officer in accordance with subsection 13(1).”

[English]

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 7

Government Orders

That Bill C-2, in Clause 16, be amended by adding after line 35 on page 11 the following:

“(b.1) exercise the powers and perform the duties and functions set out in sections 24, 24.1 and 24.2;”

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-2, in Clause 16, be amended by adding after line 35 on page 11 the following:

“(b.1) exercise the powers and perform the duties and functions set out in sections 35.1 and 35.2;”

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-2, in Clause 16, be amended by adding after line 35 on page 11 the following:

“(b.1) exercise the powers and perform the duties and functions set out in sections 34.1 and 34.2;”

● (1505)

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-2, in Clause 16, be amended by adding after line 35 on page 11 the following:

“(b.1) exercise the powers and perform the duties and functions set out in sections 26.1 and 26.2;”

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-2, in Clause 17, be amended by replacing lines 16 to 22 on page 12 with the following:

“rupted on polling day by an emergency and the Chief Electoral Officer is satisfied that, if the voting hours are not extended, a substantial number of electors will not be able to vote, the Chief Electoral Officer shall extend the voting hours at the polling station for a period of time equivalent to the period during which the polling station had to be closed because of the emergency, as long as it does not in any case”

[*English*]

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-2, in Clause 17, be amended by replacing lines 21 and 22 on page 12 with the following:

“shall extend the voting hours at the polling station for the period the Chief Electoral Officer considers necessary to give those electors a reasonable opportunity to vote, as long as the polling station does not in any case”

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-2, in Clause 24, be amended by replacing line 23 on page 16 with the following:

“24. (1) Subject to section 24.1, the Chief Electoral Officer shall”

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-2, in Clause 24, be amended by replacing line 25 on page 16 with the following:

“district to hold office for a term of ten years and may only remove him or her for”

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-2, in Clause 24, be amended by replacing line 13 on page 17 with the following:

“(7) The Chief Electoral Officer may remove”

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-2 be amended by adding after line 31 on page 17 the following new clause:

“24.1 (1) The Chief Electoral Officer shall hold a competition for the selection of qualified candidates for the purposes of the appointment of returning officers under subsection 24(1).

(2) A competition held under subsection (1) shall be open to all qualified electors, other than persons referred to in subsection 22(3).

(3) The Chief Electoral Officer shall give such notice of a proposed competition as in his or her opinion will give qualified electors a reasonable opportunity of making an application for the position of returning officer.

(4) Applications for the position of returning officer shall be in the prescribed form and shall be made at the prescribed time and verified in the prescribed manner.

(5) The Chief Electoral Officer shall examine and consider all applications for the position of returning officer received within the time prescribed for the receipt of applications and shall select the highest ranking candidates in the competition from among the qualified applicants.

24.1.2 The Chief Electoral Officer may make regulations

(a) prescribing anything that may be prescribed by section 24.1;

(b) defining the expression “qualified” for the purposes of section 24.1; and

(c) the Chief Electoral Officer considers necessary to carry out and give effect to section 24.1.”

Motion No. 27

That Bill C-2, in Clause 25, be amended by replacing lines 32 to 37 on page 17 with the following:

“25. Between the 1st and 20th days of”

Motion No. 28

That Bill C-2, in Clause 26, be amended by replacing line 43 on page 17 with the following:

“26. (1) Subject to subsection (1.2), a returning officer shall, without”

Motion No. 29

That Bill C-2, in Clause 26, be amended

(a) by replacing line 45 on page 17 with the following:

“an assistant returning officer from the list most recently sent to the returning officer under subsection 26.1(6), who shall hold”

(b) by adding after line 47 on page 17 the following:

“(1.1) Every appointment made under subsection (1) shall be made impartially.”

Government Orders

● (1510)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 30

That Bill C-2, in Clause 26, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 5 on page 18 with the following:

“(2) A returning officer shall not appoint his or her mother, father, child, brother, sister, half-brother, half-sister, uncle, aunt, employee, a person who lives with him or her or a child of a person who lives with him or her, as an assistant returning officer.”

● (1515)

[*English*]

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 31

That Bill C-2 be amended by adding after line 5 on page 18 the following new clause:

“26.1 (1) The Chief Electoral Officer shall, before each general election, hold a competition for the selection of qualified candidates to be placed on a list referred to in subsection (6) for the purposes of the appointment of assistant returning officers under section 26, 28, 29 or 30. The selection shall be based on a candidate’s merit and experience and shall be made impartially.

(2) A competition held under subsection (1) shall be open to all qualified electors, other than persons referred to in subsection 22(3).

(3) The Chief Electoral Officer shall give such notice of a proposed competition as, in his or her opinion, will give qualified electors a reasonable opportunity of making an application for the position of assistant returning officer.

(4) Applications for the position of assistant returning officer shall be in the prescribed form and shall be made at the prescribed time and verified in the prescribed manner.

(5) The Chief Electoral Officer shall examine and consider all applications for the position of assistant returning officer received within the time prescribed for the receipt of applications and shall select the highest ranking candidates in the competition from among the qualified applicants for the purposes of subsection (6).

(6) The Chief Electoral Officer shall prepare a list of the highest ranking candidates in the competition for each electoral district and shall send it to the returning officer for the electoral district.

26.1.2 The Chief Electoral Officer may make regulations

(a) prescribing anything that may be prescribed in section 26.1;

(b) defining the expression “qualified” for the purposes of section 26.1; and

(c) the Chief Electoral Officer considers necessary to carry out and give effect to section 26.1.”

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-2, in Clause 28, be amended by deleting lines 24 to 26 on page 18.

Motion No. 33

That Bill C-2, in Clause 28, be amended by replacing line 36 on page 18 with the following:

“officer, the Chief Electoral Officer shall appoint”

Motion No. 34

That Bill C-2, in Clause 28, be amended by replacing line 41 on page 18 with the following:

“returning officer without delay from the list most recently sent under subsection 26.1(6) to the returning officer who is unable to act.

(6) Every appointment made under this section shall be made impartially.”

Motion No. 35

That Bill C-2, in Clause 29, be amended by replacing line 12 on page 19 with the following:

“delay appoint a substitute from the list most recently sent to the returning officer under subsection 26.1(6).

(2.1) Every appointment made under subsection (2) shall be made impartially.”

Motion No. 36

That Bill C-2, in Clause 30, be amended

(a) by replacing line 31 on page 19 with the following:

“additional assistant returning officer from the list most recently sent to the returning officer under subsection 26.1(6) and es-”

(b) by adding after line 33 on page 19 the following:

“(2.1) Every appointment made under subsection (2) shall be made impartially.”

Motion No. 37

That Bill C-2, in Clause 34, be amended by replacing lines 16 to 19 on page 21 with the following:

“appointed impartially from the list mostly recently sent under subsection 34.1(6) to the returning officer making the appointment.”

Motion No. 38

That Bill C-2 be amended by adding after line 21 on page 21 the following new clause:

“34.1 (1) The Chief Electoral Officer shall, before each general election, hold a competition for the selection of qualified candidates to be placed on a list referred to in subsection (6) for the purposes of the appointment of deputy returning officers under section 32 or subsection 253(1) or 273(1). The selection shall be based on a candidate’s merit and experience and shall be made impartially.

(2) A competition held under subsection (1) shall be open to all qualified electors other than persons referred to in subsection 22(3).

(3) The Chief Electoral Officer shall give such notice of a proposed competition as, in his or her opinion, will give qualified electors, a reasonable opportunity of making an application for that position.

(4) Applications for the position of deputy returning officer shall be in the prescribed form and shall be made at the prescribed time and verified in the prescribed manner.

Government Orders

(5) The Chief Electoral Officer shall examine and consider all applications for the position of deputy returning officer received within the time prescribed for the receipt of applications and shall select the highest ranking candidates in the competition from among the qualified applicants for the purposes of subsection (6).

(6) The Chief Electoral Officer shall prepare a list of the highest ranking candidates in the competition for each electoral district and shall send it to the returning officer for the electoral district.

34.1.2 The Chief Electoral Officer may make regulations

(a) prescribing anything that may be prescribed by section 34.1;

(b) defining the expression "qualified" for the purposes of section 34.1; and

(c) the Chief Electoral Officer considers necessary to carry out and give effect to section 34.1."

Motion No. 39

That Bill C-2, in Clause 35, be amended by replacing lines 23 to 27 on page 21 with the following:

"paragraph 32(b) or (c) shall be appointed impartially from the list most recently sent under subsection 35.1(6) to the returning officer making the appointment."

Motion No. 40

That Bill C-2 be amended by adding after line 29 on page 21 the following new clause:

"35.1 (1) The Chief Electoral Officer shall, before each general election, hold a competition for the selection of qualified candidates to be placed on a list referred to in subsection (6) for the purposes of the appointment of poll clerks under section 32 or subsection 253(1) or 273(1). The selection shall be based on a candidate's merit and experience and shall be made impartially.

(2) A competition held under subsection (1) shall be open to all qualified electors, other than persons referred to in subsection 22(3).

(3) The Chief Electoral Officer shall give such notice of a proposed competition as in his or her opinion will give qualified electors a reasonable opportunity of making an application for the position of poll clerk.

(4) Applications for the position of poll clerk shall be in the prescribed form and shall be made at the prescribed time and verified in the prescribed manner.

(5) The Chief Electoral Officer shall examine and consider all applications for the position of poll clerk received within the time prescribed for the receipt of applications and shall select the highest ranking candidates in the competition from among the qualified applicants for the purposes of subsection (6).

(6) The Chief Electoral Officer shall prepare a list of the highest ranking candidates in the competition for each electoral district and shall send it to the returning officer for the electoral district.

35.1.2 The Chief Electoral Officer may make regulations

(a) prescribing anything that may be prescribed by section 35.1;

(b) defining the expression "qualified" for the purposes of section 35.1; and

(c) the Chief Electoral Officer considers necessary to carry out and give effect to section 35.1."

Motion No. 41

That Bill C-2, in Clause 36, be amended by replacing lines 31 and 32 on page 21 with the following:

"appoint deputy returning officers from other sources if the candidates"

Motion No. 42

That Bill C-2, in Clause 36, be amended by replacing lines 31 and 32 on page 21 with the following:

"appoint poll clerks from other sources if the candidates"

Motion No. 43

That Bill C-2, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing lines 38 and 39 on page 21 with the following:

"able grounds, refuse to appoint a poll clerk recommended"

Motion No. 44

That Bill C-2, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing line 39 on page 21 with the following:

"returning officer recommended"

Motion No. 75

That Bill C-2, in Clause 273, be amended

(a) by replacing line 8 on page 108 with the following:

"273. (1) Subject to subsection (1.1), the returning officer shall appoint"

(b) by adding after line 15 on page 108 the following:

"(1.1) Every appointment of a poll clerk made under subsection (1) shall be made from the list most recently sent under subsection 35.1(6) to the returning officer making the appointment and shall be made impartially."

Motion No. 76

That Bill C-2, in Clause 273, be amended

(a) by replacing line 8 on page 108 with the following:

"273. (1) Subject to subsection (1.1), the returning officer shall appoint"

(b) by adding after line 15 on page 108 the following:

"(1.1) Every appointment of a deputy returning officer made under subsection (1) shall be made from the list most recently sent under subsection 34.1(6) to the returning officer making the appointment and shall be made impartially."

Motion No. 77

That Bill C-2, in Clause 273, be amended by deleting lines 16 to 34 on page 108.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ):
Madam Speaker, I am pleased to address the third group of amendments on Bill C-2, the Canada Elections Act.

We had very interesting debates through the first group of amendments. As members know, that first group dealt with self-employed workers. We were able to see, during the debate on that group, that the government is not very open to this category of workers.

The second group of amendments deals essentially with financial issues, including all the issues relating to the financing of political parties. Once again, it seems that the government has been very unresponsive to the various proposals put forward by opposition members.

In this third group of amendments, we address the partisan appointment of election officials, in particular the chief electoral officer himself, returning officers and assistant returning officers, in other words everyone responsible for the proper conduct of elections, across Canada of course, but also in each of the 301 ridings throughout Canada and Quebec.

But before saying anything more about the amendments in Group No. 3, I would simply like to make a general comment about the manner in which the government has conducted the debate so far and to make an even more general comment about how the government has operated for a number of months now.

• (1520)

I think we could say, without the shadow of a doubt, that this government, whose parliamentary majority is fairly slim, to say the least, does not shy away from an almost autocratic style of operating, imposing one gag after another. Indeed, this is a government to whom bringing in closure has become second nature.

Parliamentary procedure, as we know, is part of the rich and time-honoured parliamentary tradition, which makes available a certain number of provisions for ensuring the right to speak of the opposition and of various members of the House, but more particularly of members of the opposition parties.

The opposition quite rightly relies on these various provisions to put forward its arguments and points of view, as well as the points of view expressed by the people of Canada and of Quebec through the opposition parties.

But the government, convinced that it is right, that it knows everything, does not wish to hear points of view that differ from its own, and imposes closure. We saw this with Bill C-20, when the government brought in closure at second reading in order to speed up committee stage. At the moment, on the committee, the government is preparing to gag deliberations; it told us right off that it would probably proceed in the same manner with subsequent study in the House, that is, at report stage and at third reading.

I would add as a small aside that Bill C-20 is probably one of the most important bills ever given us to study since our election in 1997 and, certainly in my case, since the 1993 election. There have been a lot of other very important bills, but none intended to question the very bases of this country, the very bases of Canadian federalism, the very process the provinces that chose to join together to form this country used at the time.

Some very upsetting and scandalous things are happening with Bill C-20. The government wants to prevent the people from being heard on a bill that directly affects their future, the future of

Government Orders

Quebec in Canada or outside it, the future of any province—although Quebec is clearly the focus—the future of any other province in Canada either inside or outside Canada, and it wants to rush this bill through in secrecy, without anyone expressing an opinion. That is totally unacceptable.

The government is pushing its arrogance, adding insult to injury, bulldozing, if I may put it that way, another basic bill in a democracy and perhaps even the most fundamental bill in a democracy, the Elections Act.

The government claimed to have shown goodwill in introducing Bill C-2, saying “We will take into consideration the various positions in this House; we do not want to impose closure; we do not want to rush parliamentary procedure; we want to hear and, if possible, even integrate the suggestions of the opposition”.

And what happened? First the committee deliberations were hurried up in a rather cavalier fashion, I must say.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: That is not true.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: The committee’s deliberations, despite the protests of my colleague, the deputy government whip, were hustled through. There was no time allocation, since this is not possible in a committee, but had it been possible to impose a gag order, the government certainly would not have hesitated to do so.

Committee deliberations were hurried up with little or no consideration for the opposition’s proposals. A few little cosmetic changes suggested by the opposition were integrated, and they will certainly improve the bill. There is no doubt whatsoever about that.

• (1525)

The bill itself is an improvement, albeit a slight one; it does nevertheless represent some improvement over the existing Elections Act. The fact that a few improvements, a few cosmetic changes, have been made to the federal election legislation by the opposition parties has improved it still more.

This represented a unique opportunity for the government to carry out an in-depth reform of the Canadian electoral system, taking into consideration the changes that have taken place, with a view to finally clean up the political act somewhat at the federal level, by integrating a number of proposals from the opposition, the Bloc Québécois included, on the public funding of political parties. It has refused any in-depth changes.

It has limited itself to superficial changes only, useful but superficial ones. The government has agreed to include the matter of the trusts. This is the first time they have been addressed by the Elections Act; transparency is required about the monies put into trusts, but only during elections.

Government Orders

All of the money that goes into trusts when it is not election time will still remain hidden from the public eye, as it is at present. There are certainly grounds for concern.

Coming back to Group No. 3 amendments on the matter of appointments of returning officers, the government has once again taken refuge behind a lot of fallacious arguments in order to claim that the present way of doing things must not be changed.

When he appeared before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, to which Bill C-2 was referred, Quebec's former director general of elections, Pierre-F. Côté, who was very closely involved in the establishment of Quebec's electoral system, of democratic institutions that make Quebecers proud and that are recognized all over the world, said that "in a democratic system, not only must democracy be served, it must also appear that democracy has been served".

I say that the current system, in which returning officers in each riding across Canada are still appointed by the government, deprives the whole process of any appearance that democracy is being served.

In volume I of the report of the Royal Commission on Electoral Reform and Party Financing, the Lortie commission, I read the following:

In any democratic system, it is essential that the electoral process be administered efficiently and that the Elections Act be applied impartially. Election officers must deal at arm's length with the government in office and must be protected from any partisan influence.

To be sure, the current situation does not reflect the wish of the Lortie commission, a wish that was echoed by the chief electoral officer himself, Jean-Pierre Kingsley, who told the committee, on October 28:

Obviously when I go out on the international scene I do not recommend that the Canadian system be emulated where it comes to the appointment of returning officers. I clearly indicate, as I do in Canada, that the appointment of returning officers under the present system is an anachronism.

I will conclude by saying that the government is using the fallacious argument that it would take too much personnel to implement such a system, an independent system of appointments—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time is really up.

[*English*]

Mr. John Solomon: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point order. Subsequent to consultations with all parties in the House, I seek unanimous consent to change the name of the mover of Motion No. 62 from the hon. member for Thompson and Highland Valleys to the member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Does the hon. member have the consent of the House to change the name of the mover of Motion No. 62?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

• (1530)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was about to conclude. I had only a few words left. I appeal to the generosity of the House for an additional 30 seconds, one minute at most.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Does the hon. member have the consent of the House to continue for a few more seconds to conclude?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their great generosity.

I simply want to say that the government is using the specious reasoning that too many employees would be needed to implement a more independent system of appointing returning officers, a system that would ensure that returning officers were appointed independently, following an administrative competition to establish their objectivity, impartiality and qualifications.

The government claims that it would take far too many people to implement such a system. The chief electoral officer himself said that such a system would require two people at most.

Once again, I respectfully submit to members of this House that introducing such a system is not too complicated, and that it is being strongly urged by the chief electoral officer, who wants to be able to appoint returning officers and to demote them when it is very clear that they are not qualified to do their job.

I urge all members to vote in favour of provisions designed to ensure that returning officers are appointed in an impartial and independent manner.

[*English*]

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to address the Group No. 3 amendments to Bill C-2, the Canada elections bill. I say it is a pleasure for me because with the enactment of yet another example of time allocation by the government, very few of my colleagues will get the opportunity to address this important piece of legislation. So it is a pleasure and a privilege as it always is to speak in the House, but particularly in this case when the government has

Government Orders

enacted time allocation and once again has shut down or severely limited debate on legislation.

I note at the outset of my remarks that this is the 63rd time that time allocation has been used by the government. That is an even worse record, a milestone achieved much more quickly, than that of the Tories in a previous parliament. The reality is that in the 33rd Parliament which commenced on November 5, 1984, the Tories reached their 50th use of time restriction on September 15, 1992, a period of approximately eight years. The 35th Parliament was the first parliament of the mandate of the Liberals and commenced on January 17, 1994. The government reached its 50th use of time restriction on March 23, 1999, almost a year ago, which is a period of just over five years. That gives the viewing public some idea of the comparison.

When the Liberals were in opposition during the two terms of the Mulroney Conservatives, they would rant and rail against the use of time allocation and closure to shut down debate on important legislation. Yet we find that it is business as usual now that the Liberals are in government. In fact it is worse under the present administration.

I notice, Madam Speaker, that you had quite time trying to read all the amendments in Group No. 3. There are some 35 amendments. That gives some indication to the viewing public and those in the House and the gallery of the need for improving the legislation. One must ask the question, if there is that much concern on the part of not just Reformers and the official opposition but all opposition parties as to the need to improve the legislation, why would the government move so quickly to shut down and limit the debate?

I am sure that tonight amendment after amendment will be voted down by the Liberal government majority. The Liberals will use the weight of their numbers to vote down all the amendments. Once again we will see that democracy does not exist in Canada and that the work of the House does not really take place.

In other words, the work that should be taking place in this Chamber does not take place here. Quite the contrary, for purely partisan political reasons good, worthwhile, well thought out amendments to this legislation will not receive the time they deserve for debate in the House. They will not receive a proper hearing before they are voted on by all members of parliament.

• (1535)

That brings me to the main thrust of my remarks. I want to talk about the golden opportunity that was presented to the government, to the Liberal Party of Canada, to dramatically improve the system with legislation such as the elections act. The Liberals were granted this opportunity when the citizens of this country elected them to govern the country. What we see is a dismal failure on the part of the government with Bill C-2.

I want to digress a bit and talk about my personal history. About 14 years ago I was a farmer in the Peace River country of northern British Columbia. I had farmed for quite a number of years on our family farm. Gradually over a period of time my one brother and I purchased the farm from my parents and we continued to expand it. We were farming about 3,000 acres. It was a fair size grain farm. We grew wheat, barley, canola, oats, all the grains. The Peace River country in both Alberta and British Columbia is noted for being the second largest region in North America for producing grass seed. We grew a lot of grass seed as well.

