



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 136 • NUMBER 098 • 2nd SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, May 16, 2000

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, May 16, 2000

The House met at 10 a.m.

[Translation]

Prayers

• (1000)

[English]

REPORT OF PRIVACY COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: I have the honour to lay upon the table the 1999-2000 report of the privacy commissioner.

[Translation]

This report is deemed permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

• (1005)

[English]

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of order in council appointments 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.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to its standing order of reference under Standing Order 108(2), the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development undertook, beginning in the month of June 1999, a study on the management of pesticides in Canada, including an evaluation of the performance of the Pest Management Review Agency in preventing pollution and in protecting the environment and human health.

[English]

I therefore have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development entitled "Making the right choice, un choix judicieux s'impose".

FINANCE

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Finance regarding its order of reference of Wednesday, May 10, 2000, in relation to Bill C-24, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act, a related act, the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Budget Implementation Act, 1997, the Budget Implementation Act, 1998, the Budget Implementation Act, 1999, the Canada Pension Plan, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, the Cultural Property Export and Import Act, the Customs Act, the Customs Tariff, the Employment Insurance Act, the Excise Act, the Income Tax Act, the Tax Court of Canada Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act.

The committee has considered Bill C-24 and reports the bill, with amendment.

* * *

[Translation]

BANK ACT

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-478 to amend the Bank Act and the Statistics Act (equity in community reinvestment).

Routine Proceedings

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am genuinely pleased to introduce a bill on community reinvestment by banks, calling upon the Superintendent of Financial Institutions to assess the effort being made by banks to respond to the credit requirements of all citizens, particularly the most disadvantaged.

I am confident that this bill will receive the support of all parties and I am asking the government not to call an election until it has been passed.

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

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Under presenting reports from committees I did not recognize the member for Edmonton—Strathcona. May we have unanimous consent to revert to presenting reports?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

* * *

• (1010)

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Miss Deborah Grey (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance) moved that the second report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, presented on Thursday, April 13, be concurred in.

She said: Mr. Speaker, although today's debate brings us to report stage and a report from the committee, what is actually happening is that the government is bringing in time allocation on legislation. I am sad to report that this is an all time championship, if one wants to call it that. The government has closed debate and snapped time allocation on legislation which does not even tie the Mulroney Conservative record but breaks it, and we call this democratic.

We have a government that has just brought in time allocation on the debate today for a record breaking 67th time. You and I have been here a while, Mr. Speaker. You certainly know that we have seen this happen time and time again. We saw it in the 1993 parliament and we have watched it in the 1997 parliament. The government has not only matched the Mulroney record of time allocation in closing off debate but has actually surpassed it now in much less time than the Mulroney Tories were here. What a shame.

I will highlight this travesty today and bring it to the attention of the Canadian people. I certainly think that as taxpayers they deserve to know exactly what is going on here and how these folks across the way have become the king of the ramrod.

I see colleagues across the way and I know that some of them would not be proud of this. In fact, one of them even served with the Mulroney Tories, as I understand it, and I do not think he was proud of bringing in time allocation 66 times. Now he is a Liberal, the hon. member for Edmonton Southeast for whom I have some respect, and he is a part of the government that has now brought it in 67 times. I know he has lived down here a while. Maybe I could brand him one of the Ottawa 67s. I wonder how that would make him feel.

An hon. member: If you don't like it then you should change the rules.

Miss Deborah Grey: Someone is saying that we should change the rules. What a wonderful idea that would be, but as soon as anyone would get up to try to change the rules the government would probably bring in time allocation or have a meeting and say that it does not like it that way.

Something is ridiculous here when we see that there truly is an anti-democratic disease that has got a hold of the government, and it needs to be exposed. I noticed that some members on the government side were free to write books about it and expose it a while ago, but I have not seen an exposé lately about the sin and corruption of government. I would love the hon. member to let us know about that. He is trying. It is good to get into government and give it a try from the inside. I think he knows and we know that it does not work.