At that time I thought that quite likely I would continue to farm for the remainder of my working life. I certainly had no real interest in politics other than to see good government in Canada. Yet 1986 was a watershed year for me. It was the second year of the first mandate of Brian Mulroney and the Progressive Conservative government. In 1984 the Tories were handed the most massive mandate up until that time in Canadian history. They came to power in Canada with the promise of cleaning up and changing the direction the Trudeau Liberals had charted for Canada.

There was actually widespread support across the nation but in particular in western Canada for the Progressive Conservatives. I was one of those who grew up supporting the Tories at the ballot box. I had hoped that we would see a major shift in the way that government was done. I was bitterly disappointed.

By 1986 the country was rocked by scandal after scandal. I can run down the list. I do not have enough time in a short 10 minute speech to explain them all but I am sure some of the viewing public will remember them. There was the Oerlikon land flip; there was what became known as tunagate; the Sinclair Stevens affair; a prison that was put into Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's riding that should have gone elsewhere. These things sound familiar. Scandal after scandal rocked the government at the time. It clearly showed to me, a farmer in northern British Columbia, that it was business as usual and that the government under the Conservatives was carrying right along with what the Liberals had done before.

I got angry, I got damn mad. I got involved in a fledgling political movement called the Reform association which in the fall of 1987 became the Reform Party of Canada. This brings me back full circle to the issue at hand today, Bill C-2, reform of the elections act. One of the main issues that prompted me to join the Reform Party was I saw that members of parliament did not adequately represent their constituents. That is what I saw with that massive majority and that is what I see with the government today.

Liberal members sitting across from us today are disciplined to the extent that they will stand up tonight, and it will just be the latest example of this, and they will vote down amendment after amendment purely because their party and their leader tell them that is what they should do. It is not because it is the best thing for their constituents or because it is the best thing for Canada. It is

Government Orders

strictly because of partisan politics in Canada that this is what will happen. That is exactly what has been happening for years and years and years regardless of whether it is a Conservative government or a Liberal government.

• (1540)

One of the things I wanted to see changed was to have MPs truly represent the interests of their constituents. One of the ways that can happen is if a government institutes a system of real free votes in this place, where MPs actually have the freedom to vote in the best interests of their constituents. The reality is that it just does not happen under the old party system. The problem is that the old parties like the system just the way it is and they are not about to change it.

Canadians ask me, and I am sure they ask MPs from all the parties, "What would you do differently? If we elect you, how can we trust you? What will you do differently?"

One of the things that is different and refreshing about the Reform Party of Canada is that in our policies and principles we state how we would change the way that elections are conducted. There would be fixed election dates, the use of referenda, the use of recall, the use of citizens initiatives, giving the power back to the people.

The government had the opportunity to do that, to bring about changes like that with Bill C-2, and it chose not to. Shame on it.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. Could you repeat, please? I did not hear the simultaneous translation of what you were saying, even though I was listening.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I am sorry you did not hear the simultaneous translation. I am sure it will be available momentarily. In any case, you will have access to a French copy as soon as possible.

[English]

Earlier today the Chair was proposing the motions in Group No. 2, and the hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre proposed to move three motions to amend clause 359 of Bill C-2. The Chair took these motions under advisement. The Chair has had an opportunity to review these motions and finds that they are in order.

Accordingly, these motions will be numbered 143, 144 and 145, and will be included in Group No. 2. A vote on Motion No. 113 will apply to Motions Nos. 143, 144 and 145. Copies of these motions and of the report stage chart which groups these motions will be available at the table and will be distributed to the parties for their information.

[Translation]

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to speak to this bill. The Canada Elections Act is perhaps the most important piece of legislation upon which our democracy is built in Canada.

It is based on three principles: equity, transparency and accessibility.

[English]

Above all this act is about the participation of Canadians in the most fundamental democratic right, that is the right to choose their government and the right to replace their government.

One of the fundamental principles of the existing act, and one which the amendments to the act we are bringing forward propose to continue and enhance is the right of Canadians to have a broad selection of candidates from which to choose; candidates that do not present themselves only on the basis of having adequate financial resources, but candidates who can present themselves on the basis of a broad range of experiences comparable to those of their fellow Canadians.

• (1545)

One of the fundamental principles of this act is and has been for 30 years that money should not determine who is able to run for election or who is able to influence voters sufficiently to get themselves elected. This law continues the principle of limits on expenses for election purposes. It continues the principle of the right of every Canadian to consider becoming a candidate.

Members of the Reform Party have spoken at great length about how unfair it is to limit third party advertising during election campaigns. We have made sure that candidates are able to put their views before Canadians on a fair and equal basis. In other words, they have a limit on how much they can spend to promote their views to their voters.

The government believes it is only fair that others who participate in the electoral process by putting forward political views about a party or a candidate should be similarly limited and should not be able to spend in an unlimited way and therefore have an undue influence on the formation of public opinion and on the outcome of an election.

We are doing other things in this act to enlarge the capacity of Canadians to participate in the voting process like extending voting hours and allowing people out of the country to vote more easily and more freely at embassies anywhere in the world. We are making sure that Canadians who want to participate in a campaign by showing their support for one or another candidate through signs or volunteer participation are able to do so whether they live in

their own private home or they live in a multiple residential dwelling unit.

[*Translation*]

I would also like to say a few words about certain amendments that were brought forward with regard to financial contributions to candidates during an election campaign.

Some have proposed that the right to make a contribution during a campaign be restricted to voters, which means to Canadian citizens. I have very strong feelings about the right of new Canadians to participate in every aspect of Canadian life from the moment they arrive in our country. I am particularly in favour of their participation in the electoral process.

A large number of new Canadians came here because they were born in a country where democracy did not exist. We have heard the views of a number of separatists on the right of new Canadians to take part in an election. On this side of the House, we encourage them and are not at all in favour of limiting their participation, whether it be as volunteers or as financial contributors.

[*English*]

I will speak about some of the particular provisions in this group of motions. The member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes has made a great point about it not being a very democratic process. He and I sit on the same committee. He knows as well as I do just how long the committee has worked on this matter and of the hearings we held with the media, interested Canadians and all political parties, no matter how small or how large or whether they do or do not have elected members in the House of Commons.

• (1550)

He also knows that a number of the amendments the government has put forward today are in response to suggestions from his party or from other opposition parties. To suggest that there has not been any opportunity for the opposition to influence the outcome of this act is simply not fair.

I point out, for instance in this group, the amendment of the government that gives the Chief Electoral Officer the power to extend voting hours where an emergency has closed the polls for a certain period of time during the day. We have responded to the opposition by making sure that the Chief Electoral Officer extends the hours where there has been an interruption in voting.

We have not agreed with the opposition on the appointment of returning officers. I go back to the Lortie commission, established earlier on in this decade, that consulted broadly with Canadians. It recommended that we not change that aspect of the election process and that it was a far more efficient and cost effective way of running elections in 300 constituencies across the country to have people involved who have experience at the constituency level of the electoral process.

Government Orders

There is not a great deal more to say on this matter, but I ask Canadians to remember that the bill is not about parliamentarians, not about government, but about their right to choose and their right to know that the candidates presenting themselves to them are not advantaged by being privileged, by having a lot of money, by having powerful and rich friends. We all campaign, every party, every member of the House and every candidate who was not elected, on the same financial basis, on a fair and equal footing and on a level playing field. That is exactly what we are trying to do, to ensure that continues under the new act.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi, PC): Madam Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to say a few words about Bill C-2.

Right at the start, I would like to point out that we Progressive Conservatives are constantly being forced to defend our track record. According to the government and the official opposition, we are responsible for all the ills of this country. According to what my Reform Party colleague said earlier, one would conclude that the Progressive Conservatives have not done one positive thing.

I would like people to judge our reputation, not on what one politician says in a speech, but on what our government accomplished in the nine years it was in power. There is no shame in rising in this House as a Progressive Conservative. In the last century we were in power for only very short periods, but these were always productive periods that made a contribution to restructuring the country as a whole.

I will read the following excerpt. I know that my Reform colleagues are not interested, but hon. members ought to listen carefully to what one of the best editorial writers in the country has to say about the record of the Progressive Conservative government and of Mr. Mulroney. Hon. members will see that this rises above prejudices and purely partisan declarations.

I am doing this strictly in order to illustrate that what was accomplished during those two mandates bore fruit, and will continue to, in a progression that is more than merely geometric. I am sure that my colleague from Frontenac—Mégantic has caught my drift, being a mathematician par excellence.

To quote the editorial “When the Chrétien government boasts of the economic results, which are starting to look good, it does so—”

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Order, please. The hon. member knows very well that, in the House, members and ministers are not to be referred to by their names, but by their constituency and title.

Mr. André Harvey: Madam Speaker, when one is quoting, it sometimes—

Government Orders

• (1555)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I do not agree with the hon. member at all. Using a quote is no excuse to mention a member's surname.

Mr. André Harvey: Madam Speaker, I will continue with the quotation. "When the current government boasts about the economic results, which are starting to look good, it does so as the heir to the Conservatives, as the manager of strategic decisions that were made by its predecessor". This is what Alain Dubuc, a very well known editorial writer in Canada, wrote in *La Presse*.

Whenever one of my colleagues rises, whether they are members of the official opposition or of the government—they agree on that—they start talking about the results of the Progressive Conservative Party. After dozens of motions for closure on the part of this government, I am not afraid to say that, at the time, we were not afraid of what this government is now afraid of doing concerning the Canada Elections Act, concerning Bill C-20, which seeks to provide a framework for future referendums in the country.

The Liberals absolutely do not want to consult the public to find out what it thinks of this measure. After decades of Liberal governments, I think, and I do not want to engage in rhetoric—I am well aware of the best way to emphasize a reality—that arrogance, contempt and indifference toward the House of Commons and toward all Canadians are now part of a behaviour that is beginning to spread throughout this government.

The government is ramming Bill C-2 through with mere technical amendments and without an in depth review. It is not true that Canadians, including people in Alberta, British Columbia, Quebec and Ontario, have nothing to say on the reform of the Canada Elections Act. It is not true that Canadians do not know what is going on in this country. It is not true that this exercise was useless.

At the time, I was sitting on the committee considering free trade, which held hearings across the country, with the current Prime Minister. It is not true that we learned nothing from listening to Canadians on this issue, which was just as vital.

Fortunately, because the government respected Canadians, it consulted them. They made us aware of the importance of better structuring marketing, coming up with a free trade agreement that would enable the country to increase its exports to the U.S. market by 150%. The government felt it important to do that.

This was also the case for the tax reform that led to the GST. This tax is bringing in \$24 billion this year. The purpose at the time of creating it was not to scrap it eventually, but to scrap taxes. That did not happen.

It is not true that consulting the public and, for a committee, going to hear what people have to say, is time wasted. I am convinced that, be it Bill C-2 or Bill C-20, which concerns a constitutional matter, it is not a waste of time.

I will mention, as an example, the 1995 referendum? What did the present government say to Canadians? It said "Do not get upset, we will assume leadership, we will take it in hand, you may rest in peace". Things rested in peace until the great rally in Montreal. They rested so peacefully with the opium of the present government that the yes side ended up with 49.4% of the vote.

I say to my anglophone colleagues "Do not sleep too heavily with a government that is afraid to consult the people".

• (1600)

This bill is extremely important. It will result in some purely technical considerations. Why not have agreed to examine this issue in greater depth?

With respect to appointments, I put a question to the chief electoral officer. Some of my colleagues were in committee at the time. I asked him whether he felt that his recommendation that there be an objective process for appointing returning officers was essential.

I can tell the House what he said. I cannot say that he is a member of the Progressive Conservative Party. He is one of the most respected public servants in the country. He replied "Yes, it is essential for all sorts of reasons. Political appointments as returning officers have incredible repercussions on the daily management of election campaigns. If politically you appoint people without the qualifications, without the necessary potential to do a good job, the result is problems with day-to-day management". This is what the chief electoral officer told the committee.

Unfortunately, we are headed nowhere with this. I managed to get a few technical amendments approved, but the rest amounts to nothing.

On the issue of funding, members of other parties were open to a study that might one day lead to increased funding from the government so that elections could be conducted in full objectivity.

The Bloc Québécois has its own view on this issue, which was very well explained by its whip. The same is true for the other political parties. Unfortunately, on the issue of funding, we are no further ahead.

I hope that one day the committee will be able to examine the issue of the funding of the country's national political parties. I think that this puts democracy in this country in serious jeopardy.

There are numerous other aspects. One of the most detrimental aspects of this bill is the control of the activities of third parties

Government Orders

during election campaigns. The people who promote political involvement, third parties, are not millionaires. These people will be so mired in administrative procedures that are difficult to understand and impossible to manage without professional resources that the government will be better able to control the next election campaign.

I would have said much more, but I see that my allotted time is up.

[*English*]

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am standing to speak on the Group No. 3 motions to Bill C-2, the Canada Elections Act.

Members will remember that the bill was originally sent to committee prior to second reading on the pretence of making meaningful amendments. The minister said that because the bill was important he was putting it into committee so that we could make meaningful amendments.

We deliberated on the bill for several weeks in committee for long hours; from nine in the morning until ten or eleven at night. We discussed many of the amendments or similar amendments to what we are discussing here. However, the government never took it seriously. The reason it sent the bill to committee before second reading was to make a few technical amendments of its own. It pretty much ignored, as the speaker before me said, any reasonable amendments submitted by the opposition.

The Group No. 3 motions are mainly concerned with the area of appointments to staff positions within Elections Canada. As speakers before me have mentioned, the returning officers throughout Elections Canada are appointed by the Prime Minister.

Why would Canadians be happy to have in their electoral system, which is supposed to be totally non-partisan, the Prime Minister appointing all of the 301 returning officers across the country? The answer is that they are not happy. It is outrageous that the government can use this bill to appoint Liberal Party hacks to positions within Elections Canada all the way down to returning officers and deputy returning officers. Out in the field positions of Elections Canada, all the parties get to appoint people.

• (1605)

During the last election many of my colleagues, myself included, told the returning officers that we would not participate in this patronage exercise. We told them that they should advertise the positions and get the best people for the job. That is the way it should be done, from top to bottom in Elections Canada.

The member who spoke before me mentioned the questions we asked the Chief Electoral Officer in committee. I asked the Chief

Electoral Officer if, when Elections Canada was helping third world countries and emerging democracies to set up their elections legislation, he ever recommended the system of patronage that we have here in Canada.

Jean Pierre Kingsley, the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada, said:

—obviously when I go out on the international scene I do not recommend that the Canadian system be emulated where it comes to the appointment of returning officers. I clearly indicate, as I do in Canada, that the appointment of returning officers under the present system is an anachronism.

It is plain wrong and improper, in an elections act that is supposed to be non-partisan, for this political patronage to go on.

I would like to speak at length about the patronage aspect of the bill but, in many ways, it is actually other areas of the bill that have come to overshadow this section. For example, there are a series of legal challenges that are certain to be launched against the bill based on previous legal activity both at the provincial and federal levels.

A series of legal challenges are certain on a thing called the 50 candidate rule, which requires a party to have 50 candidates before it can put a party name on ballot. The Communist Party of Canada took the federal government to court on that issue. It won its case in Ontario. I cannot understand why the minister is persisting with a ridiculous and stupid provision in the bill that has already been struck down by the courts. Why would he not just reach a consensus with the small parties that came to committee and said that they would be satisfied with 12 members? They did not have to have the two that the courts had said. They would agree to 12 because that was sensible and it related to the rules of the House. The minister would not agree.

Then we have the third party spending, which has just been struck down again in the courts of B.C. In the court in British Columbia, the judge specifically mentioned that the evidence used in the Libman case by this minister to justify a gag law in his elections act is invalid because the evidence used was based on a preliminary report by a UBC political science professor, Richard Johnston, which indicated that third party spending might influence election outcomes.

Although that finding went into the Lortie commission report, which was subsequently used in the Libman case, Professor Johnston later concluded that third party endorsements had no discernible effect on election outcomes.

There have been three studies done in Canada, as well as studies done in other countries, on the effects or non-effects of third party spending in elections. After studying that evidence, Justice Brenner, in the B.C. case, stated:

—there is no evidence which would allow me to conclude that third party advertising or spending has an impact on voter intentions.

Government Orders

To override Charter rights it is necessary that there be more than a general hypothetical concern about a problem when there is no evidence to demonstrate that it has existed in the past or that it is likely to exist in the future.

Professor Johnston's report, which was used in the Libman case, actually concluded, by studying the different impacts, that sometimes third party spending had the apparent effect of working against a candidate in one riding but, on exactly the same issue, had the apparent effect of helping a candidate in another riding.

For example, on the National Citizens' Coalition issues, that are often a part of the third party spending activity, there was no evidence in Professor Johnston's studies that could conclude that the spending had any particular effect in a riding. So that part of the bill is definitely flawed and will be subject to a court challenge.

Judge Brenner, in a February 9 ruling of the B.C. Supreme Court, stated that there were certain circumstances in which the goal of fairness in elections would support an argument for third party advertising.

• (1610)

If, in a future election campaign, for example, all of the political parties were to agree on a significant policy, then the lack of third party advertising would deprive the voters of a alternative view of that policy. That is a very strong argument in favour of third party spending limits.

Although the main thrust of the motions that we are discussing right now deal with patronage appointments to Elections Canada, I know that the minister is completely unresponsive to any of the amendments that were proposed to fix the problem, just as he is completely unresponsive to any of the court rulings which have shown him he is misguided in other areas of the bill. He is misguided with the 50 candidate rule. He is misguided with third party spending. He is also misguided as far as the publication of poll results goes.

I do not know why he persists in trying to reinstate parts of the bill that are continually being struck down by the courts. Is it a game for him? Is he trying to make the National Citizens' Coalition and the Canadian Taxpayers Federation spend their money in court challenges knowing that the minister does not have to pay out of his own pocket for his side of the thing? It is the taxpayers of Canada who end up paying. I wish he would not treat it like a game. I wish he would treat it with seriousness. I wish he would sit down and actually negotiate amendments to the bill that would make it more meaningful.

When members on the other side say that we do not free vote, that is simply not true. We often support their amendments. On this very bill we have supported at least 20 of their amendments. We have analyzed them, taken a look at them and have said that they

are sensible amendments. We are supporting some of the Bloc amendments and even some of the NDP amendments because we have looked at them sensibly and logically. They make sense and they should be supported.

Look at the government side. Every single amendment that has been proposed will be opposed by government members. It is not because the amendments make no sense. They are all good and sensible amendments that should be discussed. They will be opposed because government members are afraid their nomination papers will not be signed when it comes to the next election. I wish they would reconsider and start thinking about what is good for the people of Canada instead of their pocketbooks at the next election.

In the last parliament we told the government that bills like the Employment Equity Act, conditional sentencing and bills that had flaws in them would be challenged by the courts, just like the one before us today. We predicted that but they never listened. I wish they would listen on the Canada Elections Act because that minister over there will be responsible for the waste of hundreds of thousands of dollars on meaningless court cases which he could be avoided. I wish he would listen.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wish to inform the House that Thursday, February 24, 2000 shall not be an allotted day.

* * *

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-2, an act respecting the election of members to the House of Commons, repealing other acts relating to elections and making consequential amendments to other acts, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of Group No. 3.

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, would you not just love to have that kind of power that you could just wipe a day out? It is amazing.

While listening to the previous speaker and the ones before, I was trying to understand the point of view of the opposition. I found that there was some reasoned debate by the speaker who just finished, until the end.

Frankly, I also play at the game a little bit from time to time, but one of the reasons that we have such difficulty in this place is because of things like the accusation by an hon. member opposite. He tried to suggest that all the Liberals in this place are only concerned, as he put it, about their pocketbooks, that somehow there are no hon. members on this side of the House only on that

Government Orders

side. He said that we only cared about ourselves not about our constituents or the country. It is that kind of rhetoric that makes the hair on the back of our necks stand up and takes the temperature in this place to new levels.

• (1615)

I find it incredible. There is no doubt we are rushing the bill. Let us take a look at the history. In 1991 there was the Lortie commission on electoral reform. This is a slam dunk. We are hammering it home. In 1993 there was the special committee of the House of Commons. Then in 1998 this draconian hard headed government, which does not care about public opinion according to the bright lights opposite, brought in a bill.

That bill was debated in the House and sent to committee. The member opposite remembers serving on the committee late into the evening. Why? It was because they wanted to hear opinions. I have news for members opposite. They are not the government. We on this side are and we have a responsibility as the duly elected government to put forward an agenda.