Canadians need to know what is happening here today so they can judge for themselves whether they are being well served by the government. I do not think they are. Right now downstairs a couple of my colleagues are holding a press conference. They are making sure that the Canadian public knows exactly what is happening inside the Chamber here.

In six years the government has brought in time allocation 67 times. The government uses closure to quickly silence the opposition of which it was a part in years gone by and will be again sooner or later. Probably sooner. We can look at how it uses closure to quickly silence the opposition on controversial issues as opposed to stopping a filibuster—

Mr. Derek Lee: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just want to raise the issue of relevance. The hon. member is so blinded by her partisanship she has forgotten that she has moved concurrence in a committee report.

She is discussing a subject that has not even come up for debate. I am not saying it is not a subject for debate, but she is so blinded by that partisanship she has lost the relevance. I am asking the

Routine Proceedings

Chair to direct her back to the subject of debate, which is the committee report.

• (1015)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is it not serendipitous that I just happened to be consulting with the clerk about that very thing and I just happened to have that very report in my hand so as to ensure that when that challenge was made the hon. Leader of the Opposition could be gently persuaded to touch on the relevance of the motion.

Miss Deborah Grey: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will get to the topic.

I find it rather amusing, or maybe I find it rather sad, that government members have to jump up and say “They are being irrelevant”. Let me assure the hon. member, and let me assure you, too, Mr. Speaker, that I will get to what is happening now in the HRD committee. The hon. member has absolutely nothing to worry about when I start quoting from this document and then start quoting from that document. It is going to be so relevant it will make his head swim.

Regarding time allocation again, particularly this whole idea of report stage and what is going on right now with human resources development, it is absolutely amazing that a member of the governing side would stand to say “You are being irrelevant”. If what has been going on with this tragedy in human resources development over the last few months is irrelevant to Canadian taxpayers, I would bet a dollar they would want to storm this place. They know perfectly well that a government that is out of control is a government that is mismanaging millions, in fact billions of dollars. It is truly amazing that those members would have the nerve to stand and say this is irrelevant.

Why would I want to upset, harangue or offend some hon. members over there. Let us just get to the point at hand. This is when it really gets good. Let us talk about transitional jobs funds for a few moments. If that is not relevant to HRD and the committee, I do not know what is.

Let us look at political manipulation. My point with time allocation, which is certainly relevant, is that the government uses it for things that it simply wants to brush out of the way.

Let us look at transitional jobs fund contributions. Here is something in the HRD department that is painfully relevant for the government and for every Canadian taxpayer. An access to information request giving all transitional jobs fund contributions by constituency since its inception three years ago was analyzed.

Government members are quiet now. I think we are being relevant.

Let me quote from this document. I will name the province, I will name the amount of money granted through the transitional jobs fund as a percentage of the total and the number of projects that were funded as a percentage of the total. I know they are aware of how relevant this is, so let me give a few numbers.

In the province of Alberta the amount of money that was granted was \$3,548,154. My hon. friend from Edmonton Southeast knows that we are a sizeable percentage of the population out home in Alberta, but under the transitional jobs fund the percentage of total money that was granted through the TJF was 1.3%. His math is probably better than mine, but I know that 1.3% of the funding went to Alberta, which has close to 10% of the population.

He also knows that there is a veritable dearth of government members in Alberta. In fact, he is half. His friend from Edmonton West is the other half. I do not suspect he would think there was any political manipulation there in terms of granting through the TJF. I would not think so. I would hate to be that cynical to believe it. For Alberta there was 1.3%. The number of projects funded—six. The percentage total—0.6%.

Do we see him going home to Alberta saying “I am from the government and I am here to help you”? I have not seen him around town saying that. I respect the fact that he is not out flaunting or dishing out money like some others would do. At the same time, if we were to look at the bare bones and if people were to say that this is not politically motivated, my colleague on the Liberal side from Edmonton, as well as myself, would probably not believe them.

• (1020)

Let us look at British Columbia. The amount of money granted was \$17,680,920, which as a percentage of the total was 6.3%. B.C. has a fair population, but 6.3%? That seems rather strange to me. The number of projects funded through the TJF was 64. The percentage of the final total was 5.9%. It is not exciting, is it?

Let us move to Saskatchewan. The total amount granted was \$5,230,555. As a percentage of the total it was 1.9%. Granted, Saskatchewan has a somewhat smaller population, but 1.9%? The number of projects funded was 43. The percentage of the big total was 4.0%.

Let us move to Manitoba. The amount granted was \$5,450,995. That also was 1.9% of the total. There were 28 projects funded. The percentage of the big total—2.6%.

Let us move to Ontario, which is a fairly hefty province in terms of population. It was granted \$31,308,862. Its percentage of the total, with a huge percentage of the population, was 11.1%. The number of projects funded was 96. Its percentage of the total was 8.9%.

Let us move to Quebec. The amount was \$94,924,227 in terms of dollars granted, making its percentage of the total 33.7%. There is

Routine Proceedings

the province that is over in terms of population percentage; that is, actual percentage in terms of numbers across the country. There were 318 projects funded, representing 29.4%.

I know there would be some, if they looked up from their newspapers, who would say "There she is being critical again". No. It is rather funny, but that is where the Prime Minister's riding is and the ridings of others who perhaps had to buy a few seats from the separatists. That gets expensive. An incredible amount of money was granted, \$94 million. As I am making sure that I am relevant in this debate I will have a look later at some of the things that have gone on in terms of the TJF funding in the Prime Minister's riding and in that province in general.

Let us go to New Brunswick. The amount of money granted was \$30,958,605. As a percentage of the total that was 11%. There were 143 projects funded. In terms of the percentage of the big total it represented 13.2%.

Let us go to Prince Edward Island. The amount granted was \$9,724,041. That was 3.5% of the total. The number of projects was 35. The percentage of the big total was 3.2%.

Let us go to Newfoundland. The number of dollars granted was \$49,800,368, which was 17.4% of the total, and 192 projects were funded. As a percentage of the total it represented 17.7%.

Nova Scotia was granted \$30,374,481, which was 10.8% of the total, and 137 projects were funded, for a percentage of 12.7% of the total.

The Northwest Territories was granted \$1,795,675. The percentage of the total was 0.6%, and 17 projects were funded. As a percentage of the big total it represented 1.6%.

Then there is Yukon. The amount granted was \$1,380,000. The percentage of the total was 0.5%. Three projects were funded. Three projects for \$1.3 million. As a percentage of the total it represented 0.3%.

• (1025)

If we add it all up the lottery looks like this: the number of dollars granted was \$281,384,883, for a total of 1,082 projects. It is a good deal. It is amazing.

I hear that my colleagues have returned from the press conference, which was incredibly relevant. What they said at the press conference was, when these kinds of projects are handed out, when these kinds of dollars are involved, with the budget that the finance minister brought down and trumpeted, representing \$13 billion in grants and contributions, and whatever the bills will be to deal with these things in legislation, the government says "All right, you have had enough time. We are going to shut down debate". We are talking about \$13 billion. That is big bucks. There were some members who were screeching that this was irrelevant. No, it is incredibly relevant.

What my colleagues will be bringing up later, and what they discussed at the press conference, is that this kind of stuff really irritated government members when they sat on the opposition benches. Some members were not here at the time, but government members were extremely righteous. How we remember the shrieking.

Mr. Speaker, if you do not have the strength to sit through this, I am assuming that another Speaker will come along, and I certainly hope it is the member for Kingston and the Islands. I have some quotes which are real doozies from him when he was in opposition. I bet you a dollar he will think it is relevant, let me assure you.

Let us look at some of the things that happened in terms of the transitional jobs fund grants. There were a few anomalies. We could look at the percentages and the dollars. There are lots of ways we could describe it and explain it away, but let us look at a few of the anomalies.