Members opposite form the opposition. I understand that. I served five years in opposition in the province of Ontario. I respect the fact that they have a job to do, but each party, particularly my dear friends in the Reform Party, continually mislead and misrepresent the issues. This is part of the reason that we wind up—

Mr. Ted White: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you would agree it is improper for the member opposite to say that we are misleading or misrepresenting any of the issues, or that we are misleading our constituents.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The hon. member has a point. I am sure the hon. member for Mississauga West will choose his words more judiciously.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Madam Speaker, I will choose my words this way. It would be a wonderful experience if just once on one issue members opposite would stand and say there are some reasonable points.

Mr. Ken Epp: We did.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: They do not at all. They stand and say that this is the most draconian bill they have ever seen and that it is being jammed down people's throats.

Do members know why we have to use the tool called time allocation? If we did not, we would never get anything done in this place because opposition members get out of bed every morning and ask themselves one question: What shall we oppose today? They do not ask what they can do for Canadians today or what they can accomplish for their constituents?

They also ask what minister they can go after today? It does not matter if it is based on the truth. It does not matter if it is based on

any kind of fact. It only matters if they think it will get them in the media or if they think they will get some points at home.

Mr. Ken Epp: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is particularly important in a debate when we are rushed for time to stick to the topic. I would ask you to ask the member to be relevant.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I was following the debate. I am sure the hon. member will speak to the matter before the House.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Madam Speaker, I am equally sure that this is simply an attempt to stop me from getting my points across. I understand that because they do not like to hear the facts.

What are they opposing? Let me talk about third party spending on elections. We know the Reform Party would love to give a blank cheque to Charlton Heston and the NRA out of Washington, Dallas or wherever to ride into Ottawa on horseback, shooting their pistols in the air, and let them spend whatever they want.

On the other side of the coin I am not sure Reformers would want to see money being allocated to a third party group like the National Action Committee on the Status of Women. I suspect they would not want to see that organization being given this kind of power.

What is fair in an electoral process? What is fair is that there are registered parties. There are registered candidates. For all the disagreements we have in this place, I personally have nothing but the utmost respect for anyone who stands for elected office for any party at any time. It takes a lot of courage. It takes a lot of commitment. It is not just for a Liberal. It takes a lot of courage to run as a Reformer in Canada. Let us imagine running in Ontario as a Reformer. It must be sort of like the appliance guy with the loneliest job in town. They have trouble getting their deposits back.

• (1620)

I respect the fact that the candidate who ran against me for the Reform Party came out more than the Tories did to the all candidate meetings to put forward his viewpoints, his ideas, what he believed in. He is a man in the community. I might even convince him to vote for me one day. I suspect he votes for my wife because he lives in her municipal riding, so he has some common sense.

Why should someone with an axe to grind, a third party that does not have the commitment or dedication, be allowed to have blank cheque to influence the outcome of the election or to be manipulated perhaps by a party that knows it does not have support in a certain region, whether it is Atlantic Canada, Ontario or the province of Quebec? Maybe they want to manipulate the voters through advertising. Does that work? I ask members to use the analogy of why tobacco companies advertise to try attract young smokers to their products. It is because it works. The reality is that advertising in politics works as well.

Government Orders

It is a very serious issue. It is not like we are saying they cannot have a say. They can spend up to \$150,000 across the nation. I do not think that is unreasonable. They can put their viewpoints across. They can attend all-candidate meetings. They can go to the candidate of any party they want and demand that the person explain why he or she believes in whatever the issue happens to be. This is the democratic process. This is not a government and this is not a country that will tolerate the ability of any special interest group to hijack the agenda during an election campaign. That is very important.

I want to deal with another issue that members talked about, the appointment of the Chief Electoral Officer. Let us be clear. In this case a resolution is required of the House, not of the Senate, to approve that.

There is much about democracy in the bill. If the opposition thinks it is democratic for us to be sitting here tonight voting on 67 nonsensical amendments which they want to put forward, keeping members of parliament in this place until two or three o'clock in the morning, I do not call that productive. I call that destructive democracy. It will not improve the bill and they know it.

They have had every opportunity to have their oar in the water. We should support the bill. We should pass the bill. We should stop the silly political games that are being played opposite.

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to debate Bill C-2 today. We have before the House a very important piece of legislation which outlines in finite detail the democratic process in Canada. It outlines for Canadians how we should be electing our representatives in a democratic way, in an inclusive way and in a transparent way to represent the interests of the House of Commons in issues which pertain to all Canadians.

We have seen the Liberal government opposite continue on its anti-democratic path. It is very unfortunate but it continues to crush debate in the House of Commons. This is parliament. We have been sent from all parts of the country to speak about issues which are important to all of us.

What do members of the Liberal government do? They spend hour after hour strategizing on how to reduce debate and reduce the importance of parliament. They do this by time allocation. They are implementing a shortened debate period.

• (1625)

We will be sitting for seven or eight hours in the House of Commons on this bill and 301 members of parliament will have maybe three hours to debate it. The government has used time allocation to shorten the debate from a natural progression of spending a few days to hear the views of other members on the bill, how to improve it and make it better. It has spent all its time taking

democracy away from Canadians. Time allocation is when the government invokes a time period of two or three hours to debate a bill which is hundreds of pages long.

I am not sure whether the Prime Minister or the government House leader had time to read the bill. It is 258 pages long and they want 301 members of parliament to speak no more than 10 minutes and condense that into three hours of debate. This is anti-democratic. It is an indication of Liberal priorities. They do not want any debate on democracy because they like the closed system. It is a very closed system where very few people are elected to the House of Commons to represent 30 million Canadians. When we get here they shut down debate because they do not like exactly what has been going on.

We in the NDP are very concerned about that. We object to the strategies and the terrible lack of democracy Liberals are pushing on Canadians. We feel the motions we are debating now have some problems, but some of them are very good.

We believe there are five cornerstones of democracy and we want to apply those cornerstones to Bill C-2. The government House leader knows exactly what those cornerstones are. That is why he is suppressing debate. They are responsibility, accessibility, accountability, inclusiveness and transparency. We put Bill C-2 to the test on those five cornerstones and the bill fails in many ways in each and every one of them.

With respect to the particular grouping we are talking about, the issue of numbered companies contributing to political parties and candidates was put forward by the NDP as an amendment. We are asking all parties to embrace and support it because it provides additional transparency with respect to who is giving money to political parties and candidates. Concerning transparency, the way it works now is that if a numbered company makes a contribution to the constituency of the industry minister or to the Liberal Party in general, it only has to provide its number, for example 651391 Canada Inc. There is no indication who that represents or who is behind that contribution.

Our amendments make it more transparent by calling upon the numbered company making a contribution to outline who is its chief executive officer or its president and to outline their addresses. Many Canadians may not know but the addresses of numbered companies are primarily those of law firms. Lawyers are the legal bodies behind the entities and they just use their law offices as the head offices of numbered companies. It is very difficult to obtain this information. We feel this is one amendment that should be supported.

In addition there is the issue regarding voting hours in British Columbia. My three NDP colleagues from Vancouver East, Burnaby—Douglas, and Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys,

believe very strongly that the hours in the act should be changed. The amendment in this grouping makes that suggestion. They are calling for the hours in British Columbia to be from 8 a.m. until 8 p.m. instead of 7 a.m. until 7 p.m. because the lower mainland is a very congested area and the transportation system is not as up to par as it should be. People in the lower mainland tend to work far distances from their residences and therefore will have difficulty voting by 7 p.m.

As critic on Bill C-2 they asked me to make that recommendation to the government. They had many instances and anecdotal stories about how people were unable to exercise their franchise in the last election because the polls in the lower mainland closed at 7 p.m. We are asking the government to consider supporting this amendment.

• (1630)

I have put forward amendments with respect to numbered companies which would apply not only to candidates in political parties but to third parties as well. We hear that the Reform and the Conservative parties are very cautious about this amendment. They want third parties, which could be the oil companies, the prescription pharmaceutical corporations, the banks or the National Rifle Association in the States, not to be transparent in terms of contributions made to them in order for third parties like these organizations to attack, personally, individual candidates or members of parliament who are seeking re-election.

We find that to be unfair. Third parties should qualify and follow the rules of Bill C-2 with respect to numbered companies and the transparency of political contributions so that when the oil companies attack my colleague from Acadie—Bathurst in an election campaign we will know where the moneys came from. We will know whether they came from corporations, Imperial Oil or Shell, or from third parties which feel we have been fighting these issues to defend consumers, that we have been taking and holding accountable the oil companies which have undertaken to gouge consumers. We feel that the contributions which are made to these particular organizations have to be crystal clear and transparent.

We in the NDP also support the notion of regular, fixed election dates. We would like to see the federal election held in the middle of June every four years. The writs would be issued on the second Monday of May, every fourth year. The election would take place in the second or third week of June, depending on the season and the calendar. We feel that regular election dates would take away a lot of the politicking that members opposite are so inclined to participate in, rather than deciding on what kind of action they are going to take on behalf of Canadians.

The biggest problem we have was mentioned by the member for Mississauga West a few minutes ago: “What shall I oppose

Government Orders

today?” That was his line about the opposition. Some members of the opposition get up every day to oppose things. New Democrats get up every day to make recommendations as to what actions we could take to solve the problems of the country. The Liberals do not seem to get it. They do not listen to our recommendations, which, by the way, are embraced by the majority of Canadians in many ways.

For example, today in question period I stood in the House to ask the Prime Minister what action plan he was instituting to defend the Canadian economy, consumers, truckers and agricultural producers from the OPEC oil cartel and soaring energy prices. Rather than saying that we have a plan or we are working on a plan, I said that maybe the Prime Minister should look to the Americans. America is the home of capitalism and free enterprise, where this sort of thing was born, and it has undertaken a 17-point program to support its consumers, truckers and farmers. Yet all our government does is pass the buck to the provinces. Rather than saying that we oppose what the Prime Minister is doing, we say this is what he should be doing with respect to oil prices. He should be calling together the provinces and the oil companies to figure out what can be done. They should look at the recommendations of the U.S. to know how it is helping its consumers and business people.

The Liberals only listen to what they want to hear. They do not want to have any debate on issues like Bill C-2, as we have proposed. We feel that it is unacceptable to have this kind of suppressive government. It suppresses debate and discourages members from putting forward alternatives. It does not like the views of the grassroots in the House. It does not even like the views of the majority in the House. It tends to discount this, say that it will deal with that, and it just calls the opposition names. I think that is pretty low class. On behalf of the NDP, I put forward our opposition to Bill C-2.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ): Madam Speaker, Bill C-2 redefines the federal government’s position on the way elections are conducted.

• (1635)

I will focus my remarks on the funding of political parties, the appointment of election officers in the various ridings, the transparency of postal voting, equity, compliance with the Elections Act on which we will be voting democratically in this parliament, and the sacred principle of one person one vote.

First of all, I will discuss the one person, one vote principle in the last election in Quebec. It would seem that Quebec has one of the most advanced and strict electoral systems of all countries in the world. Yet, the Liberals have found ways to literally steal an election. That is what happened in the riding of Anjou where they stole—

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I ask the member to refrain from using such words and to choose his words very carefully. There are words that cannot be used in the House.

Hon. Martin Cauchon: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You just drew the attention of the House to some words used by my colleague opposite. He started his speech by saying that Quebec was a country. Everyone knows that Quebec is still—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I do not think this is a point of order, but rather a point of debate.

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien: Madam Speaker, I thank you for your co-operation.

In the riding of Anjou, Minister Pierre Bélanger lost the election by a handful of votes—

An hon. member: Come on.

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien:—votes that went to Jean-Sébastien Lamoureux. It was proven beyond any doubt that Jean-Sébastien Lamoureux and his team managed to get hundreds of people to vote more than once—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien:—and it would seem that these people got paid \$10 per vote. One such person collected \$130. At \$10 per vote, we can quickly figure that this floater voted 13 times.

As I said, Quebec is recognized world-wide for having the strictest system. Be that as it may, we lost the riding of Anjou. I know that, when Jean-Sébastien Lamoureux rises to vote in the National Assembly, several members of the government party tell him “Jean-Sébastien, you just vote once here. This is a democratic institution”. Even the Liberals are laughing up their sleeve, because they know full well that a number of people in that riding each voted several times.

Speaking of money, which, in my opinion, is the core of the issue, the distinguished Pierre Corbeil and Marcel Massé, the former member from across the river here, had an interesting arrangement. Pierre Corbeil was apparently provided by Marcel Massé, his department or his office, with the list of future recipients of substantial grants from HRDC, a topic which is the subject of much debate these days. Pierre Corbeil received cash amounts of between \$5,000 and \$25,000.

We do not have the file indicating what became of it, if some did not get lost in the back of his car, hon. members know what I mean by that.

Pierre Corbeil, like CINAR, admitted his guilt. Probably the party footed the bill, including the fine.

This leads me to speak about my riding of Frontenac—Mégantic. The people of Lac Mégantic are proud folk. The people living in

the Granit regional municipality are proud folk and they are respectful of laws and regulations. In the last election, on June 2, 1997, the local member of the National Assembly, a regular citizen with several elections under her belt, both provincial and federal, took it upon herself to go around shaking hands with people at the Centre Monseigneur-Bonin as if she were running for election.

● (1640)

She was given several warnings, but the Primeau's, the people in charge of security and of seeing that the voting ran smoothly, had to ask her to leave, after of course the usual solicitation of support for the Liberal candidate.

The Bloc Québécois organization for Lac Mégantic filed, with the assistance of Pierre Greffard, an official complaint with the office of the chief electoral officer. The outcome was more or less the same as in Anjou, the same as with Pierre Corbeil, in the biggest possible mess.

If an elected member of the provincial legislature can scoff at federal legislation at a poll, how can there be any respect? When we see, for example, that the Parliament of Canada is sending a mission abroad to monitor an election when, here, we are not even capable of ensuring one person, one vote, and limiting the power of money in an election, I think we are patting ourselves on the back unjustifiably.

The opposition raised the question of postal votes when Bill C-2 was considered in committee. Postal voting is one more devious way of getting dozens of votes out of one person. The envelope for a mail-in ballot can be bought, as we have seen in Anjou, with Jean-Sébastien Lamoureux. In some poor neighbourhoods, they can be bought for under \$10. It involves taking a busload of people to the office of the chief electoral officer, where everybody gets off one after the other with an envelope, and on the bus, they give it to the organizer, who, naturally, has the money.

The Liberals know full well what I mean, because they are expert at organizing elections. They are so expert that sometimes they get told things in private meetings, how they can proceed, and that is a scandal.

I heard earlier the deputy government whip say that money should not play a determining role in the election of one candidate or another. I can tell her that she spoke out of both sides of her mouth at the same time, since the Liberal Party uses CKAC's slogan “The Power of Words” in conjunction with another one: “The Power of Money”.

The list of generous contributors to the Liberal Party is really scandalous. Bombardier contributed over \$75,000 to the Liberal Party in 1998—that is what is in the books—and \$30,000 to the Progressive Conservative Party. That makes for good collecting. To collect \$30,000 in my riding, I have to work very hard collecting

Government Orders

\$10 here, \$25 there, and \$100 somewhere else, while the Liberal Party collects \$75,000 and the Progressive Conservative Party, \$30,000, from a single contributor. Members will understand that, if Mr. Beaudoin, the CEO of Bombardier, gives \$75,000 to the grits, he will reap \$7.5 million a month later. It does not take long.

Now, moving to appointments, because I see my time is quickly running out. In 1993, in the riding of Frontenac, Ms. Roy was the returning officer. She was very competent, totally above suspicion and popular with all the political parties. When it came to power in 1993, the Liberal Party turfed her out and appointed my friend André Pomerleau, a man who was very dedicated to the community, but particularly to the Liberal Party.

• (1645)

Ms. Roy was relieved of her duties and replaced by André. He was retired, while for Ms. Roy the job was a means of supplementing her income and being able to afford some of the niceties.

In Quebec, in our nation, we do not fire returning officers after every change of government. In Frontenac, Chantal has been returning officer since 1985, if memory serves, and she will continue in that position as long as she continues to do a good job in the Government of Quebec's elections.

In closing, the Bloc Québécois will, of course, not support Bill C-2, because there are too many issues that we cannot agree on, particularly with respect to the funding of political parties. I propose a change in the way political parties are funded. Not surprisingly, what I would suggest is that the government give each candidate a certain amount—a bit along the lines of what Quebec does—so that he or she can conduct a truly democratic election campaign, and let the best man, or woman, win.

[*English*]

Mr. Cliff Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak against this legislation. Unless otherwise amended by members from all parties and approved by members from all parties, it will turn out to be a bad piece of legislation. This legislation is being pushed through the House in order to suppress debate and yet again, time allocation has been invoked. Shame on the government for cutting off debate.

There have been over 60 time allocations in six years. That is the Liberal record, which is about double the Mulroney record. Shame on the Liberals for shutting down debate on legislation with provisions that would stifle Canadian citizens their freedom of speech during federal elections. It stifles freedoms and liberties that go back to the Magna Carta of 1215. Rather than keeping the powers of government in check, Bill C-2 is expanding the powers of the federal government.

Bill C-2 is a gag law. It gags the freedom of Canadian citizens the right to speak up and be heard, hence it is dangerous legislation.

The Liberal government dubs Bill C-2 as legislation that will limit the influence of money in politics. That is for everyone except of course the Liberals themselves. That is what it is doing.

Under the legislation the Liberal governing party will be allowed to spend almost \$20 million in the country's various ridings, but it does not stop there. It can top that off with another \$12 million nationally which it can spend in any riding it wishes. It is all taxpayers' dollars. Some limit. The sky is virtually the limit for Liberal spending.

What about private citizens groups or other organizations? The following just shows the kind of bastion of hypocrisy the Liberal government really is. Bill C-2 would limit the spending of a private citizen, or an organization no matter how large, to an average of \$500 per constituency across the country with no more spending than \$3,000 targeted at any one riding.

Here is the stark contrast and hypocrisy of it all. Liberal candidates can spend millions of taxpayers' dollars to get themselves elected to office. However private citizens can spend at the most a few paltry thousand dollars and they are not even trying to get elected to office.

• (1650)

That is why Bill C-2 is so dangerous. Where do the millions that the Liberals can spend come from? Under Bill C-2 the majority of the \$30 million plus will come from taxpayers. How can this happen? How in heaven's name is this done? It is done, as all political bagmen know, through a generous system of tax credits and rebates. It is interesting that under this bill a limit really would never be reached.

It is the private citizens that the Liberals are trying to muzzle, even if the citizens are spending their own money. Bill C-2 really is not about how much money is being spent, but about who is spending it.

Here is what it boils down to. It is entirely okay for Liberals to spend the voters' money to spread Liberal opinions, but not for voters to spend it on their own opinions. That is even if they are not asking for a dime in tax breaks and slush funds.

Speaking of slush funds, Bill C-2 leaves contributions to Liberal associations and party campaigns a private matter, just like the deliberations of caucus and cabinet. In other words, it remains perfectly legal for wealthy contributors to meet privately with government decision makers and arrange to make money available to a Liberal association in exchange for a favour. The public of course would never really know about it unless there is an internal audit, like the billion dollar boondoggle at HRDC.

On the other hand, if private citizens and organizations use their money to communicate their views directly and publicly to voters, this would constitute buying influence in government and they

Government Orders

could go to jail. George Orwell would be proud and heck, so would Joseph Stalin.

Here is the biggest scam of it all. Under Bill C-2 most of the money the Liberals will spend in the next election will not even count as spending and thus faces no limits at all. I am talking about all the money the Liberal government can spend on self-promoting advertising.

The federal government is the biggest advertiser in the country. Here is a small example. Liberal backbenchers can send mailers to their constituencies attacking private organizations. It may cost more than \$3,000, but it will not count as election spending as long as it is mailed a few seconds before the writ is dropped. This is a standard practice of government MPs.

A bigger example is in the Prime Minister's own riding. Through various agencies and programs, \$12 million in grants and loans found their way to Shawinigan in time for the last election. The amount is even larger than the spending limit for the Liberal Party at the national level.

Under Bill C-2 that is the kind of pork barrelling that private citizens could not expose and attack in the next election. Private people would have to remain quiet, but will they? Will they?

Do we really think that a group that believes in individual freedom will comply with a law that threatens prison terms for citizens using their own money to communicate their own ideas to other citizens? Do we really think a group that believes in democracy will support a law that gives governments virtually unlimited use of public dollars to finance their re-elections? Do we really think a group that believes in free elections will adhere to a law that makes it a crime for citizens to publicly advertise in a free press, but gives uncontrolled avenues of private influence to friends and cronies? Of course not.