The member for Parry Sound—Muskoka, who is the Secretary of State for Rural Development, received five transitional jobs fund grants worth a total of \$1,257,289. Three were given a month before the last election. Mr. Speaker, I know you would find that hard to believe. I know the table officers have never seen this happen in their history in this place before, that money would be dished out just before an election. One grant was approved during the time leading up to the 1997 election and one was approved two days after the election. Is that relevant? You bet. That kind of political manipulation has to stop. The Ottawa '67s over there are the folks who have the power to do that.

The unemployment rate—and this is incredibly relevant—in that member's riding was 8.1% in May 1997. Mr. Speaker, you were out on the hustings and so was I in May 1997. We were busy door-knocking along with our friend from Edmonton Southeast. We were talking about how shameful it was that the government would throw money into ridings during election times. Were we not? He is nodding. You bet. Yet it is lotto day in Parry Sound—Muskoka. The unemployment guideline was 12%. The unemployment rate in the member's riding was 8.1%.

Hon. Denis Coderre: Let's talk about last night.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, someone said "Let's talk about last night". I bet a dollar he would not want to do that either. The Liberals did not do so great.

Let us look at the riding of the member for Edmonton West, who is another neighbour. The girl just down the road. Her riding received three grants worth \$2,328,663 from the transitional jobs fund. All but \$70,000 was given in two TJF grants in late February 1997, three months before the election. We knew there was an election coming. The unemployment rate in the member's riding was about 7% in 1997. It was into the single digits. The guidelines, I am sure, were 12%.

Routine Proceedings

I have a memo to the minister about the TJF program dated November 1997, received through an access to information request, which says that there are no economic zones with 12% unemployment in Alberta. To be relevant, I know that the HRD minister says that you could pick a pocket of high unemployment, that there were pita pockets, unemployment pockets, pickpockets, whatever. The benchmark was 12%, but if the minister felt it was deemed necessary people could dip into those pockets of unemployment and help themselves to a TJF grant. The member for Edmonton West in 1997 was told, through these sensitive documents that found their way into public hands, that there were no economic zones with 12% unemployment in Alberta. There should have been a period and a new sentence saying “Thanks anyway but you do not qualify”. Of course, that did not happen.

• (1030)

Let us look at the Minister of Human Resources Development, the member for Brant. I want to make it clear that she was not the HRD minister back in 1997 but lotto days were alive and well. She received \$1,769,012 from TJF but her riding boasted an unemployment rate of 8.1% in 1997. It is even lower now at 8%. I doubt if it was government grants that created those jobs.

Let us look at another one. The leader of the Bloc Québécois, the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, his riding had an unemployment rate of 15% in 1996. He received \$100,000 over three years.

Smell anything here? Political manipulation? I would dare any one of them to stand and say that there was nothing political about this. Three government members whom I just listed got millions of dollars during the writ period in fact. Yet, the leader of the Bloc Québécois got \$100,000 in TJF grants over three years.

The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration whose riding lies directly beside the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie and had a lower unemployment rate of 12.1% at the time, received \$5,650,577. I am sure that is just absolute irony. I cannot imagine it would be anything else. We look at the unemployment rates of two ridings. One got \$100,000 over three years and the minister who was probably having quite the fight of her political career got \$5,650,577.

Let us look at the member for Fredericton who was in the news awhile ago. Things have been fairly quiet on the Fredericton front. He received \$571,509, yet the unemployment rate in 1996 for his riding was 9.9%.

They are not screaming irrelevant now, but you do need to listen to this, Mr. Speaker.

The guideline was 12% yet at 9.9% and 8.1% there was milk and honey. When it is election time no price is too much to buy that seat for those in government, “Just let us know what you want and we will tell you about the deep pockets”. But it is the Canadians’ deep pockets that are springing the cash. The folks across the way think

they have every God-given right to help themselves to those pockets and dish it out.