There is no doubt that Bill C-2 will pass in the House unamended, but the gag law will be defeated. This oppressive law will be overturned as others have been overturned. That will be a good thing for the freedoms and liberties of all Canadians.

• (1655)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Before we go to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, I want to put on the record the fact that I listened carefully to the presentation of the hon. member for Yellowhead and the word hypocrisy was used. As all members know, no word is of itself unparliamentary; it is the form and the context. As long as that word which has been repeatedly ruled unparliamentary is not addressed to a specific person, a specific member, but is used in general terms to reflect an action, it is a word that is used in the English language, it is descriptive and in my view it is parliamentary and quite permissible.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is always with a lot of pride that we in the Bloc Québécois are called to speak as representatives of Quebec's heartland.

It is perfectly natural for us to discuss such an issue as the elections act, given our tradition as Quebecers. We can truly speak about tradition as it dates back to 1976-77, the year the Parti Québécois was elected under the late René Lévesque, who had transformed Quebec election mores. This was a demand clearly expressed by the people.

It is therefore with great pride that we participate in this debate. We are proud, as Claude Ryan, this staunch federalist Quebecer said yesterday when he testified with great courage and paid homage to Quebec democracy. I was deeply moved to see the pride with which he spoke of Quebec democracy and our institutions in Quebec. I was also moved by the sadness which was permeating his remarks about how our democratic institutions are being trampled by a will coming from God knows where in Canada.

This is a fabrication, not to say a machination, of the Privy Council, presided by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Thus, in spite of the fact that there are some 20 members from Quebec among government members, we on this side feel no respect. However fine some of these members are, we feel no respect for Quebec democracy. Quebec has nothing to learn about democracy from this government, the people of Canada or any other people in the western world or elsewhere.

The Quebec people accepted with great calm and dignity the close result in the 1995 referendum. In other countries, it might have led to popular upheaval. It took only a few hours for everyone to understand that this result had to be accepted, even though it was eminently frustrating.

In a context of activism, losing a referendum with 49.4% of the vote is hard to swallow, particularly since we were ahead for part of the evening, as members will remember. It takes great political maturity and a great sense of democracy for things to be as dignified as they were on the evening of October 30, 1995.

All that to say that, in terms of democracy, we remain very comfortable. It is all the more upsetting, not to say humiliating, to see the sad spectacle that has been unfolding before us since just before the Christmas holidays. It is being perpetuated by this government's unreasonable desire to rush through Bill C-20, which changes the eminently democratic rules governing the way election are run in Quebec.

• (1700)

I will begin my presentation by quoting the 1991 Royal Commission on Electoral Reform and Party Financing, which stated in volume 1, page 483:

A cornerstone of public confidence in any democratic system of representative government is an electoral process that is administered efficiently and an electoral law that is enforced impartially. Securing public trust requires that the election officials responsible for administration and enforcement be independent of the government of the day and not subject to partisan influence.

These words are very important. It is said that election officials must be independent from the government of the day and not subject to partisan influence. Yet, the very opposite is happening today in Canada.

That is somewhat surprising when we know what the Canadian government is claiming in foreign countries and it has the audacity to lecture so-called underdeveloped countries and tell them how to administer their electoral activities.

I had the privilege to meet a young and talented lawyer from Quebec who was in Cameroon at public expense, for the Canadian Department of Justice, to explain to Cameroonians how to administer the electoral process. I believe he was not comfortable with this task. He could not, honestly—at least I hope not—make suggestions to Cameroonians, while believing in true democracy, on the strategic and sensitive function of local returning officer, as well as on the role of chief electoral officer who, hopefully, is not designated on a partisan basis.

As we know, returning officers are institutionally chosen by the political party in power, which is a true scandal, considering the importance of this function and the claims of Canada in foreign countries. I say that without necessarily judging the persons in office. However, it is almost mandatory, though this is probably not written down anywhere, for those who want to be returning officers to be members of the Liberal Party of Canada. It is even better if one has been a defeated candidate, a Liberal MP or president or vice-president of the Liberal Party's riding association. Then, one has a good chance at being chosen.

Decades go by, and it is truly indecent. It is even more indecent if we consider that in Quebec—Canada's most important neighbour for all sorts of reasons, historical as well as economic, a special partner that will remain so in the future with a good partnership agreement that people from both sides of the Ottawa River will come to wish for one day—a process was established when the Parti Québécois came to power in 1976 under the determined leadership of René Lévesque, who had made it its second priority, right behind the law on the French language, to pass a law on the financing of political parties, designed to ensure the independence of the whole electoral system. In the dark ages when Duplessis—whom many federalist Quebecers love to despise—was in power in Quebec, he ran things just like the Liberals are running them today, as if we were in the dark ages.

We have corrected things by ensuring that that strategic position—we cannot overstress this—is occupied by someone who has

Government Orders

been selected through a democratic and neutral process that ensures that those who are designated today, in the most neutral way possible, as returning officers in all the ridings of Quebec are chosen for their personal and human qualities as well as for their experience.

• (1705)

This gives rise to a situation such as the one in the federal riding of Trois-Rivières—this is not because she is not a nice person and, furthermore, she has the same name as mine—where the former vice-president of the Liberal Party of Canada, a very charming person to whom I send my regards, has been and still is, until further notice, the returning officer.

In Quebec, it is the former returning officer from the Conservative era who has been chosen, and by competition. He had the best resume, he made the best presentation and he defended his case the best. He was chosen among other candidates who had applied, probably people from the Parti Québécois. One must surely like politics to apply for this kind of job.

Given his skills and his relevant experience, it is the former returning officer chosen by the Conservatives at the time who is now the returning officer for Quebec in the riding of Trois-Rivières.

This illustrates very well the nobility of the process in Quebec, and it is urgent that the federal government copy that process, particularly as the chief electoral officer of Canada, probably an appointed official, has long been recommending that the government act in a non partisan way.

The government only needs the political determination, instead of trying to basely take advantage of the situation, as it is doing right now.

[English]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am honoured to stand in this place today on behalf of the constituents of Elk Island, whom I have the honour to represent, in defence of democracy and in defence of our country.

The question we are dealing with today is that of democracy. What is democracy? I humbly submit that the Liberals have it wrong. They somehow feel that democracy is when they get their own way, even though they received only 38% of the popular vote in the last election. They feel that with a majority in this place they can ram everything through.

That time allocation has been invoked on this bill is despicable. We are at second reading and debate will end before my speech is over. That will be the end of second reading. However, by the force of their majority membership the Liberals have already closed off debate on third reading, which has not yet begun. We have not yet debated the amendments which were made at committee and

Government Orders

already the Liberals have put time allocation on third reading. That was the vote which was held earlier this afternoon, which all Liberals were forced to vote for. I find this totally despicable. It is anti-democratic. For the Liberals to do that on this important bill is unconscionable.

I know that the technical name of the bill is an act to amend the Canada Elections Act, but I would like to call it the pump primer bill. We had a well on the farm where I grew up in Saskatchewan. The rule was that we always kept the primer pail full because if there was no water in the primer pail the pump would not work. Water was poured into the pump to prime it and when it was running the first thing we did was to replenish the pail so that the next time we went for water the pump would work. The Liberals are doing that with this bill. Bill C-2 is a primer bill.

The Liberals, I believe, are aware of the fact that after the next election they will no longer have a majority. They are trying to increase their chances of electoral success by doing everything possible in Bill C-2 to stack the odds in their favour. The Liberals are doing this with a number of different provisions in the bill, including the continuation of patronage appointments in the election process. This will hopefully win the favour of people in their ridings who could make money during the election by being good appointees of the government. That is one element of this bill which should not be passed. This is, after all, a democracy. This is where we want to hear the will of the people. However, the government does not know anything about democracy.

I would like to quote the Prime Minister. I came across this accidentally when I was looking at *Hansard*. Last week the Prime Minister, in response to a question from a Bloc member, said "I allowed a free vote in the House of Commons". We do not have to be very brilliant to see through that statement. In other words, the Prime Minister has the power to tell the people "You vote the way I tell you. When I choose, I will allow you to vote freely".

• (1710)

I believe very strongly in the principle of free votes in the House of Commons. I am very pleased that the new Canadian alliance has that in its policies, as did the Reform Party. I am proud to say that in every vote in this House I have voted according to what I believed was best for my constituents. Not once have I taken a voting order from the party hierarchy in Ottawa or anywhere else, contrary to what is done by members opposite. This is the essence of democracy. Does this government believe in democracy? No, it does not.

Let me give the House another example. We now have over 500,000 names on petitions asking the government to deal with the issue of child pornography. At the present time child pornography is legal in British Columbia. It is making inroads across the whole country because of this spineless government which is not willing to take action. We have 500,000 citizens who have said "Do

something", but the government does not do a thing. It just sits on it and lets it slide by. In a democracy, the wishes of the people, which have been so clearly expressed, would result in some action that would reflect the wishes of Canadian citizens. That is an area which is very important and the government is doing nothing.

I am absolutely appalled at the fact that the government will not accept even simple amendments. Earlier today the minister in charge of this bill said, off the record, that the reason the government had to invoke time allocation was because of all the deleterious amendments put forward by the opposition.

There is another way to speed up the passage of the bill, and that is to accept some of the amendments. To automatically assume that those amendments, because they come from one of the four opposition parties, are not worthy of respect or implementation is a false assumption which the government arrogantly assumes. Instead of listening to the amendments and changing some of the rules, it jams it through.

On command, it gets all of its members to rise, one at a time, when their strings are pulled, to vote for time allocation to shut down the debate on the democratic process in this country. I would be ashamed if I were a Liberal. In fact, if I were a Liberal I would hide somewhere, put my head under a blanket and hope that no one would ever find me. This is absolutely atrocious.

There are interesting concepts in this bill that need to be corrected. There are very, very important things. I would like to say that the government's lack of response on these meaningful amendments will backfire. It is saying that there will continue to be the rule of 50 members per party, and all of these other things. I do not have the time to go into them. We have finished the debate. It is done. It is closure.

I will use my last 30 seconds to make a simple prediction. The government thinks that it will jam this bill through with all of the advantages that will stack the deck toward the Liberals in the next election. That is going to backfire. Let it be said that this was first said here. I predict that, at minimum, the Liberals will be brought down to a minority level government the next time. At maximum, they will be where the Conservatives were after the election of 1993.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): It being 5.15 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage and second reading of the bill now before the House.

Mr. Ted White: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It has come to my attention that some of the amendments that were put forward by Reform, which will be voted on tonight, are seconded or proposed by a person other than the member for North Vancouver, myself, or the member for Elk Island. Some of those members unfortunately are not able to be present tonight.

Government Orders

• (1715)

Earlier this day we co-operated in the House to allow the transfer of some amendments from the NDP to another person's name. Therefore I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to transfer all the Reform motions which are not in the name of the hon. member for North Vancouver or the hon. member for Elk Island to be moved by the hon. member for North Vancouver and seconded by the hon. member for Elk Island.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Does the hon. member have the agreement of the House to proceed in such a way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The question is on Motion No. 4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 4 stands deferred.

[*English*]

Ms. Bev Desjarlais: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would seek the unanimous consent of the House to change Motions No. 53 and 138 standing in the name of the hon. member for Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys to that of the hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Does the hon. member have the agreement of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Ken Epp: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In view of the fact there is this magnanimity in the House right now, I think there was a misunderstanding previously. I would like to ask that you again ask for unanimous consent for what the hon. member for North Vancouver asked just moments ago.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): It would be my pleasure to ask the House again for its consent to the request of the hon. member for North Vancouver and the hon. member for Elk Island. Is there agreement?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The next question is on Motion No. 5. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 5 stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 6. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 6 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 7. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 7 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 25, 27 to 29, 32 and 33.

• (1720)

The next question is on Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 8 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 39 to 41, 44 and 76.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 9 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 37, 38, 42, 43, 75 and 77.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The question is on Motion No. 12. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 12 stands deferred.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 21. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 21 stands deferred.

Mr. Derek Lee: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My records show that if Motion No. 12 were negated, then we would put the question on Motion No. 13.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The division on Motion No. 12 was deferred.

Government Orders

Mr. Derek Lee: Madam Speaker, are you putting the question on Motion No. 13 later or now?

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Motion No. 12 was not negatived, the division was deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 23. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 23 stands deferred.

• (1725)

The next question is on Motion No. 24. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 24 stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 30 stands deferred.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 62 stands deferred.

Mr. Ted White: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am going to try again. Hopefully the House will be friendlier this time. I seek unanimous consent to reassign Motions Nos. 14, 15, 16 and 17 currently listed on the notice paper as sponsored by the member for Calgary Centre to stand in the name of the member for North Vancouver.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is there unanimous consent to proceed in such a way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): We will now proceed to Group No. 4.

Hon. John Manley (for Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-2, in Clause 325, be amended

(a) by replacing line 18 on page 129 with the following:

“a person with authority to authorize its transmission.”

(b) by replacing lines 23 to 25 on page 129 with the following:

“sion if reasonable notice has first been given to the person who authorized the transmission; or

Government Orders

(b) the removal by an employee of a public authority of a sign, poster or banner”

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 82

That Bill C-2 be amended by adding after line 2 on page 143 the following new clause:

“348.1 The definitions in this section apply in this Part.

“election advertising” has the same meaning as in section 319.

“government election advertising” means election advertising published by or on behalf of the Government of Canada, but does not include publications that are intended solely to inform the public about the law, government programs or public administration in a factual and non-partisan manner.

348.1.2 No person shall knowingly authorize, on behalf of the Government of Canada, any government election advertising during an election period or the three month period preceding the month in which a general election is to be held pursuant to subsection 57(2.1).

348.1.3 For the purposes of sections 422 and 423, where government election advertising is published in contravention of section 348.1.2, the cost of the government election advertising is deemed to be an election expense of the registered party that forms the government immediately prior to the election.”

Motion No. 83

That Bill C-2 be amended by deleting Clause 350.

Motion No. 84

That Bill C-2 be amended by deleting Clause 351.

Motion No. 85

That Bill C-2, in Clause 359, be amended by replacing lines 25 to 33 on page 148 with the following:

“(a) in the case of a general election, a list of all election advertising expenses and the time and place of”

Motion No. 86

That Bill C-2, in Clause 359, be amended by replacing lines 37 and 38 on page 148 with the following:

“election expenses incurred to promote or oppose the election of a leader of a registered party or eligible party in a given electoral district and the time and place of”

Motion No. 136

That Bill C-2, in Clause 496, be amended by deleting lines 13 and 14 on page 214.

Motion No. 137

That Bill C-2, in Clause 496, be amended by deleting lines 29 to 31 on page 214.

• (1730)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The question is on Motion No. 79. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 79 stands deferred.

Mr. Ken Epp: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I seek clarification on Motions Nos. 83 to 86, 136 and 137. I do not believe that those were properly disposed of. Do we not have to vote and do that preliminary part? I just want clarification.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): We just moved the motions and we will get to voting now.

The question is on Motion No. 82. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 82 lost on division.

(Motion No. 82 negated)

• (1735)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The next question is on Motion No. 83. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 83 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 84 to 86, 136 and 137.

We will now proceed to Group No. 5.

Hon. John Manley (for the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-2, in Clause 18.1, be amended by replacing lines 5 and 6 on page 13 with the following:

“future use in a general election or a by-election. Such a process may not be used for”

Motion No. 45

That Bill C-2, in Clause 44, be amended by replacing line 32 on page 24 with the following:

“surname, given names, sex, date of birth, occupation.”

Motion No. 47

That Bill C-2, in Clause 45, be amended by replacing lines 10 and 11 on page 25 with the following:

“elector’s surname, given names, civic address”

Mr. Ken Epp: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I heard you say Mr. Manley for Mr. Boudria, Mr. Boudria not being present. Does that not require unanimous consent?

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): As we all know, it is usual for a minister of the government to propose a motion in lieu of one of his colleagues.

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 55

That Bill C-2, in Clause 59, be amended by replacing lines 16 and 17 on page 30 with the following:

“disaster the conduct of the overall electoral campaign will be so severely hampered that a significant portion of the electorate in the affected district will not have a reasonable opportunity to consider the issues in that campaign and make an informed choice.”

Motion No. 56

That Bill C-2, in Clause 67, be amended by replacing line 24 on page 35 with the following:

“(a) a deposit of \$150;”

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 57

That Bill C-2, in Clause 81, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 37 to 41 on page 38 with the following:

“81. (1) No person who is in control of an apartment building, condominium building or other multiple residence building may prevent a”

(b) by adding after line 8 on page 39 the following:

“(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of a person who is in control of a multiple residence building whose residents’ physical or emotional well-being may be harmed as a result of permitting canvassing or campaigning referred to in that subsection.”

Motion No. 58

That Bill C-2, in Clause 93, be amended by replacing lines 13 and 14 on page 41 with the following:

“contain only the names and addresses of”

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 59

That Bill C-2, in Clause 107, be amended by replacing line 17 on page 47 with the following:

“(2.1) Each list referred to in subsection (2) shall set out the number assigned to each elector, the sex of each elector and the number assigned to the polling division to which the list relates.”

Motion No. 60

That Bill C-2, in Clause 107, be amended by adding after line 21 on page 47 the following:

“(3.1) Each returning officer shall provide each person acting as a candidate’s representative

(a) at an advanced polling station, with a printed copy of the revised lists of electors provided to the deputy returning officer of that station under subsection (2), and

(b) at a polling station, with a printed copy of the official lists of electors provided to the deputy returning officer of that station under subsection (2).”

• (1740)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 61

That Bill C-2, in Clause 117, be amended by adding after line 32 on page 51 the following:

“(3.1) Ballots shall contain, beside each candidate’s name, a recent photograph of that candidate to be sent to the Chief Electoral Officer no later than 25 days before polling day.”

[*English*]

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 64

That Bill C-2, in Clause 143, be amended by replacing line 25 on page 61 with the following:

“of the candidate, and shall provide satisfactory proof of his or her identity to the deputy returning officer, and on request to a representative of the candidate.”

Motion No. 65

That Bill C-2, in Clause 143, be amended by replacing line 29 on page 61 with the following:

“crossed off the list and, subject to sections 144 and 145,”

Motion No. 66

That Bill C-2, in Clause 144, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 34 and 35 on page 61 with the following:

“who has doubts concerning the identity of a person intending to vote at a”

(b) by replacing line 37 on page 61 with the following:

“show satisfactory proof of resi-”

Government Orders

Motion No. 67

That Bill C-2, in Clause 144, be amended by deleting lines 39 to 41 on page 61.

Motion No. 68

That Bill C-2, in Clause 144, be amended by replacing line 44 on page 61 with the following:

“proof of identity or take an oath under this Act.”

Motion No. 69

That Bill C-2, in Clause 145, be amended by replacing line 3 on page 62 with the following:

“identity under subsection 143(1) or satisfactory proof of residence under subsection 144(1), to take an oath required by this Act or”

Motion No. 70

That Bill C-2, in Clause 148, be amended by replacing line 38 on page 62 with the following:

“prescribed oath, after the”

Motion No. 71

That Bill C-2, in Clause 149, be amended

(a) by replacing, in the English version, lines 45 and 46 on page 62 with the following:

“unless (a) the elector gives the deputy returning officer a”

(b) by replacing lines 4 and 5 on page 63 with the following:

“(b) the deputy returning officer ascertains”

(c) by replacing line 10 on page 63 with the following:

“(c) the elector gives the deputy returning officer a”

[*Translation*]

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 72

That Bill C-2, in Clause 195, be amended by adding, in the English version, after line 5 on page 85 the following:

“Officer may invite the member to provide other information that the Chief Electoral Officer considers necessary to implement agreements made under section 55, but the member is not required to provide that information.”

● (1745)

[*English*]

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 73

That Bill C-2, in Clause 253, be amended

(a) by replacing line 17 on page 102 with the following:

“polling stations and shall, subject to subsection (1.1), appoint a deputy returning”

(b) by adding after line 18 on page 102 the following:

“(1.1) Every appointment of a poll clerk under subsection (1) shall be made from the list most recently sent under subsection 35.1(6) to the returning officer making the appointment and shall be made impartially.”

Motion No. 74

That Bill C-2, in Clause 253, be amended

(a) by replacing line 17 on page 102 with the following:

“polling stations and shall, subject to subsection (1.1), appoint a deputy returning”

(b) by adding after line 18 on page 102 the following:

“(1.1) Every appointment of a deputy returning officer made under subsection (1) shall be made from the list most recently sent under subsection 34.1(6) to the returning officer making the appointment and shall be made impartially.”

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The question is on Motion No. 18. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 18 stands deferred.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 45 stands deferred.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 55 stands deferred.

• (1750)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 56 stands deferred.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 57 stands deferred.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 58 stands deferred.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 59 stands deferred.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 60 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 61.