Let us look at what is probably the greatest anomaly in the whole program, the member for Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies. This Liberal backbencher managed to receive \$19,946,649. That is an amazing pile of cash; \$20 million over three years. This is especially interesting knowing that the 1996 census identified his riding as having an unemployment rate of, oops, just 12.2%. It might have been one of those pick a pocket areas. That is amazing.

It was a swing riding held by the Bloc. Now that is relevant. It looked like the Liberals were in danger of losing to the Bloc Québécois. Le député d’Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, 30 millions de dollars. A swing riding held by the Bloc. The MP received 15 transitional jobs fund grants just before and during the election worth a total of \$5,851,720. Seven of those were signed during the writ period.

I cannot imagine that anyone would be proud to stand and say, “I lead the government and I want to tell you about how well we are going to manage your money”. All these were signed during the writ period. It is absolutely amazing. There is no shame.

• (1035)

The Minister for International Trade, who was the minister of HRD back in the good old days before he got a transfer, signed off on 49 grants during the writ period of the last election, April 27 to June 2. I can hardly imagine he had time to go out and knock on a door or two. It seems pretty strange to me if he was that busy. He was just writing and signing his name. He thought he was autographing things as a famous person. It turned out they were grants.

That amounts to 4.5% of all the grants when that one month period comprised just 2.8% of the total length of the program. It is hard to believe.

Now he says, “Nothing was wrong at HRD. I did a fine job. I was a great steward of that department”. He turned it over to his buddy from Brant and it has just gotten worse since then.

There were 49 grants during the writ period. The writ period was about 37 days or so. That was more than one a day. That must have kept him busy. He must have had quite a campaign team out there knocking on doors and seeing businesses for him. He was a busy boy.

Looking at the amount of money, we like this question answered. Why would any approvals be signed during the election writ period at all? The Liberals had no idea they were going to be back in government. They had absolutely no idea what was going to happen to them. Yet while the cash is there, they want to keep signing their signatures and get that cash rolling especially in those awkward little seats, those persnickety people who looked like they

Routine Proceedings

were going to win the election, the Bloc. They just try to buy them off.

I woke up this morning and I noticed that we did not do particularly well in the byelection in Newfoundland, but we got a start and our name is known there now. We have one way to go and that is up.

It seems to me I saw on the news last night—and I could have been sleeping because I was tired and I must confess I was flipping back and forth to the hockey game—but I am sure I saw the Minister of Finance in Newfoundland announcing a \$58 million ferry. I suspect that would be confirmed by members on the other side. I am convinced I saw that. I would have to ask my friend from Edmonton Southeast because he would probably know the true story on it. I could have sworn I saw 58 million bucks being thrown into that byelection. Just buy a ferry and guess what, it did not work. It happened but it did not work.

Maybe the Canadian public is starting to say, “Hey, wait a minute. That is not your money you are offering us in your great lovingness and largesse. That is our money”. When I talked to Newfoundlanders a couple of weeks ago I made this point and I think they buy it.

We did not win the byelection but at least we doubled our vote in that byelection. The Tories went down in that vote; they lost about 12% or something like that. The Liberals lost a whole pile, up in the double digits again. The NDP made an incredible gain. I know there is one of them here who would celebrate today and say yea. Well, okay, he is nodding yea. He is being very shy about that close second. We, the Canadian Alliance, doubled our vote. That is more than any of those other parties. Three cheers for wrestler Sailor White.

Perhaps that was a little irrelevant, but not particularly, because it is government money. Who in their right mind would have the nerve to say, “Let us go buy this off”. I remember when Lucien Bouchard was here and he ran for the Tories in the byelection in 1984 I think. They said that his was the best riding money could buy. They paid for stuff that should not have even been paid by them. Yet, here it is with a big wink, “What can we do to help you? We will give you a hand here”.

Those days surely have to be over. But with this government that rams more and more legislation through the House, it really goes at it.

Alleviating unemployment was the secondary criteria of the transitional jobs fund. The Liberals said, “We will give you cash. We will get that whole job creation program going and we will virtually eliminate unemployment”. That begs the question, and I am not the economist in the crowd—

• (1040)

Hon. Denis Coderre: Who would notice?

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, at least I am free to admit it. It begs this question which I will ask the member, if government funding for job creation programs was the answer, why do we still have such high unemployment in this country? Should we not have zero percent unemployment? If throwing money at it will solve the problem, Lord knows between Mulroney and the present Prime Minister alone, they have thrown enough money at it. Between those two guys alone we ought to have about 0.03% unemployment in the country, but it does not happen that way.

The primary criteria were regional and political visibility. That is relevant, “Let me help you get the seat, let me make sure everything is okay for you in your riding” and make sure that everything looks wonderful.

I have some wonderful notes here which I will come across sooner or later. They are really good. They are notes about making sure that you look good, feel good, sound good. Here they are and for goodness sake, they are labelled “Calendar of Events and Site Visits”. Is that not handy? Let us move to that. That is relevant too, thanks be for that. If they are going to dish out some of those dollars, they might as well look good, sound good, feel good while it is happening.

The “Calendar of Events and Site Visits” was obtained by opposition research through access to information on April 15, 1999, barely one year ago. Is that relevant? Yes it is. It is a 160 page list on legal size paper of government funded projects to visit. Dated December 12, 1998 it was sent presumably on a routine basis to all Liberal members of parliament. I thought I saw everything that came into my office and I am sure I did not get that list of projects. Accompanying the list is a letter dated December 16, 1998 on privy council letterhead. Oh my.

Mr. Hec Clouthier: It is like a Christmas present.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, the member says it is a Christmas present. You bet. It is signed by Peter Donolo, director of communications for the Prime Minister, who has crossed over the Atlantic and now has a wonderful position in Italy. The letter says, “Specific dates for announcements/conferences remain opportunities for site visits as well”. Spiff yourself up, polish your nose, you are going out to dish out government money as if it were your own.

The calendar is designed to be used by the Prime Minister, ministers, secretaries of state, and no offence, last but not least, members of parliament on the government side of course, when planning visits to regions and home constituencies. Is that not the sweetest that the government members would be the dishes of cash and the dishes would be the people who were getting this government grant by a government member saying “Here you are, you lucky people, here is some cash”. Whose money is this anyhow? When money gets transferred from the government to a group or whomever in a riding, this is the living proof through access to

Routine Proceedings

information, that it is the government members who hand it out. And I certainly have seen government members dish it out.

There were 1,006 sites listed. Each site visit has a description, a contact name and a phone number. I just wonder who it might have been that they were ringing up to say, "I am here from the government and I am here to help you with your own money, or with someone else's money that was sent into the coffers". Among the names to be contacted for photo ops are officials in universities, other public bodies and private companies. That looks like photo op anonymous except it is not so anonymous. One has to be a member of the government.

Opportunities suitable for Liberal photo ops are youth oriented projects. Do the Liberals think youth are too stupid to know they are getting a dish out? I do not think so. Young people more than anyone else have it figured out that when they send money to Ottawa it is swirled around and Ottawa takes its cut off the top and gives some back. Come on. Get your picture taken. Liberal photo ops with youth oriented projects indicate that Liberal members of parliament want to be identified with the youth rather than the elderly.

• (1045)

Live the dream. Get those young people. Does the House know with whom the Liberal members of parliament ought to have their pictures taken? They ought to have their pictures taken with young people. They should tell those young people that they are sorry that they left them a \$600 billion debt. That is a photo op I would not mind seeing.

Unless any Liberal thinks this is irrelevant, for every single dollar that those young people pay in taxes, even those of us who are middle aged baby boomers or older people who are sending our dollars in, 30 cents out of every single dollar goes toward paying the interest alone on the debt.