[Translation]

Mrs. Monique Guay: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Perhaps certain members need to be reminded that cellular phones

Government Orders

are not allowed in the House. I understand that there are members opposite who use their cellular phones very freely in the House.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The hon. member for Laurentides is perfectly right. Cellular phones are allowed neither in the House nor behind the curtains.

• (1755)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 61 stands deferred.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 64 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 65 and 67 to 70.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 66 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 71. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 71 stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 72. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 72 stands deferred.

• (1800)

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 73. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 73 stands deferred. I will now proceed to putting the motions in Group No. 6.

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 53

That Bill C-2, in Clause 57, be amended by replacing lines 25 to 37 on page 29 and lines 1 to 5 on page 30 with the following:

“(a) the date of issue of the writ for every electoral district shall be the second Monday in May that is nearest to four years after the previous general election;

(b) polling day shall be 35 days after the issue of the writ; and

(c) the proclamation shall fix a date for the return of the writ to the Chief Electoral Officer, which date shall be the same for all of the writs.

(3) Paragraph (2)(a) does not apply to a general election after a dissolution of Parliament that follows the resignation or dismissal of a government.

(4) The Prime Minister shall not advise the Governor General to dissolve Parliament except

(a) prior to a general election that is to be held on a date set by paragraph (2)(a), or

(b) at the time of tendering the resignation of the government.”

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 54

That Bill C-2, in Clause 57, be amended by adding after line 32 on page 29 the following:

“(2.1) Polling day in a general election shall be in the month that contains the fourth anniversary of the date of the next previous general election.

(2.2) Notwithstanding subsection (2.1), if Parliament is dissolved as a result of the resignation of the government on a day that is more than 60 days before the commencement of the month referred to in subsection (2.1), the proclamation referred to in subsection (1) shall fix a date for voting at the election that is no less than 36 and no more than 60 days after the day on which Parliament was dissolved.”

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 138

That Bill C-2 be amended by adding after line 15 on page 235 the following new clause:

“537.1 The House of Commons shall, without delay after the coming into force of this Act, designate a committee of that House composed of members from all parties in the House to

(a) carry out a comprehensive study of voter turnout in Canadian elections,

(b) to make recommendations in respect of changes to the Canada Elections Act designed to increase the rate of voter participation in Canadian elections, and

(c) to study the possibility of implementing a system of proportional representation for Canadian elections.”

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 142

That Bill C-2 be amended by adding after line 11 on page 248 the following new clause:

“562.1 Subsection 31(1) of the Act is replaced by the following:

31. (1) Where a vacancy occurs in the House of Commons, a writ shall be issued between the 11th day and the 144th day after the receipt by the Chief Electoral Officer of the warrant for the issue of a writ for the election of a member of the House.

(1.1) The date fixed for the election in the writ issued under subsection (1) shall not be later than six months after the day the Chief Electoral Officer received the warrant for the issue of the writ under that subsection.”

• (1805)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): We will now put the question on the motions in Group No. 6. The question is on Motion No. 53. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 53 stands deferred.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 138. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 138 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 142. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 142 stands deferred. The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at report stage of the bill.

Call in the members.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 22, 2000

Point of order

Tabling of Documents

Mr. Bergeron	3823
Mr. Ménard	3823
Mr. Loubier	3823
Mr. Laurin	3823
Mr. Canuel	3823
Mrs. Guay	3824
Mrs. Picard	3824
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	3824
Mr. Dumas	3824
Mr. Sauvageau	3824
Mr. Crête	3824
Mr. Bigras	3824
Mr. Mercier	3824
Mr. Rocheleau	3825
Mr. Godin (Châteauguay)	3825
Mr. Lebel	3825
Mr. Marceau	3825
Mr. Marchand	3825
Mr. Asselin	3826
Mr. Desrochers	3826
Mrs. Gagnon	3826
Ms. Alarie	3826
Mr. Fournier	3826
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean)	3827
Mr. Perron	3827
Ms. St-Hilaire	3827
Mr. Cardin	3827
Mr. Marchand	3827
Mr. Ménard	3827

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Order in Council Appointments

Mr. Lee	3827
---------------	------

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lee	3828
---------------	------

Committees of the House

Agriculture and Agri-Food

Mr. Harvard	3828
-------------------	------

National Defence and Veterans Affairs

Mr. Laurin	3828
Motion in concurrence	3828
Mr. Harb	3829
Mr. Hilstrom	3829
Mr. Laurin	3829
Mr. Hilstrom	3830

National Defence and Veterans Affairs

Mr. Godin (Châteauguay)	3831
Mr. Laurin	3831
Mr. Earle	3831
Mr. Laurin	3831
Ms. Alarie	3831
Mr. Laurin	3832
Mr. Lee	3832
Motion	3832
Motion agreed to	3833

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Elections Act

Bill C-2—Time Allocation Motion

Mr. Boudria	3833
Motion agreed to	3834

Canada Elections Act

Bill C-2. Report stage and second reading	3834
Mr. Casson	3834
Mr. Gilmour	3836
Mr. Elley	3837
Mr. Schmidt	3839
Division on Motion No. 87 deferred	3840
(Amendment agreed to)	3841
(Motion No. 90, as amended, agreed to)	3841
Mr. Bergeron	3841
(Amendment agreed to)	3841
(Motion No. 94, as amended, agreed to)	3841
Division on Motion No. 100 deferred	3841
Division on Motion No. 102 deferred	3842
Mr. Solomon	3842
Motion No. 143	3842
Mr. Solomon	3842
Motion No. 144	3842
Motion No. 145	3842
Mr. Epp	3842
Mr. Laurin	3842
(Motion No. 105 negatived)	3843
Mr. Laurin	3843
(Motion No. 105 negatived)	3843
Division on Motion No. 109 deferred	3843
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	3843
Division on Motion No. 111 deferred	3844
Division on Motion No. 122 deferred	3844
Division on the amendment to Motion No. 123 deferred ..	3844
Division on Motion No. 128 deferred	3844
Division on Motion No. 129 deferred	3844
Division on Motion No. 139 deferred	3845

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Agriculture

Mr. Myers	3845
-----------------	------

Correctional Service Canada

Mr. Stinson	3845
-------------------	------

Mouvement Desjardins

Mr. Patry	3845
-----------------	------

Heritage Day

Mrs. Redman	3845
-------------------	------

Agriculture

Mr. Casson	3846
------------------	------

Canadian Economy

Mr. Bélair	3846
------------------	------

Girl Guides of Canada

Ms. Carroll	3846
-------------------	------

Simcoe—Grey

Mr. Bonwick	3846
-------------------	------

Iran	
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	3847
Pilon Limitée	
Mr. Proulx	3847
Mouvement Desjardins	
Mr. Dubé (Lévis—et—Chutes—de—la—Chaudière)	3847
Revenue Canada	
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	3847
Burns Bog	
Mr. Herron	3848
Education	
Mr. Adams	3848
Bill C-20	
Ms. Alarie	3848
Hepatitis C	
Mr. Elley	3848
Health Care	
Ms. Wasylycia-Leis	3849
St. John's West	
Mr. Doyle	3849
Royal Canadian Regiment	
Mr. Clouthier	3849

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Human Resources Development	
Miss Grey	3849
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3849
Miss Grey	3849
Miss Grey	3849
Miss Grey	3850
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3850
Miss Grey	3850
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3850
Mrs. Ablonczy	3850
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3850
Mrs. Ablonczy	3850
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3850
Mr. Duceppe	3850
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3850
Mr. Duceppe	3851
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3851
Mr. Crête	3851
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3851
Mr. Crête	3851
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3851
Canada Health and Social Transfer	
Ms. McDonough	3851
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3851
Ms. McDonough	3851
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3852
Research and Development	
Mrs. Wayne	3852
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3852
The Economy	
Mr. MacKay	3852
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3852

Human Resources Development	
Mr. Solberg	3852
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3852
Mr. Solberg	3852
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3852
Mrs. Gagnon	3852
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3853
Mrs. Gagnon	3853
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3853
Mr. Jaffer	3853
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3853
Mr. Jaffer	3853
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3853
Mr. Tremblay	3853
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3853
Mr. Tremblay	3853
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3853
Ms. Meredith	3853
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3854
Ms. Meredith	3854
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3854
Audiovisual Productions	
Mr. Bergeron	3854
Ms. Copps	3854
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Szabo	3854
Mr. Axworthy	3854
Human Resources Development	
Mr. Goldring	3854
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3855
Mr. Goldring	3855
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3855
Gasoline Pricing	
Mr. Solomon	3855
Mr. Peterson	3855
Mr. Solomon	3855
Mr. Goodale	3855
Mr. Casey	3855
Mr. Peterson	3855
Mr. Casey	3855
Mr. Casey	3856
Mr. Peterson	3856
National Defence	
Mr. O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	3856
Mr. Eggleton	3856
Human Resources Development	
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead)	3856
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3856
Taxation	
Mr. Loubier	3856
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3856
Human Resources Development	
Ms. Davies	3856
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	3856
Gasoline Pricing	
Mr. Brison	3856
Mr. Peterson	3857
Justice	
Mr. Gallaway	3857

Ms. McLellan 3857

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada elections act

Bill C-2. Report stage and second reading 3857
Mr. Bergeron 3857
Motion No. 4 3857
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3857
Motion No. 5 3857
Mr. Bergeron 3857
Motion No. 6 3857
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3857
Motions Nos. 7 to 9 3857
Mr. Epp 3858
Motion No. 11 3858
Mr. Bergeron 3858
Motion No. 12 3858
Mr. Boudria 3858
Motion No. 13 3858
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3858
Motions Nos. 21, 23 to 25 and 27 to 29 3858
Mr. Bergeron 3859
Motion No. 30 3859
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3859
Motions Nos. 31 to 44 and 75 to 77 3859
Mr. Bergeron 3860
Ms. Catterall 3861
Mr. Bergeron 3861
Mr. Solomon 3862
Mr. Bergeron 3862
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) 3862
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) 3864
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault) 3864
Ms. Catterall 3864
Mr. Harvey 3865
Mr. Harvey 3866
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3867

Business of the House

Mr. Boudria 3868

Canada Elections Act

Bill C-2. Report stage and Second Reading 3868
Mr. Mahoney 3868
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3869
Mr. Mahoney 3869
Mr. Epp 3869
Mr. Mahoney 3869
Mr. Epp 3869
Mr. Mahoney 3869
Mr. Solomon 3870
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) 3871
Mr. Cauchon 3872
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) 3872
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead) 3873
Mr. Rocheleau 3874
Mr. Epp 3875
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3877
Division on Motion No. 4 deferred 3877
Ms. Desjarlais 3877
Mr. Epp 3877
Division on Motion No. 5 deferred 3877
Division on Motion No. 6 deferred 3877

Division on Motion No. 7 deferred 3878
Division on Motion No. 8 deferred 3878
Division on Motion No. 9 deferred 3878
Division on Motion No. 12 deferred 3878
Division on Motion No. 21 deferred 3878
Mr. Lee 3878
Mr. Lee 3879
Division on Motion No. 23 deferred 3879
Division on Motion No. 24 deferred 3879
Division on Motion No. 30 deferred 3879
Division on Motion No. 62 deferred 3879
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3879
Mr. Manley 3879
Motion No. 79 3879
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3880
Motions Nos. 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 136 and 137 3880
Division on Motion No. 79 deferred 3880
Mr. Epp 3880
(Motion No. 82 negatived) 3880
Division on Motion No. 83 deferred 3881
Motions Nos. 18, 45, and 47 3881
Mr. Manley 3881
Mr. Epp 3881
Motions Nos. 55 and 56 3881
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3881
Motions Nos. 57 and 58 3881
Mr. Boudria 3881
Motions Nos. 59 and 60 3881
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3881
Mr. Bergeron 3881
Motion No. 61 3881
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3881
Motions Nos. 64 to 71 inclusive 3881
Mr. Boudria 3882
Motion No. 72 3882
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3882
Motions Nos. 73 and 74 3882
Division on Motion No. 18 deferred 3882
Division on Motion No. 45 deferred 3882
Division on Motion No. 55 deferred 3883
Division on Motion No. 56 deferred 3883
Division on Motion No. 57 deferred 3883
Division on Motion No. 58 deferred 3883
Division on Motion No. 59 deferred 3883
Division on Motion No. 60 deferred 3883
Mrs. Guay 3883
Division on Motion No. 61 deferred 3884
Division on Motion No. 64 deferred 3884
Division of Motion No. 66 deferred 3884
Division on Motion No. 71 deferred 3884
Division on Motion No. 72 deferred 3884
Division on Motion No. 73 deferred 3885
Mr. Solomon 3885
Motion No. 53 3885
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3885
Motion No. 54 3885
Mr. Solomon 3885
Motion No. 138 3885
Mr. White (North Vancouver) 3885
Motion No. 142 3885
Division on Motion No. 53 deferred 3885
Division on Motion No. 138 deferred 3886
Division on Motion No. 142 deferred 3886

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



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 136 • NUMBER 054 • 2nd SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

**Tuesday, February 22, 2000
(Part B)**

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, February 22, 2000

• (1830)

[English]

And the bells having rung:

The Speaker: It is possible that we will have a long series of votes. I would urge all members to be patient. We will go through them systematically. As always, if members wish to rest they may go to the lobbies. That is where they will be able to eat and drink tea, et cetera.

The first question is on Motion No. 1 in Group No. 1.

• (1840)

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

(Division No. 693)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Blaikie	Borotsik
Brisson	Cadman
Canuel	Cardin
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Dumas
Earle	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Fournier	Gagnon
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Gruending
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Hardy
Hart	Harvey
Herron	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Konrad
Laliberté	Lalonde
Laurin	Lill
Loubier	Lunn

MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Ménard	Mills (Red Deer)
Muise	Nystrom
Obhrai	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Price
Reynolds	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solberg
Solomon	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vautour
Venne	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—105	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Augustine
Axworthy	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marleau
Matthews	McCormick

Government Orders

McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)	McDonough	McNally
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague	Ménard	Mills (Red Deer)
McWhinney	Mifflin	Nystrom	Ohrai
Minna	Mitchell	Picard (Drummond)	Piamondon
Murray	Myers	Reynolds	Robinson
Normand	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Rocheleau	Sauvageau
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan	Schmidt	Solberg
Paradis	Parrish	Solomon	St-Hilaire
Patry	Peric	Stinson	Strahl
Peterson	Pettigrew	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Turp	Venne
Pillitteri	Proud	Wasylcia-Leis	White (North Vancouver)
Proulx	Redman	Williams—87	
Reed	Richardson		
Robillard	Rock		
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)		
Serré	Sgro		
Shepherd	Speller		
St. Denis	St-Julien		
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)		
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo		
Telegdi	Torsney		
Ur	Valeri		
Vanclief	Volpe		
Wappel	Whelan		
Wilfert	Wood—140		

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 87. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 89, 91 and 95 to 99 in Group No. 2.

● (1850)

(The House divided on Motion No. 87, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 694)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy	Alcock	Anderson
Alarie	Asselin	Augustine	Axworthy
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Baker
Bergeron	Bigras	Bakopanos	Beaumier
Blaikie	Cadman	Belair	Bélanger
Canuel	Cardin	Bellemare	Bennett
Casson	Chatters	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête	Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Davies	de Savoye	Bonin	Bonwick
Debien	Desjarlais	Borotsik	Boudria
Desrochers	Dockrill	Bradshaw	Brison
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe	Brown	Bryden
Dumas	Earle	Bulte	Byrne
Elley	Epp	Calder	Cannis
Forseth	Fournier	Caplan	Carroll
Gagnon	Gilmour	Catterall	Cauchon
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Chamberlain	Chan
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goldring	Charbonneau	Clouthier
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)	Coderre	Collenette
Gruending	Guay	Comuzzi	Copps
Guimond	Hanger	Cotler	Cullen
Hardy	Hart	DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom	Dromisky	Drouin
Jaffer	Johnston	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Konrad	Laliberte	Eggleton	Finlay
Lalonde	Laurin	Folco	Fontana
Lill	Loubier	Fry	Gagliano
Lunn	Mancini	Galloway	Godfrey
Marceau	Marchand	Goodale	Graham
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield	Guarnieri	Harb
		Harvard	Harvey
		Herron	Hoeppner
		Hubbard	Ianno
		Iftody	Jackson
		Jennings	Jones
		Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
		Karygiannis	Keys
		Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
		Knutson	Kraft Sloan
		Lastewka	Lavigne
		Lee	Leung
		Limoges	Lincoln
		Longfield	MacAulay
		MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
		Malhi	Maloney
		Manley	Marleau
		Matthews	McCormick
		McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
		McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
		McWhinney	Mifflin
		Minna	Mitchell
		Muise	Murray
		Myers	Normand
		O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
		Pagtakhan	Paradis
		Parrish	Patry
		Peric	Peterson
		Pettigrew	Phinney
		Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
		Price	Proud
		Proulx	Redman

NAYS

Members

Government Orders

Reed
Robillard
Saada
Serré
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Torsney
Valeri
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—153

Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Sgro
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wayne
Wilfert

Herron
Hilstrom
Johnston
Laliberte
Laurin
Loubier
Mancini
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McDonough
Ménard
Muise
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Robinson
Sauvageau
Solberg
St-Hilaire
Stinson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne
White (North Vancouver)

Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoeppner
Konrad
Lalonde
Lill
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Mark
Mayfield
McNally
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Plamondon
Reynolds
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solomon
St-Jacques
Strahl
Turl
Wasylcia-Leis
Williams—88

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 87 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 89, 91 and 95 to 99 lost.

Naturally we take all hon. members at their word. After I have begun to read whatever we will vote on then members should not vote if they are not in their seats when I start. Members should remain until the end of the vote so that we do not make any mistakes.

The next question is on Motion No. 88. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (1855)

(The House divided on Motion No. 88, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 695)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Blaikie
Cadman
Casey
Chatters
Crête
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Elley
Forseth
Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Hart

Alarie
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Bigras
Borotsik
Canuel
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Doyle
Duceppe
Earle
Epp
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harvey

Alcock
Augustine
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Calder
Caplan
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Minna
Murray
Normand
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
DeVillers
Dion
Duhamel
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marleau
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proulx
Reed
Robillard
Saada

Government Orders

Scott (Fredericton)
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Vanclief
Wilfert

Sgro
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Torsney
Volpe
Wood—124

Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Williams—71

Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
White (North Vancouver)

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 88 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 92. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 93. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (1905)

(The House divided on Motion No. 92, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 696)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bergeron
Blaikie
Cardin
Casson
Crête
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Doyle
Duceppe
Earle
Fournier
Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Guay
Hardy
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lill
Lunn
Mancini
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McDonough
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Proctor
Robinson
Schmidt
St-Hilaire

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bigras
Canuel
Casey
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Epp
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Gruending
Hanger
Harvey
Hilstrom
Laliberte
Laurin
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McNally
Muise
Price
Reynolds
Sauvageau
Solomon
St-Jacques

Alcock
Augustine
Baker
Beaunier
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Boudria
Brown
Calder
Caplan
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Collenette
Coppes
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Longfield
Malhi
Manley
McCormick
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murray
Normand
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Richardson
Rock
Speller
St-Julien
Telegdi
Vanclief
Wood—107

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bélanger
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bradshaw
Bryden
Canniss
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
DeVillers
Dion
Duhamel
Finlay
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Lincoln
MacAulay
Maloney
Marleau
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proulx
Robillard
Saada
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Torsney
Volpe

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 92 lost. I therefore declare Motion No. 93 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 100.

[Translation]

The vote on this motion applies as well to Motions Nos. 112, 115, 117, 119, 132 and 134.

• (1910)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 100, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 697)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bigras
Cardin
Crête
de Savoye
Desrochers
Duceppe
Earle
Gagnon
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Guay
Laliberté
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
McDonough
Proctor
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Wasylcia-Leis—41

Asselin
Bergeron
Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Davies
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Gruending
Hardy
Lalonde
Lill
Marceau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Nystrom
Robinson
Solomon
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Bélanger
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Brison
Bryden
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Eggleton
Finlay
Gagliano
Godfrey
Goodale
Grose
Hanger
Harvard
Herron
Hilstrom
Ianno
Jackson
Jones
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)

Anderson
Axworthy
Baker
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bradshaw
Brown
Byrne
Cannis
Casey
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Collenette
Copps
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Epp
Fontana
Gallaway
Goldring
Graham
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Iftody
Jaffer
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Government Orders

Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lee	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Lunn	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Mark	Marleau
McCormick	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Normand	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud	Proulx
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Torsney
Vanclief	Volpe
Wayne	Whelan
Williams	Wood—130

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 100 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 112, 115, 117, 119, 132 and 134 lost.