Now those people across the way will say "Oh no, it was not our responsibility. It was those Tories when they came in".

Now the Tories of course will say "Oh no, it was those lousy Liberals who left it to us". And we all blame each other.

Let us look at the actual numbers. I think deficit financing started in about 1972. The person who was the finance minister during those years was none other than the member for Saint-Maurice. It really started with the Liberals spending more than they were taking in. What a legacy Trudeau left us: Take in a dollar and spend \$1.28.

A deal should be made to get a picture taken with young people saying "Sorry about that. We spent so much money and racked up the MasterCard so high that you young people are the unlucky recipients of our debt". Any offers over there to stand up and get a picture taken with a young person with that little slogan underneath

it? I think not. Yet they continue to say "Here you are. Here is a cheque".

Multiple departments, ranging from the Departments of National Defence and Industry, to ACOA, the Atlantic Canadian Opportunities Agency—but as the Liberal minister from Newfoundland used to call it back when he voted against it in the days when he had principles and voted against the Tories even bringing this in, the Atlantic Canada overblown agency—to CMHC, the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, are represented.

A heavy emphasis is placed on HRDC programs. No wonder; \$13 billion was given in grants and contributions. Wow, what a deal. The list demonstrates the government's ongoing intention to use government grants, especially HRDC grants, to profile its members. I am very grateful that someone jogged my memory about that particular little list.

I am certainly not being irrelevant but I do digress. Oh my, there is so much, Mr. Speaker. I know you are not tired of listening and I do appreciate that so much.

I was talking about the TJF earlier and about some of the members who got in on that incredible windfall, but besides the TJF there is another little thing called the minister's reserve. Now that is another handy little pocket full of cash. The TJF changed its name around 1996, I believe, to the Canada jobs fund, but it certainly did not change the sentiment. Maybe because the transitional jobs fund had so many problems attached to it and certainly the reputation was not great they changed the name to the Canada jobs fund.

However, they also have this little pocket called the minister's reserve. This is something extra special. There is more of an opportunity for political handouts. The following information is taken from access to information documents obtained by the official opposition during the fall of 1999. Surely no one on the government side would think that I am just jotting this down or making it up on my own.

I will me read a little bit of the information I received through access to information. It says that "There is a multimillion dollar annual fund within the Department of Human Resources Development's Canada jobs fund job subsidy program called the minister's reserve". This is as if it is her own personal cash.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: It is like a special bottle of wine.

• (1050)

Miss Deborah Grey: This is like her own RRSP account from which she is generously withdrawing cash.

One of my colleagues said that it sounds like a special bottle of wine. It is a special bottle of something or other for those who are

Routine Proceedings

getting cash under it. Under the transitional jobs fund it was \$3.3 million. Of course that is never enough. How could we get by on \$3.3 million in our own personal reserve pocket? It was raised to \$5 million a year in fiscal year 1999-2000. As if HRDC grants and contributions are not discretionary enough, we have the minister's reserve over and above.

Each year the provinces are granted a notional allocation. I remember in grade 8 home economics that we had to talk about notions: sewing, buttons, thread and all that kind of stuff. Maybe it is the same thing, I have no idea. Anyway, it is a notional allocation. It is the total amount one can expect from the TJF and CJF, but the minister's reserve is not part of that notional allocation. It is not as if we would sit down and have coffee and say that we have a notion to help somebody here. It is over and above the notional stage. Holy smokes, it is cash right out of the reserve. It is not even part of that notional allocation.

On February 18, 1999, just a year ago, the Atlantic council of regional executive heads—I assume they had bodies and things to go with them but these were the heads—senior HRD officials, wrote to the assistant deputy minister asking questions about the use of the reserve. At least—and good for them—they had the fortitude to ask the minister what this was all about.