• (1915)

The next question is on Motion No. 101. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (1920)

(The House divided on Motion No. 101, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 698)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bergeron	Bigras
Brison	Bryden
Cardin	Casey
Casson	Chatters

Government Orders

Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Dumas	Earle
Epp	Fournier
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Gruending
Guay	Hanger
Hardy	Harvey
Herron	Hilstrom
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Konrad
Laliberte	Laurin
Lill	Loubier
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau	Marchand
McNally	Ménard
Muise	Nystrom
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
St-Jacques	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
Williams—61	

NAYS

Members

Alcock	Anderson
Augustine	Axworthy
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Byrne
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harvard	Iaino
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knudson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lee	Limoges
Lincoln	MacAulay
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marleau
Matthews	McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Myers	Normand
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud	Proulx
Reed	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Speller
St. Denis	St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—101	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 101 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 113. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 114, 116, 118, 143, 144 and 145. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (1925)

(The House divided on Motion No. 113 which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 699)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Anderson
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Bennett
Bergeron	Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Cadman
Cannis	Canuel
Caplan	Carroll
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Cullen	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Dumas	Earle
Eggleton	Epp
Folco	Fontana
Fournier	Gagliano
Gilmour	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goodale
Grewal	Gruending
Guarnieri	Harb
Hardy	Harvard
Jennings	Jordan
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knudson
Konrad	Laliberte
Laurin	Lee
Lill	Limoges
Lunn	MacAulay
Mahoney	Maloney
Manley	Marceau

*Government Orders**(Division No. 700)*

Marchand
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 Mifflin
 Minna
 Myers
 Nystrom
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Proctor
 Proulx
 Rocheleau
 Saada
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Solomon
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Torsney
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Volpe
 Wasylcia-Leis
 Wilfert

Marleau
 Matthews
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 Ménard
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Mitchell
 Normand
 Paradis
 Pettigrew
 Picard (Drummond)
 Proud
 Robillard
 Rock
 Sauvageau
 Shepherd
 Speller
 St-Julien
 Szabo
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
 Valeri
 Venne
 Wappel
 Whelan
 Wood—134

NAYS

Members

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Brison
 Casson
 Doyle
 Goldring
 Hart
 Herron
 Johnston
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 McNally
 Schmidt
 Vautour
 Williams —25

Borotsik
 Casey
 Chatters
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Hanger
 Harvey
 Jaffer
 Jones
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Price
 Stinson
 Wayne

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 113 carried. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 114, 116, 118, 143, 144 and 145 carried.

● (1930)

The next question is on Motion No. 120. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 121.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 120 carried. I therefore declare Motion No. 121 carried.

(Motion No. 120 agreed to)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 102.

● (1935)

(The House divided on Motion No. 102, which was agreed to on the following division:)

Abbott
 Alarie
 Asselin
 Axworthy
 Bakopanos
 Bergeron
 Bertrand
 Blaikie
 Bonwick
 Boudria
 Brison
 Bryden
 Byrne
 Cannis
 Caplan
 Casey
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Chatters
 Clouthier
 Collenette
 Copps
 Cullen
 Dhaliwal
 Dockrill
 Drouin
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Earle
 Elley
 Folco
 Fournier
 Gagliano
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
 Goldring
 Grewal
 Gruending
 Harb
 Hart
 Harvey
 Ianno
 Jones
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keyes
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Laliberte
 Laurin
 Leung
 Limoges
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Mancini
 Marceau
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Matthews
 McDonough
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McNally
 Mifflin
 Minna
 Myers
 Nystrom
 Paradis
 Pettigrew
 Picard (Drummond)
 Price
 Proud
 Reed
 Robinson
 Rock
 Sauvageau
 Sgro
 Solberg
 Speller
 St-Hilaire
 Steckle
 Stinson
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
 Ur
 Vanclief

YEAS

Members

Adams
 Anderson
 Augustine
 Baker
 Bennett
 Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Bevilacqua
 Blondin-Andrew
 Borotsik
 Bradshaw
 Brown
 Bulte
 Cadman
 Canuel
 Carroll
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
 Coderre
 Comuzzi
 Cotler
 Desjarlais
 Dion
 Doyle
 Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
 Dumas
 Eggleton
 Epp
 Fontana
 Fry
 Gilmour
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 Goodale
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Guarnieri
 Hardy
 Harvard
 Herron
 Johnston
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
 Knutson
 Lalonde
 Lee
 Lill
 Lunn
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Maloney
 Manley
 Marchand
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 Mayfield
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 Ménard
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Mitchell
 Normand
 O'Reilly
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Plamondon
 Proctor
 Proulx
 Robillard
 Rocheleau
 Saada
 Schmidt
 Shepherd
 Solomon
 St. Denis
 St-Julien
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Szabo
 Torsney
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
 Valeri
 Vautour

Government Orders

Venne
Wappel
Wayne
Wilfert
Wood—169

Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan
Williams

Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Minna
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
Paradis
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Proud
Reed
Rocheleau
Saada
Schmidt
Shepherd
Solomon
St-Jacques
Steckle
Stinson
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Ur
Vanclief
Venne
Wappel
Wayne
Wilfert
Wood—165

Mayfield
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Normand
Obhrai
Peterson
Phinney
Plamondon
Proctor
Proulx
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Sgro
Solberg
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Valeri
Vautour
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan
Williams

NAYS

Members

*Nil/aucun

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 102 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 109.

• (1940)

(The House divided on Motion No. 109, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 701)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Anderson
Axworthy
Baker
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Bonwick
Boudria
Brisson
Bryden
Byrne
Cannis
Caplan
Casey
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Copp
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Dockrill
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Eggleton
Épp
Fournier
Gagliano
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring
Grewal
Gruending
Guay
Hardy
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Loubier
MacAulay
Mahoney
Mancini
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)

Ablonczy
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blondin-Andrew
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Cadman
Canuel
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Collenette
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Earle
Elley
Folco
Fry
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hart
Harvey
Iftody
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottetown)
Knutson
Lalonde
Leung
Limoges
Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney
Manley
Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)

NAYS

Members

*Nil/aucun

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 109 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 111.

• (1950)

(The House divided on Motion No. 111, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 702)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bailey
Bélair
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Canuel
Carroll
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Copp
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Drouin

Adams
Anderson
Axworthy
Baker
Bélanger
Bergeron
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Cadman
Cannis
Caplan
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Collenette
Debien
DeVillers
Dion
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)

Government Orders

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 111 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 122.

● (1955)

(The House divided on Motion No. 122, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 703)

YEAS**Members**

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alarie
Anderson	Asselin
Axworthy	Bailey
Baker	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Blondin-Andrew
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Byrne
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Canuel
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Casson
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Copps
Debien	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Doyle
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Eggleton	Elley
Epp	Folco
Fournier	Fry
Gagliano	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goldring
Goodale	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Gruending	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Hardy	Hart
Harvard	Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hubbard
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Johnston
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Laliberte
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne
Leung	Lill
Limoges	Longfield
Loubier	Lunn
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney	Malhi
Manley	Mancini
Marchand	Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mark
Matthews	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	Mayfield
McGuire	McDonough
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard	McTeague
Mills (Red Deer)	Ménard
Mitchell	Mills (Red Deer)
Murray	Mitchell
Normand	Murray
Obhrai	Normand
Parrish	Obhrai
Peterson	Parrish
Phinney	Peterson
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Phinney
Plamondon	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proctor	Plamondon
Richardson	Proctor
	Richardson

Duceppe	Dumas
Earle	Eggleton
Elley	Epp
Folco	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gilmour	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goldring
Goodale	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Gruending	Guay
Hardy	Hart
Harvard	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Leung	Lill
Limoges	Longfield
Loubier	Lunn
MacAulay	Mahoney
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Matthews	Mayfield
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Ménard	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Normand
Nystrom	Obhrai
Paradis	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Proctor	Proulx
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Saada
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Sgro	Shepherd
Solberg	Solomon
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan
White (North Vancouver)	Wilfert
Williams	Wood—160

NAYS**Members**

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Brison	Casey
Doyle	Harvey
Jones	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Muise	Price
St-Jacques	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vautour	Wayne—14

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

Government Orders

Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Sgro
Solberg
St-Hilaire
Steckle
Stinson
Szabo
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Valeri
Vautour
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—177

Rocheleau
Saada
Schmidt
Shepherd
Solomon
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Ur
Vanclief
Venne
Wappel
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)
Williams

Harvey
Hubbard
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde
Laurin
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mathews
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murray
Normand
Obhrai
Parrish
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Price
Proulx
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Sgro
Solberg
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Valeri
Vautour
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—177

Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Iftody
Jennings
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Laliberte
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lill
Lincoln
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marceau
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
Paradis
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon
Proctor
Richardson
Rocheleau
Saada
Schmidt
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Jacques
Steckle
Stinson
Szabo
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Ur
Vanclief
Venne
Wappel
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)
Williams

NAYS

Members

*Nil/aucun

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 122 carried.

The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 123.

• (2000)

(The House divided on the amendment to Motion No. 123, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 704)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Anderson
Axworthy
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blondin-Andrew
Bradshaw
Brown
Byrne
Calder
Canuel
Carroll
Casson
Chatters
Clouthier
Collenette
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel
Earle
Epp
Fournier
Gagliano
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring
Grewal
Grose
Guarnieri
Harb
Hart

Ablonczy
Alarie
Asselin
Baker
Bélair
Bellemare
Bergeron
Blaikie
Borotsik
Brisson
Bryden
Cadman
Cannis
Caplan
Casey
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Debien
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Dumas
Eggleton
Folco
Fry
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale
Grey (Edmonton North)
Gruending
Guay
Hardy
Harvard

NAYS

Members

*Nil/aucun

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the amendment to Motion No. 123 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 123 as amended. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

• (2005)

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2010)

(The House divided on Motion No. 123, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 705)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Anderson
Axworthy
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie
Borotsik
Brison
Bulte
Cadman
Cannis
Caplan
Casey
Chan
Clouthier
Collenette
Debien
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duhamel
Earle
Elley
Finlay
Fournier
Gagliano
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring
Grewal
Grose
Hardy
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Iftody
Jennings
Jones
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde
Laurin
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)

Ablonczy
Alarie
Asselin
Baker
Bélair
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Canuel
Carroll
Casson
Chatters
Coderre
Coppes
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Eggleton
Epp
Folco
Fry
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale
Grey (Edmonton North)
Gruending
Hart
Harvey
Hubbard
Jackson
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lill
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Mancini
Marceau
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney

Government Orders

Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murray
Obhrai
Parrish
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Price
Richardson
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Sgro
Solberg
St. Denis
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Valeri
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—169

Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Muisse
Myers
Paradis
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon
Proctor
Robillard
Rocheleau
Saada
Schmidt
Shepherd
Solomon
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Stinson
Szabo
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Ur
Vanclief
Venne
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)
Williams

NAYS

Members

*Nil/aucun

PAIRED MEMBERS

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 123, as amended, carried. The next question is on Motion No. 128.

• (2015)

(The House divided on Motion No. 128, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 706)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Bergeron
Blaikie
Brison
Canuel
Chatters
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Elley
Forseth
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lill

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Cadman
Casson
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Epp
Fournier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grewal
Gruending
Hardy
Harvey
Johnston
Laliberte
Laurin
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)

Government Orders

Mancini	Marceau
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McDonough
McNally	Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)	Muise
Obhrai	Picard (Drummond)
Price	Proctor
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Solberg	Solomon
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Vautour
Venne	Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—74

NAYS

Members

Adams	Augustine
Axworthy	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fry	Gagliano
Goodale	Grose
Harvard	Hubbard
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Leung
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Manley	Matthews
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Normand
Parrish	Peterson
Pettigrew	Pillitteri
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Sgro
Shepherd	St. Denis
St-Julien	Steckle
Szabo	Telegdi
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Whelan
Wilfert—93	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 128 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 129.

● (2025)

(The House divided on Motion No. 129, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 707)***YEAS**

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Bergeron	Blaikie
Canuel	Davies
Desjarlais	Duceppe
Earle	Fournier
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Gruending	Hardy
Laliberte	Lalonde
Lill	Marceau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
Ménard	Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)	Proctor
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Solomon
St-Hilaire	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Wasylcia-Leis—34

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Augustine
Axworthy	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Borotsik
Bradshaw	Brison
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Cadman
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Chatters
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel	Eggleton
Elley	Epp
Finlay	Folco
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Godfrey
Goldring	Goodale
Graham	Grewal
Grose	Hanger
Harb	Hart
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Johnston
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Mark

Government Orders

Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Mayfield
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 McWhinney
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Minna
 Muise
 Myers
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Obhrai
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pillitteri
 Richardson
 Rock
 Sgro
 Solberg
 St. Denis
 St-Julien
 Stinson
 Szabo
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Valeri
 Vautour
 Wayne
 White (North Vancouver)
 Williams —149

Matthews
 McCormick
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McNally
 Mifflin
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Mitchell
 Murray
 Normand
 O'Reilly
 Parrish
 Peterson
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Price
 Robillard
 Schmidt
 Shepherd
 Speller
 St-Jacques
 Steckle
 Strahl
 Telegdi
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Wappel
 Whelan
 Wilfert

Chan
 Clouthier
 Comuzzi
 Davies
 Desjarlais
 Dhaliwal
 Drouin
 Duhamel
 Earle
 Finlay
 Fontana
 Fry
 Gallaway
 Godfrey
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 Graham
 Gruending
 Harb
 Harvard
 Itody
 Jennings
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keyes
 Knutson
 Laliberte
 Lavigne
 Leung
 Limoges
 Longfield
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 McCormick
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 Ménard
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Murray
 Normand
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Parrish
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Proctor
 Robinson
 Rock
 Sauvageau
 Shepherd
 Speller
 St-Hilaire
 Szabo
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Wappel
 Whelan

Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
 Collette
 Cullen
 Debien
 De Villers
 Dockrill
 Duceppe
 Dumas
 Eggleton
 Folco
 Fournier
 Gagnon
 Girard-Bujold
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
 Goodale
 Grose
 Guay
 Hardy
 Hubbard
 Jackson
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
 Kraft Sloan
 Lalonde
 Lee
 Lill
 Lincoln
 MacAulay
 Malhi
 Manley
 Matthews
 McDonough
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McWhinney
 Mifflin
 Minna
 Myers
 Nystrom
 O'Reilly
 Peric
 Picard (Drummond)
 Pillitteri
 Richardson
 Rocheleau
 Saada
 Sgro
 Solomon
 St. Denis
 Steckle
 Telegdi
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
 Valeri
 Venne
 Wasylcia-Leis
 Wilfert—136

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 129 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 130. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 131, 133 and 135. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (2030)

(The House divided on Motion No. 130, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 708)

YEAS

Members

Adams
 Asselin
 Axworthy
 Bakopanos
 Bélaire
 Bellemare
 Bergeron
 Blaikie
 Bryden
 Byrne
 Canuel
 Catterall

Alarie
 Augustine
 Baker
 Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bevilacqua
 Bonwick
 Bulte
 Calder
 Carroll
 Cauchon

Abbott
 Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Brison
 Casson
 Doyle
 Elley
 Forseth
 Grewal
 Hart
 Herron
 Jones
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 McNally
 Muise
 Schmidt
 St-Jacques
 Strahl

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
 Borotsik
 Cadman
 Chatters
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Epp
 Goldring
 Hanger
 Harvey
 Johnston
 Konrad
 Mark
 Mayfield
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Price
 Solberg
 Stinson
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)

Government Orders

Vautour
White (North Vancouver)

Wayne
Williams—40

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 130 carried. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 131, 133 and 135 carried.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 139. A vote on this motion applies as well to Motions Nos. 140 and 141.

• (2035)

(The House divided on Motion No. 139, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 709*)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Canuel
Debien
Dockrill
Dumas
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay
Laliberte
Laurin
Marchand
McDonough
Nystrom
Proctor
Rocheleau
Solomon
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Wasylycia-Leis—39

Asselin
Blaikie
Davies
Desjarlais
Duceppe
Earle
Gagnon
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending
Hardy
Lalonde
Lill
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Robinson
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Augustine
Baker
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bryden
Calder
Casson
Cauchon
Chatters
Collenette
Cullen
Doyle
Duhamel
Elley
Finlay
Fry
Godfrey
Goodale
Grewal
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvard
Hubbard
Iftody

Adams
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bélaire
Bellemare
Bertrand
Brisson
Cadman
Casey
Catterall
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Comuzzi
De Villers
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Eggleton
Epp
Fontana
Galloway
Goldring
Graham
Grose
Hanger
Hart
Harvey
Ianno
Jackson

Johnston
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Konrad
MacAulay
Maloney
Mark
Mayfield
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Muisse
Parrish
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Saada
Solberg
St. Denis
Stinson
Telegdi
Vautour
Wayne
Williams—97

Jones
Keyes
Knutson
Lee
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Manley
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McGuire
McNally
Mills (Red Deer)
Normand
Pettigrew
Price
Rock
Schmidt
Speller
St-Jacques
Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Wappel
White (North Vancouver)

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 139 lost. I declare Motions Nos. 140 and 141 also lost.

• (2040)

We will now proceed to the motions in Group No. 3. The question is on Motion No. 4.

• (2045)

[*English*]

During the taking of the vote:

The Speaker: We should, as much as possible, try to keep track of our votes. We are now voting on the nays and as yet the Progressive Conservative members have not declared which way they are voting.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. That was my fault, not the fault of the party. I want that to be understood.

Before we go any further, rather than missing your turn, please pay attention to the way that you would like to vote. When we call the yeas, those in favour please stand. When we call the nays, those opposed please stand.

I am going to finish with those who wish to oppose this particular section. For this time only I will come back to the yeas, but we are not going to do this again.

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

(*Division No. 710*)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Asselin
Blaikie
Canuel

Alarie
Bergeron
Cadman
Casson

Chatters
 Debien
 Dockrill
 Dumas
 Elley
 Forseth
 Gagnon
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
 Goldring
 Gruending
 Hanger
 Hart
 Johnston
 Laliberte
 Laurin
 Lunn
 Marchand
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Mayfield
 McNally
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Picard (Drummond)
 Proctor
 Sauvageau
 Solberg
 St-Hilaire
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
 Wasylcia-Leis
 Williams—65

Davies
 Desjarlais
 Duceppe
 Earle
 Epp
 Fournier
 Girard-Bujold
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 Grewal
 Guay
 Hardy
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Konrad
 Lalonde
 Lill
 Marceau
 Mark
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 McDonough
 Ménard
 Nystrom
 Plamondon
 Robinson
 Schmidt
 Solomon
 Strahl
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
 White (North Vancouver)

Saada
 Shepherd
 St. Denis
 Steckle
 Telegdi
 Ur
 Vautour
 Whelan—109

Sgro
 Speller
 St-Jacques
 Szabo
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Valeri
 Wappel

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 5.

• (2055)

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

(Division No. 711)

NAYS

Members

Adams
 Axworthy
 Bakopanos
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bertrand
 Bonwick
 Boudria
 Bulte
 Calder
 Casey
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Clouthier
 Comuzzi
 De Villers
 Drouin
 Duhamel
 Finlay
 Fontana
 Gagliano
 Godfrey
 Graham
 Guarnieri
 Harvard
 Hubbard
 Jackson
 Jones
 Karetak-Lindell
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
 Kraft Sloan
 Lavigne
 Leung
 Lincoln
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Malhi
 Matthews
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 Mifflin
 Murray
 Normand
 Parrish
 Pettigrew
 Pillitteri
 Proud
 Richardson

Augustine
 Baker
 Beaumier
 Bellemare
 Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Bevilacqua
 Borotsik
 Brison
 Byrne
 Carroll
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
 Collenette
 Cullen
 Doyle
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Eggleton
 Folco
 Fry
 Gallaway
 Goodale
 Grose
 Harb
 Harvey
 Ianno
 Jennings
 Jordan
 Keyes
 Knutson
 Lastewka
 Lee
 Limoges
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 McCormick
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McWhinney
 Muise
 Myers
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Peric
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Price
 Proulx
 Rock

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
 Blaikie
 Brison
 Casey
 Chatters
 Desjarlais
 Doyle
 Earle
 Epp
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
 Grewal
 Hanger
 Hart
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Jones
 Lunn
 Laliberte
 Mark
 Mayfield
 McNally
 Muise
 Price
 Robinson
 Solberg
 St-Jacques
 Strahl
 Vautour
 Wayne
 Williams—57

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Borotsik
 Cadman
 Casson
 Davies
 Dockrill
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Elley
 Forseth
 Goldring
 Gruending
 Hardy
 Harvey
 Johnston
 Konrad
 Lill
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 McDonough
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Nystrom
 Proctor
 Schmidt
 Solomon
 Stinson
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Wasylcia-Leis
 White (North Vancouver)

NAYS

Members

Adams
 Asselin
 Axworthy
 Bakopanos
 Bellemare
 Bertrand
 Bonwick
 Bryden
 Calder
 Carroll
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
 Coderre

Alarie
 Augustine
 Baker
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bevilacqua
 Boudria
 Byrne
 Canuel
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Clouthier
 Collenette

Government Orders

Comuzzi	Copps	Earle	Epp
Cullen	Debien	Forseth	Fournier
DeVillers	Drouin	Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Duceppe	Duhamel	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Dumas	Eggleton	Goldring	Grewal
Finlay	Folco	Gruending	Guay
Fontana	Fournier	Hanger	Hardy
Fry	Gagliano	Hart	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Gagnon	Galloway	Johnston	Konrad
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey	Lalonde	Laurin
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goodale	Lill	Lunn
Grose	Guay	Mancini	Marceau
Harb	Harvard	Marchand	Mark
Hubbard	Ianno	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Iftody	Jackson	Mayfield	McDonough
Jennings	Jordan	McNally	Ménard
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes	Mills (Red Deer)	Nystrom
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Knutson	Kraft Sloan	Proctor	Robinson
Lalonde	Lastewka	Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Laurin	Lavigne	Schmidt	Solberg
Lee	Leung	Solomon	St-Hilaire
Limoges	Longfield	Stinson	Strahl
MacAulay	Mahoney	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Malhi	Maloney	Venne	Wasylcia-Leis
Marceau	Marchand	White (North Vancouver)	Williams—68
Matthews	McGuire		
McKay (Scarborough East)	McWhinney		
Ménard	Mifflin		
Murray	Myers		
Normand	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)		
Paradis	Parrish		
Peric	Peterson		
Pettigrew	Picard (Drummond)		
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri		
Plamondon	Proud		
Proulx	Richardson		
Robillard	Rock		
Saada	Sauvageau		
Shepherd	Speller		
St. Denis	St-Hilaire		
St-Julien	Steckle		
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo		
Telegdi	Torsney		
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)		
Ur	Valeri		
Venne	Wappel		
Whelan	Wilfert		
Wood—125			

NAYS

Members

Adams	Augustine
Axworthy	Bakopanos
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Brison	Bryden
Byrne	Caldier
Carroll	Casey
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Doyle	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges
Longfield	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Matthews
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Muise	Murray
Myers	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Paradis
Parrish	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pillitteri
Price	Proud
Proulx	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 6.

• (2100)

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

*(Division No. 712)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Asselin
Bergeron	Blaikie
Cadman	Canuel
Casson	Chatters
Davies	Debien
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Duceppe	Dumas

Government Orders

St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—115

Steckle
Szabo
Torsney
Valeri
Vautour
Wayne
Wilfert

Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Finlay
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Gruending
Harb
Harvard
Herron
Iftody
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mifflin
Minna
Muisse
Myers
Paradis
Peterson
Phinney
Price
Proud
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Ur
Vanclief
Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan
Wood—125

Drouin
Earle
Fontana
Galloway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Guarnieri
Hardy
Harvey
Hubbard
Jackson
Jordan
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McGuire
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Normand
Parrish
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Proctor
Proulx
Richardson
Robinson
Shepherd
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Torsney
Valeri
Vautour
Wayne
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 6 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 7. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 25, 27 to 29, 32 and 33.

• (2105)

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

(Division No. 713)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Cadman
Casson
Debien
Dumas
Epp
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Guay
Hart
Johnston
Lalonde
Lunn
Mark
Mayfield
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne
Williams—47

Ablonczy
Asselin
Canuel
Chatters
Duceppe
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grewal
Hanger
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Konrad
Laurin
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Mills (Red Deer)
Plamondon
Solberg
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
White (North Vancouver)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Bakopanos
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Borotsik
Bryden
Byrne
Caplan
Casey
Cauchon
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Comuzzi
Davies
DeVillers

Augustine
Bélaïr
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie
Boudria
Bulte
Calder
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Cullen
Desjarlais
Dockrill

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 25, 27 to 29, 32 and 33 lost.

• (2110)

The next question is on Motion No. 8. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 39 to 41, 44 and 76.

• (2115)

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

(Division No. 714)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Cadman
Elley
Forseth
Grewal

Ablonczy
Casson
Epp
Goldring
Hanger

Government Orders

Hart
Johnston
Lunn
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Solberg
White (North Vancouver)

Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Konrad
Mark
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Strahl
Williams —24

NAYS

Members

Adams
Asselin
Bakopanos
Bélanger
Bennett
Blaikie
Borotsik
Bryden
Byrne
Canuel
Casey
Chamberlain
Clouthier
Comuzzi
Davies
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel
Earle
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grose
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvey
Hubbard
Jackson
Jordan
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lastewka
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchand
Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Normand
Paradis
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon
Proctor
Proulx
Richardson
Robinson
Sauvageau
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Jacques
Steckle
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Ur
Vanclief
Venne
Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan
Wood —145

Alarie
Augustine
Bélair
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bonwick
Boudria
Bulte
Calder
Carroll
Cauchon
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Cullen
Debien
De Villers
Doyle
Drouin
Duceppe
Dumas
Finlay
Fournier
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Gruending
Guay
Harvard
Herron
Iftody
Jones
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kraft Sloan
Lalonde
Laurin
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Marceau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McGuire
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Proud
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Shepherd
Speller
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Valeri
Vautour
Wappel
Wayne
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 8 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 39 to 41, 44 and 76 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 9. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 37, 38, 42, 43, 75 and 77.

• (2120)

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 715)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Cadman
Casson
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Epp
Goldring
Hanger
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jones
Lunn
Mark
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Price
St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy
Borotsik
Casey
Doyle
Elley
Forseth
Grewal
Hart
Herron
Johnston
Konrad
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Muise
Schmidt
Strahl
Vautour
Williams—38

NAYS

Members

Adams
Asselin
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bonwick
Bryden
Byrne
Canuel
Carroll
Chamberlain
Coderre
Cullen
Debien
De Villers
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Finlay
Fournier
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvard
Iftody
Jordan
Keyes

Alarie
Augustine
Bélanger
Bennett
Blaikie
Boudria
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Cauchon
Clouthier
Coppes
Davies
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Drouin
Duhamel
Earle
Folco
Gagliano
Galloway
Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gruending
Guay
Hardy
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)

Government Orders

(Division No. 716)

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney	Ménard
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Normand	Nystrom
Paradis	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Robinson
Saada	Sauvageau
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan	Wood—132

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 9 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 37, 38, 42, 43, 75 and 77 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 11. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 28, 31 and 34 to 36. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2125)

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

Abbott
Alarie
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Canuel
Casson
Doyle
Dumas
Epp
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jones
Lalonde
Lunn
Marceau
Mark
Mayfield
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Schmidt
St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne
White (North Vancouver)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Asselin
Borotsik
Cadman
Casey
Debien
Duceppe
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grewal
Guay
Hart
Herron
Johnston
Konrad
Laurin
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Muise
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour
Wayne
Williams—64

NAYS

Members

Adams	Anderson
Augustine	Axworthy
Baker	Beaumur
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bulte	Byrne
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Chamberlain
Clouthier	Coderre
Copps	Cullen
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Earle
Finlay	Folco
Fry	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Graham
Gruending	Guarnieri
Harb	Hardy
Harvard	Hubbard
Jackson	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)

Government Orders

McWhinney	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Normand	Nystrom
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pillitteri
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—113	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 28, 31 and 34 to 36 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 12.

● (2130)

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

(Division No. 717)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Asselin
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman	Canuel
Cardin	Davies
Debien	Desjarlais
Dockrill	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Dumas
Earle	Elley
Epp	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Grewal
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Hardy
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Johnston
Konrad	Laurin
Lill	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)	Proctor
Robinson	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solomon
St-Hilaire	Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Williams—58

NAYS

Members

Adams	Anderson
Augustine	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélair	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Calder
Caplan	Casey
Catterall	Chamberlain
Clouthier	Coderre
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	DeVillers
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel	Finlay
Fry	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Jackson
Jennings	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Lincoln
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
McCormick	McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Muise	Murray
Myers	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pillitteri
Price	Proud
Proulx	Redman
Reed	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Shepherd
Speller	St-Jacques
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney	Ur
Vanclief	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—106

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 12 lost.

● (2135)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2140)

(The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 718)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Cadman
Canuel
Cardin
Casson
Chamberlain
Cloutier
Collenette
Coppes
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Dumas
Elley
Finlay
Forseth
Gagnon
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring
Grewal
Gruending
Hanger
Hardy
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Knutson
Laliberte
Laurin
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Marceau
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)

Adams
Anderson
Augustine
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Casey
Catterall
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
de Savoye
Desjarlais
DeVillers
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel
Earle
Epp
Folco
Fry
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Harvard
Herron
Hubbard
Jennings
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McDonough
McNally
Ménard
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)

Minna
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Proctor
Proulx
Reed
Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)
St. Denis
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Thibeault
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vanclief
Venne
Wappel
Wayne
Wilfert
Wood—179

Mitchell
Murray
Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Obhrai
Paradis
Patri
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proud
Redman
Robinson
Schmidt
Shepherd
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Ur
Vautour
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan
Williams

NAYS

Members

*Nil/aucun

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 13 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 21.

• (2145)

(The House divided on Motion No. 21, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 719)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Borotsik
Cadman
Cardin
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Doyle
Dumas
Elley
Forseth
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grewal
Gruending
Hanger

Alarie
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Canuel
Casey
Chatters
Crête
Debien
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Earle
Epp
Gagnon
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay
Hardy

Government Orders

Harvey	Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Laliberté	Laurin
Lill	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Muise
Nystrom	Obhrai
Picard (Drummond)	Price
Proctor	Robinson
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Solberg	Solomon
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne	Williams—78

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 21 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 23.

• (2155)

(The House divided on Motion No. 23, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 720)

NAYS

Members

Adams	Anderson
Augustine	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Calder	Caplan
Catterall	Chamberlain
Clouthier	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Finlay
Folco	Fry
Graham	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Maloney
Matthews	McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)	McWhinney
Mifflin	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Proud
Proulx	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sgro
Shepherd	St. Denis
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Torsney
Ur	Vanclief
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—101	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bigras
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman	Canuel
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	de Savoye
Debien	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Dumas
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)	Golding
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Hanger
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Mayfield
McNally	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Muise
Obhrai	Picard (Drummond)
Price	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solberg
St-Jacques	Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Wayne
Williams—61	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Augustine
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Chamberlain
Clouthier	Collenette
Comuzzi	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dockrill
Dromisky	Duhamel
Earle	Fry
Galloway	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Gruending
Guarnieri	Hardy
Harvard	Hubbard
Jackson	Jennings
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Government Orders

Knutson
Laliberte
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
MacAulay
Maloney
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mifflin
Mitchell
Myers
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Robinson
Scott (Fredericton)
Shepherd
St. Denis
Steckle
Szabo
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—117

Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
Malhi
Mancini
Matthews
McDonough
McWhinney
Minna
Murray
Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proctor
Proulx
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sgro
Solomon
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wilfert

Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
Solberg
St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wayne—61

Meredith
Muisse
Perron
Price
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp

NAYS**Members**

Adams
Anderson
Baker
Beaumier
Belanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caplan
Catterall
Chan
Collenette
Copps
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Fry
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Gruending
Hardy
Hubbard
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Leung
Limoges
MacAulay
Maloney
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mifflin
Myers
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proctor
Richardson
Robinson
Scott (Fredericton)
Shepherd
St. Denis
Steckle
Szabo
Ur
Vanclief
Wilfert

Alcock
Augustine
Bakopanos
Belair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bradshaw
Bryden
Calder
Carroll
Chamberlain
Clouthier
Comuzzi
Davies
Dhaliwal
Earle
Galloway
Goodale
Grose
Guarnieri
Harvard
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lill
Longfield
Malhi
Mancini
Matthews
McDonough
McWhinney
Murray
Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proulx
Robillard
Rock
Sgro
Solomon
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wood —108

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 23 lost.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 24.

● (2200)

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 721*)

YEAS**Members**

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Canuel
Casey
Chatters
Crête
Debien
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Forseth
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark
Mayfield

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Borotsik
Cadman
Cardin
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Epp
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grewal
Guay
Herron
Jaffer
Lunn
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally

*Nil/aucun

PAIRED MEMBERS

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 24 lost.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 30.

• (2205)

(The House divided on Motion No. 30, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 722*)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron	Bigras
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman	Canuel
Cardin	Casey
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas	Earle
Epp	Forseth
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Gruending	Guay
Hardy	Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Jaffer
Johnston	Laliberte
Lill	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McDonough
McNally	Ménard
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Muise	Nystrom
Obhrai	Perron
Price	Proctor
Robinson	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solberg
Solomon	St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—69	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Augustine
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Dhaliwal
Fry	Galloway
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harvard	Hubbard

Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lee
Leung	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
Malhi	Maloney
Matthews	McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)	McWhinney
Mifflin	Murray
Myers	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Proulx
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Scott (Fredericton)
Sgro	Shepherd
St. Denis	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—93	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 30 lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 62.

• (2210)

(The House divided on Motion No. 62, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 723*)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bergeron
Bigras	Blaikie
Canuel	Cardin
Casey	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas	Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Gruending	Guay
Hardy	Herron
Laliberte	Lill
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marchand	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Ménard	Muise
Nystrom	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Proctor
Robinson	Sauvageau
Solomon	St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vautour
Wasylcyia-Leis—49	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Anderson
Augustine	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Cadman
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Drouin
Elley	Epp
Fry	Galloway
Goldring	Goodale
Graham	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Ianno
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Longfield
Lunn	MacAulay
Malhi	Maloney
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Matthews
Mayfield	McNally
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Mills (Red Deer)
Murray	Myers
Normand	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Sgro
Shepherd	Solberg
St. Denis	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Volpe	Whelan
White (North Vancouver)	Wood—114

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 62 lost.

We will now proceed to vote on the motions in Group No. 4. The question is on Motion No. 79.

[Translation]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. At this point, you should be calling for the vote on Motion No. 14, not on Motion No. 79.

• (2215)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In response to the question by the hon. member for Rimouski—Mitis, Motion No. 14 was never put to the House. I think the hon. member referred to the old list, not the most recent one.

We will continue therefore with the question.

• (2220)

(The House divided on Motion No. 79, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 724)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alarie	Alcock
Anderson	Asselin
Augustine	Axworthy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bertrand
Bigras	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Calder
Canuel	Caplan
Cardin	Carroll
Casey	Casson
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Crête	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Earle	Elley
Epp	Folco
Fry	Galloway
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goldring
Goodale	Graham
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Gruending
Guarnieri	Guay
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
Lee	Lill
Limoges	Longfield
Loubier	Lunn
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand

Government Orders

Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 Mayfield
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 Ménard
 Mifflin
 Mitchell
 Murray
 Normand
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Pagtakhan
 Parrish
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Picard (Drummond)
 Pillitteri
 Proctor
 Reed
 Robillard
 Rock
 Schmidt
 Sgro
 Solberg
 St. Denis
 St-Jacques
 Steckle
 Szabo
 Torsney
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
 Ur
 Vautour
 Wappel
 Whelan
 Wilfert
 Wood—181

Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 Matthews
 McGuire
 McNally
 Meredith
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Muise
 Myers
 Nystrom
 O'Reilly
 Paradis
 Patry
 Perron
 Phinney
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Price
 Proulx
 Richardson
 Robinson
 Sauvageau
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Shepherd
 Solomon
 St-Hilaire
 St-Julien
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
 Turp
 Valeri
 Volpe
 Wasylcia-Leis
 White (North Vancouver)
 Williams

Herron
 Jaffer
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Laliberte
 Lunn
 Mancini
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Mayfield
 McNally
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Nystrom
 Proctor
 Schmidt
 Solomon
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 White (North Vancouver)

Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Johnston
 Konrad
 Lill
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Mark
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 McDonough
 Meredith
 Muise
 Price
 Robinson
 Solberg
 St-Jacques
 Wasylcia-Leis
 Williams—54

NAYS

Members

*Nil/aucun

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 79 carried.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 83. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 84 to 86, 136 and 137.

● (2225)

(The House divided on Motion No. 83, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 725)

YEAS

Members

Abлонczy
 Blaikie
 Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead)
 Casson
 Davies
 Dockrill
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Elley
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Hardy

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
 Borotsik
 Casey
 Chatters
 Desjarlais
 Doyle
 Earle
 Epp
 Goldring
 Gruending
 Harvey

Adams
 Asselin
 Axworthy
 Baker
 Bélair
 Bellemare
 Bigras
 Bonin
 Bryden
 Canuel
 Cardin
 Chan
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
 Collenette
 Copps
 de Savoye
 DeVillers
 Dromisky
 Duceppe
 Dumas
 Finlay
 Godfrey
 Graham
 Guarnieri
 Harvard
 Ianno
 Karygiannis
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Lastewka
 Lincoln
 Loubier
 Malhi
 Marceau
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 McGuire
 Minna
 Murray
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Paradis
 Patry
 Perron
 Pettigrew
 Picard (Drummond)
 Pillitteri
 Richardson
 Rock
 Scott (Fredericton)
 St. Denis
 St-Julien
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
 Turp
 Volpe
 Wood—105

*Nil/aucun

NAYS

Members

Alarie
 Augustine
 Bachand (Saint-Jean)
 Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bergeron
 Blondin-Andrew
 Brown
 Calder
 Caplan
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Coderre
 Comuzzi
 Crête
 Desrochers
 Dhaliwal
 Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
 Duhamel
 Eggleton
 Gallaway
 Goodale
 Grose
 Guay
 Hubbard
 Jackson
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
 Knutson
 Lee
 Longfield
 MacAulay
 Maloney
 Marchand
 McCormick
 Mifflin
 Mitchell
 Normand
 O'Reilly
 Parrish
 Peric
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Reed
 Robillard
 Sauvageau
 Speller
 St-Hilaire
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
 Vanclief
 Wappel

PAIRED MEMBERS

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 83 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 84 to 86, 136 and 137 lost.

[Translation]

We will now proceed to the motions in Group No. 5. The next question is on Motion No. 18.

• (2235)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 18, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 726)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alarie	Asselin
Augustine	Axworthy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Bryden
Calder	Canuel
Caplan	Cardin
Casey	Casson
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	De Villers
Dhaliwal	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Earle	Eggleton
Elley	Epp
Finlay	Folco
Gallaway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Goodale	Graham
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Gruending
Guarnieri	Guay
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Laliberte
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Loubier
Lunn	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Marceau
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
Mayfield	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire

McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murray
Nystrom
Paradis
Patry
Perron
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Proctor
Redman
Richardson
Robinson
Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)
Shepherd
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Vanclief
Volpe
Wasylcyia-Leis
Williams

McNally
Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Muise
Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Parrish
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Proulx
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Schmidt
Sgro
Solberg
Speller
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Valeri
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—172

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

*Nil/aucun

PAIRED MEMBERS

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 18 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 45. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 47.

• (2240)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 45, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 727)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Borotsik
Bryden	Byrne
Calder	Casey
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	De Villers
Doyle	Dromisky

Government Orders

Drouin	Duhamel
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Galloway
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jones	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peterson	Pettigrew
Pillitteri	Price
Proulx	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Ur
Vanclief	Vautour
Wappel	Whelan
Wood—99	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron	Bigras
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Canuel	Cardin
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Dumas	Earle
Elley	Epp
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Gruending	Guay
Hardy	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad	Laliberte
Loubier	Lunn
Mancini	Marceau
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McDonough
McNally	Ménard
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Proctor
Robinson	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solberg
Solomon	St-Hilaire
Strahl	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Wasylcia-Leis	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—69	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 45 carried. I also declare Motion No. 47 carried.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 55.

• (2245)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 55, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 728)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Blaikie	Borotsik
Canuel	Cardin
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Earle	Elley
Epp	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Gruending
Hardy	Harvey
Herron	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad
Laliberte	Loubier
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Marchand
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Muise
Picard (Drummond)	Price
Proctor	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solberg
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—73	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Augustine
Axworthy	Baker
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne

Government Orders

Calder
 Cauchon
 Charbonneau
 Coderre
 De Villiers
 Dromisky
 Duhamel
 Finlay
 Gagliano
 Graham
 Harvard
 Jackson
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keyes
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Lee
 Limoges
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 McCormick
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 Mifflin
 Minna
 Murray
 Patry
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Redman
 Richardson
 Saada
 Sgro
 Speller
 St-Julien
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Ur
 Volpe
 Whelan

Carroll
 Chan
 Clouthier
 Copps
 Dion
 Drouin
 Eggleton
 Folco
 Goodale
 Grose
 Hubbard
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
 Lastewka
 Leung
 Longfield
 Malhi
 Manley
 Matthews
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Mitchell
 Normand
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Proulx
 Reed
 Robillard
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Shepherd
 St. Denis
 Steckle
 Szabo
 Vanclief
 Wappel
 Wilfert—94

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 55 lost.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 56.

● (2250)

(The House divided on Motion No. 56, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 729)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
 Chatters
 Goldring
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Lunn
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 McNally
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Solberg
 White (North Vancouver)

Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
 Epp
 Grewal
 Johnston
 Konrad
 Mark
 Mayfield
 Meredith
 Schmidt
 Strahl
 Williams—22

NAYS

Members

Adams
 Asselin
 Axworthy
 Béclair
 Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Bigras
 Bonin
 Boudria
 Bryden
 Canuel
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Coderre
 Crête
 Davies
 Debien
 Desrochers
 Dhaliwal
 Dromisky
 Duceppe
 Dumas
 Finlay
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
 Gruending
 Harvard
 Herron
 Keyes
 Laliberte
 Loubier
 Maloney
 Manley
 Marchand
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 McGuire
 Ménard
 Muise
 Paradis
 Pettigrew
 Picard (Drummond)
 Proctor
 Sauvageau
 St. Denis
 St-Jacques
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Torsney
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
 Vanclief
 Wappel

Anderson
 Augustine
 Bachand (Saint-Jean)
 Bergeron
 Bertrand
 Blaikie
 Borotsik
 Bradshaw
 Calder
 Cardin
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Copps
 Cullen
 de Savoye
 Desjarlais
 De Villiers
 Dion
 Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
 Duhamel
 Earle
 Gagliano
 Graham
 Hardy
 Harvey
 Karygiannis
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
 Lee
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Mancini
 Marceau
 Marleau
 McDonough
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 Mifflin
 Normand
 Perron
 Phinney
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Robillard
 Speller
 St-Hilaire
 St-Julien
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
 Turp
 Volpe
 Wasylcia-Leis —96

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 56 defeated.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 57.

● (2300)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 57, which was agreed to on the following division:)

Government Orders

(Division No. 730)

Mark
Mills (Red Deer)
White (North Vancouver)—13Meredith
Strahl

YEAS

Members

Adams	Anderson
Asselin	Axworthy
Baker	Bakopanos
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Canuel
Cardin	Carroll
Casey	Cauchon
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Copps
Crête	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desrochers	DeVillers
Dion	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duhamel	Earle
Eggleton	Fry
Gagliano	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goodale
Graham	Gruending
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lee
Leung	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Maloney	Manley
Marceau	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Normand	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Paradis
Parrish	Perron
Pettigrew	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Proctor	Proud
Robillard	Scott (Fredericton)
Speller	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert—119	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Chatters
Epp	Goldring
Grewal	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 57 carried.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I would simply draw to your attention the fact that the House has been very flexible and very indulgent with members all evening, but there is one colleague, the member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia, who is taking the liberty of eating ice cream in the House. I invite you to call him to order.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Order, please. I admit having seen nothing, but if someone is indeed eating anything at all in the House, I would ask them to withdraw and return subsequently.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Order, please. The matter is closed.

The next question is on Motion No. 58.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

[English]

Mr. Peter MacKay: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We have heard from the whip of the Bloc Québécois. He seemed to indicate that there is a spirit of sweetness in the House. I would like to know if we could apply some of these votes so we might be able to get out of here to eat ice cream in the lobby.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I have ruled and the matter is closed.

The next question is on Motion No. 58.

● (2305)

(The House divided on Motion No. 58, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*Government Orders**(Division No. 731)***YEAS**

Members

Adams
Anderson
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bélanger
Bonin
Calder
Cassey
Cauchon
Coderre
Copps
Dion
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Fry
Godfrey
Graham
Harvard
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lee
MacAulay
Maloney
Marleau
McGuire
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Normand
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Pillitteri
Proud
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Speller
St-Jacques
Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vautour

Alcock
Augustine
Baker
Bélair
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Caplan
Catterall
Chan
Collenette
DeVillers
Doyle
Eggleton
Gagliano
Goodale
Grose
Hubbard
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Lastewka
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Manley
McCormick
McWhinney
Minna
Murray
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Pettigrew
Price
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Julien
Szabo
Torsney
Wood—82

NAYS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Blaikie
Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Davies
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Guay
Hardy
Jaffer
Konrad
Loubier
Marceau
Mark
McDonough
Meredith
Nyström
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Wasylycia-Leis—49

Asselin
Bigras
Canuel
Casson
Crête
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dumas
Epp
Goldring
Hanger
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laliberte
Mancini
Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Perron
Proctor
Solomon
Strahl
Turp

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 58 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 59.

● (2315)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 59, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 732)***YEAS**

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bergeron
Borotsik
Cardin
Casson
Crête
Desjarlais
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Guay
Hardy
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laliberte
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Ménard
Muisé
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
Solomon
St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Turp
Wasylycia-Leis—57

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bigras
Canuel
Cassey
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Davies
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Epp
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Harvey
Jaffer
Konrad
Lunn
Mancini
Marchand
McNally
Meredith
Perron
Price
Solberg
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour

NAYS

Members

Adams
Augustine
Baker
Bélair
Bellemare
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Bryden
Caplan
Cauchon
Chan
Cotler
DeVillers
Dion
Drouin
Folco
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Harvard
Ianno
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Lastewka

Anderson
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bélanger
Bertrand
Bonin
Bradshaw
Calder
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Grose
Hubbard
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lee

Government Orders

Leung
Lincoln
MacAulay
Maloney
Marleau
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Parrish
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Proulx
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Shepherd
St-Julien
Szabo
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—101

Limoges
Longfield
Malhi
Manley
Matthews
McGuire
McWhinney
Minna
Murray
Normand
Pagtakhan
Patry
Phinney
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Speller
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wilfert

Sauvageau
Solomon
St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Turp
Wasylycia-Leis

Solberg
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour
Williams—72

NAYS

Members

Adams
Augustine
Baker
Belair
Bellemare
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Calder
Caplan
Cauchon
Chan
Collenette
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Grose
Hubbard
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Maloney
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McWhinney
Minna
Murray
Normand
O'Reilly
Patry
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Saada
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—105

Anderson
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Belanger
Bertrand
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Coderre
Cotler
DeVillers
Dion
Drouin
Folco
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Harvard
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Lastewka
Leung
Longfield
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proulx
Reed
Rock
Shepherd
St. Denis
Steele
Szabo
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 59 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 60.

● (2320)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 60, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 733)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bigras
Canuel
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Davies
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Epp
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay
Hardy
Herron
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laliberte
Lunn
Mancini
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Meredith
Nystrom
Price

Alarie
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Casey
Chatters
Crête
de Savoye
Desrochers
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Forseth
Goldring
Gruending
Hanger
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Konrad
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Ménard
Muise
Picard (Drummond)
Proctor

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 60 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 61.

● (2325)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 61, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 734*)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Canuel	Cardin
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
de Savoye	Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dumas
Epp	Gagnon
Goldring	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Hanger	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad
Loubier	Lunn
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Schmidt
Solberg	St-Hilaire
Strahl	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	White (North Vancouver)
Williams —49	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Anderson
Augustine	Axworthy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélair	Bertrand
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Brown	Bryden
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Casey
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Coderre	Collenette
Coppes	Cullen
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Earle	Eggleton
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goodale
Gruending	Hardy
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Ianno
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottetown)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte	Lee
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough	McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)	Mifflin
Minna	Mitchell

Government Orders

Muise	Normand
Nystrom	Pagtakhan
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price	Proctor
Proud	Robillard
Saada	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney	Vanclief
Vautour	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Wood —98

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 61 lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 64. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 65 and 67 to 70.

● (2330)

(The House divided on Motion No. 64, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 735*)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron	Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Canuel
Cardin	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	de Savoye
Desrochers	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas	Epp
Gagnon	Goldring
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Hanger
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad	Loubier
Lunn	Marceau
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Perron	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solberg
St-Hilaire	Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	White (North Vancouver)
Williams —49	

NAYS

Members

Anderson	Axworthy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Blaikie	Bryden
Cauchon	Clouthier
Collenette	Coder
Davies	Desjarlais
Doyle	Drouin

Government Orders

Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Earle
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Galloway
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Gruending
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Hubbard
Jackson	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Laliberte
Lastewka	Leung
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Malhi
Mancini	Manley
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
McCormick	McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Myers	Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Patry	Pettigrew
Pillitteri	Price
Proctor	Proulx
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	St-Jacques
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Ur
Valeri	Whelan
Wilfert—81	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 64 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 65 and 67 to 70 lost.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 66.

● (2340)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 66, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 736)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Casson	Chatters
Epp	Goldring
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lunn
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Schmidt	Solberg
Strahl	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—25	

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Anderson
Asselin	Axworthy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bigras
Blaikie	Bryden
Calder	Canuel
Cardin	Cauchon
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Clouthier
Collenette	Copps
Cotler	Crête
Davies	de Savoye
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Doyle
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Dumas
Earle	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Gagnon	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goodale
Graham	Grose
Gruending	Guay
Guimond	Hardy
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Jackson	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Laliberte
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Leung
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	Loubier
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi	Mancini
Manley	Marceau
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
McCormick	McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Myers	Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Patry	Perron
Pettigrew	Pillitteri
Price	Proctor
Proulx	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur	Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan	Wilfert—110

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 66 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 71.

● (2345)

(The House divided on Motion No. 71, which was negated on the following division:)

*Government Orders**(Division No. 737)***YEAS**

Members

Ablonczy	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron	Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Canuel
Cardin	Casson
Chatters	Crête
de Savoye	Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dumas
Epp	Gagnon
Girard-Bujold	Goldring
Grewal	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad	Lalonde
Laurin	Loubier
Lunn	Marceau
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Perron	Sauvageau
Solberg	St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—48

NAYS

Members

Adams	Anderson
Augustine	Axworthy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bellemare	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Brown	Bryden
Calder	Caplan
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Coderre
Collenette	Copps
Cullen	Davies
Desjarlais	Dion
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Earle	Eggleton
Fry	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale	Gruending
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Laliberte
Lee	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Normand	Nystrom
Paradis	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price	Proctor
Proud	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Solomon
St. Denis	St-Jacques
Stewart (Northumberland)	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney	Vanclief
Wasylycia-Leis	Wood—82

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 71 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 72.

● (2350)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 72, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 738)***YEAS**

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Anderson
Augustine	Axworthy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélaire	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Brown
Bryden	Calder
Caplan	Casson
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chatters	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Dockrill	Doyle
Duhamel	Earle
Eggleton	Epp
Finlay	Folco
Fry	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring	Goodale
Graham	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Gruending	Hanger
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hubbard
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lee
Leung	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Mark
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Matthews	Mayfield
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McNally	McTeague
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Myers
Normand	Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Patry	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Price
Proctor	Proud

Government Orders

Proulx
Richardson
Rock
Schmidt
Sgro
Solomon
St-Jacques
Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Williams

Reed
Robillard
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Shepherd
St. Denis
Steckle
Szabo
Torsney
Valeri
Wasylycia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)
Wood —148

NAYS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Desrochers
Dumas
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Laurin
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bigras
Cardin
Crête
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Guay
Lalonde
Loubier
Perron
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—24

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 72 carried.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 73.

● (2400)

(The House divided on Motion No. 73, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 739*)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Chatters
Desjarlais
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Gruending
Hardy
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laliberte
Mancini
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Mills (Red Deer)
Proctor
Solomon
White (North Vancouver)

Blaikie
Casson
Davies
Dockrill
Epp
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Konrad
Lunn
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Meredith
Nystrom
Schmidt
Wasylycia-Leis
Williams—40

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Asselin
Axworthy
Baker
Bélair
Bellemare
Bergeron
Blondin-Andrew
Bryden
Byrne
Canuel
Cardin
Cauchon
Clouthier
Collenette
Cotler
Desrochers
Dion
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Folco
Gagnon
Godfrey
Graham
Guay
Harvard
Herron
Jackson
Jordan
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde
Laurin
Limoges
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Minna
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Perron
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proulx
Robillard
Sauvageau
Sgro
St-Jacques
Stewart (Northumberland)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Ur
Vanclief
Wilfert—119

Alarie
Anderson
Augustine
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Bélanger
Bennett
Bigras
Boudria
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Carroll
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Coderre
Coppes
Crête
Dhaliwal
Doyle
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fry
Girard-Bujold
Goodale
Grose
Guimond
Harvey
Hubbard
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Leung
Lincoln
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Marleau
Matthews
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Miffin
Mitchell
Normand
O'Reilly
Patry
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Proud
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
St-Hilaire
Steckle
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Valeri
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 73 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 74. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2405)

(The House divided on Motion No. 74, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 740)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Casson	Chatters
Epp	Goldring
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer	Johnston
Konrad	Lunn
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Schmidt	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—23	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Anderson	Asselin
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bélaïr	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Boudria	Bradshaw
Canuel	Caplan
Cardin	Cauchon
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Coderre
Collenette	Copps
Crête	de Savoye
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Eggleton	Fry
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goodale
Gruending	Guay

Government Orders

Guimond	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	Loubier
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Manley
Marceau	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough	Mifflin
Minna	Normand
Nystrom	Pagtakhan
Perron	Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Price
Proctor	Proud
Robillard	Rock
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Solomon	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Vanclief
Wasylycia-Leis—87	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 74 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 53.

• (2410)

(The House divided on Motion No. 53, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 741)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Casson
Chatters	Davies
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring	Grewal
Gruending	Hanger
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad	Laliberte
Lunn	Mancini
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom	Proctor
Schmidt	Solomon
Wasylycia-Leis	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—39	

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Alcock
Anderson	Asselin
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bélaïr
Bélaïr	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron

Government Orders

Bigras	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Calder	Canuel
Cardin	Carroll
Cauchon	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Collenette
Copps	Cotler
Crête	de Savoye
Desrochers	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dumas
Eggleton	Finlay
Fournier	Gagnon
Galloway	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Graham
Grose	Guay
Guimond	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Leung
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Manley
Marceau	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCormick	McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Patry	Perron
Pettigrew	Price
Proulx	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sgro
Shepherd	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Ur
Valeri	Whelan
Wilfert—101	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 53 lost.

• (2415)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2420)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 54, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 742)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Casson
Chatters	Davies
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Gruending
Hanger	Hardy
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad	Laliberte
Lunn	Mancini
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McNally	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Nystrom
Proctor	Schmidt
Solomon	Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—40

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Alcock
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bertrand
Bigras	Bonin
Brown	Bryden
Byrne	Calder
Cannis	Canuel
Cardin	Catterall
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Clouthier
Cotler	Crête
de Savoye	DeVillers
Doyle	Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dumas
Eggleton	Folco
Fournier	Gagnon
Galloway	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Graham
Grose	Guay
Guimond	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lee
Leung	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Marceau

Government Orders

Marleau
McGuire
McWhinney
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Paradis
Perron
Phinney
Price
Reed
Robillard
Sauvageau
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Jacques
Szabo
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Valeri
Wood—107

Matthews
McKay (Scarborough East)
Myers
O'Reilly
Patry
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Proulx
Richardson
Saada
Sgro
Speller
St-Hilaire
Steckle
Telegdi
Torsney
Ur
Whelan

St-Hilaire
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
White (North Vancouver)

St-Jacques
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Wasylcia-Leis
Williams —74

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bonin
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Clouthier
Collenette
Cotler
DeVillers
Dromisky
Eggleton
Folco
Galloway
Graham
Harvard
Iftody
Karetak-Lindell
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kraft Sloan
Lee
Limoges
Mahoney
Maloney
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Minna
Murray
Normand
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Ur
Vanclief
Wilfert

Alcock
Augustine
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Blondin-Andrew
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Coderre
Coppes
Cullen
Dion
Drouin
Finlay
Fry
Godfrey
Grose
Hubbard
Jackson
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lastewka
Leung
Lincoln
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proulx
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sgro
Speller
Steckle
Szabo
Torsney
Valeri
Whelan
Wood—114

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 54 lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 138.

● (2425)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No.138, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 743)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cardin
Chatters
Crête
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Earle
Forseth
Gagnon
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Gruending
Guimond
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Konrad
Lalonde
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Mills (Red Deer)
Perron
Proctor
Schmidt

Alarie
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bergeron
Blaikie
Canuel
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Davies
Desrochers
Doyle
Dumas
Epp
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay
Hanger
Herron
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laliberte
Laurin
Lunn
Mancini
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Meredith
Nystrom
Price
Sauvageau
Solomon

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 138 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 142.

Government Orders

● (2435)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 142, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 744)***YEAS**

Members

Abлонczy	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bergeron
Bigras	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Canuel
Cardin	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Davies
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dumas
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Fournier
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)	Gruending
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Harvey
Herron	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	Loubier
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Marceau
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom	Perron
Price	Proctor
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Solomon	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—72

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Augustine
Axworthy	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Cloutier
Coderre	Collenette
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	DeVillers
Dion	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale

Graham	Grose
Harvard	Hubbard
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lee
Leung	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Miffin	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Proud
Proulx	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sgro	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—123	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 142 lost.

[Translation]

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved that Bill C-2, as amended, be concurred in at report stage with further amendments and read a second time.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (2440)

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

(Division No. 745)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Cannis
Carrroll
Cauchon
Chan
Coderre
Copp
Cullen
Dion
Drouin
Eggleton
Folco
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lee
Limoges
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Minna
Murray
Normand
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)

Alcock
Augustine
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Clouthier
Collenette
Cotler
DeVillers
Dromisky
Duhamel
Finlay
Fry
Gallaway
Goodale
Grose
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Leung
Lincoln
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proulx
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sgro
Speller
Steckle
Szabo

Telegdi
Ur
Vanclief
Wilfert

Torsney
Valeri
Whelan
Wood—124

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cardin
Chatters
Crête
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Earle
Forseth
Gagnon
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay
Hanger
Herron
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laliberte
Laurin
Lunn
Mancini
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Meredith
Nystrom
Proctor
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
White (North Vancouver)

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Blaikie
Canuel
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Davies
Desrochers
Doyle
Dumas
Epp
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Gruending
Guimond
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Konrad
Lalonde
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Mills (Red Deer)
Price
Sauvageau
Solomon
St-Jacques
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Wasylcia-Leis
Williams —70

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare the motion carried.

I wish to inform the House that because of the delay there will be no Private Members' Business hour today. Accordingly, the order will be rescheduled for another sitting.

It being 12.44 a.m., this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12.44 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 22, 2000

Canada Elections Act

Motion No. 1 negatived	3888	Motion No. 24 negatived	3910
Motion No. 87 negatived	3889	Motion No. 30 negatived	3910
Motion No. 88 negatived	3890	Motion No. 62 negatived	3911
Motion No. 92 negatived	3890	Mrs. Tremblay	3911
Motion No. 100 negatived	3891	Motion No. 79 agreed to	3912
Motion No. 101 negatived	3892	Motion No. 83 negatived	3913
Motion No. 113 agreed to	3893	Motion No. 18 agreed to	3913
(Motion No. 120 agreed to)	3893	Motion No. 45 agreed to	3914
Motion No. 102 agreed to	3894	Motion No. 55 negatived	3915
Motion No. 109 agreed to	3894	Motion No. 56 negatived	3915
Motion No. 111 agreed to	3895	Motion No. 57 agreed to	3916
Motion No. 122 agreed to	3896	Mr. Bergeron	3916
Amendment to Motion No. 123 agreed to	3896	Mr. MacKay	3916
Motion No. 123, as amended, agreed to	3897	Motion No. 58 agreed to	3917
Motion No. 128 negatived	3898	Motion No. 59 negatived	3918
Motion No. 129 negatived	3899	Motion No. 60 negatived	3918
Motion No. 130 agreed to	3900	Motion No. 61 negatived	3919
Motion No. 139 negatived	3900	Motion No. 64 negatived	3920
Motion No. 4 negatived	3901	Motion No. 66 negatived	3920
Motion No. 5 negatived	3902	Motion No. 71 negatived	3921
Motion No. 6 negatived	3903	Motion No. 72 agreed to	3922
Motion No. 7 negatived	3903	Motion No. 73 negatived	3922
Motion No. 8 negatived	3904	Motion No. 74 negatived	3923
Motion No. 9 negatived	3905	Motion No. 53 negatived	3924
Motion No. 11 negatived	3906	Motion No. 54 negatived	3925
Motion No. 12 negatived	3906	Motion No. 138 negatived	3925
Motion No. 13 agreed to	3907	Motion No. 142 negatived	3926
Motion No. 21 negatived	3908	Motion for concurrence and second reading	3926
Motion No. 23 negatived	3909	Mr. Boudria	3926
		Motion agreed to	3927

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