To summarize the memo, it says “My colleagues in the Atlantic region are very concerned with respect to the proposed distribution under the CJF program”. Thank goodness for people in the bureaucracy who stand up to the minister and ask some of these questions. The memo goes on to say “Furthermore, due to the lack of regional consultation on the structuring of this proposal, we are requesting your review of our concerns”.

It would be easy for the government to rant about the opposition making a fuss about this but these are its very own officials, and good for them.

In this whole HRD scandal that we have witnessed swirling about us over the last few months, the minister has tried to stand up in question period and say that the official opposition, and in fact all opposition parties, were besmirching the officials at HRD. Let me correct the record. We are doing nothing of the sort. These are good people who are trying to do their jobs but their political masters keep getting their paws in the way and they are not allowed to do the job that they were hired to do.

On March 12 the assistant deputy minister replied by saying that under the new Canada jobs fund the minister's reserve was to be \$8 million but that the minister has agreed to \$5 million. Oh, my, do members not love it when they tighten their belts? If not \$8 million then I guess \$5 million will do. The minister has \$3.3 million at her discretionary spending. The government is trying to force her to take \$8 million but I guess she can live on \$5 million, which is over and above the \$13.3 billion in grants and contributions from the government. There it is, the minister is tightening her belt. She has agreed to \$5 million a year.

Regarding the use of the minister's reserve, the assistant deputy minister said “—for proposals that meet the terms and conditions of the Canada jobs fund that the minister wishes to fund”. What does that have to do with merit? I am astounded. I assumed that these projects, which the Liberals have been railing about for months, are based on merit. If they are based on merit, why should the minister have to be involved at all? That is a big \$13.3 billion barrel. This is the \$5 million little discretionary fund in her personal reserve that the minister wishes to fund. In brackets, it says “This continues the practice followed under the transitional jobs fund”. Okay, then if it happened under the TJF it might as well happen under the CJF, right?

This simply means that the minister can do whatever he or she likes with the fund. The note makes clear that a proposal under the reserve could be generated from the minister's office where we would not even have to hear about it. We would not even need to get an application form or anything like that. If I am just out there trucking around and I see what looks to be a great little project, I could initiate it all by myself. That is hard to believe.

• (1055)

An e-mail dated June 2, 1999, nearly a year ago, from a senior financial analyst at national headquarters indicates that at least one region's budget was reduced to accommodate the minister's reserve. A whole ministry's budget was cut back just so the minister's personal reserve could get a little extra cash in it. It is hard to believe.

An e-mail dated February 23, 1999 indicates that the minister's reserve was \$3.3 million under the TJF but was increased to \$5 million, as I mentioned earlier. The reason given was that the minister's office provided significant support to obtaining cabinet support for the Canada jobs fund and they felt that \$5 million a year for the minister's reserve was appropriate.

As far as we know, there were three disbursements totalling \$1.38 million from the \$10 million minister's reserve under the TJF. To our knowledge, none have yet been made under the CJF, although maybe the minister in question period today could let us know if any of those things have happened. Maybe we are not right up to snuff on that.

There was \$500,000 to Cornwall, the riding of the chief government whip. It is not up to a \$1 million but it is \$500,000 which is a step in the right direction, is it not? It is halfway there. The unemployment rate in his riding was 10.7% according to the 1996 census. It was supposed to be 12% but, yes, he was higher than Brant which was 8%.

Oh, my, \$500,000 to Brantford. Oops, that is the riding of the then Indian affairs minister. The unemployment rate in her riding was 8.4% according to the 1996 census.

Why did the HRD fund TJF projects in areas of less than 12% unemployment? We have asked that any number of times in the House. That is when we got the new creative line that it was the

Routine Proceedings

pockets of unemployment. We could just pick a pocket and fund whatever we like.

Other access documents showed that the 12% rule could easily be broken. The rule is 12% but who cares. We will just write a little rule to supersede the rule. The rule says that individual communities and groups of communities that had unemployment of 12% and greater but which were outside 12% unemployment insurance regions were also considered to be included in the 12% areas.

It is called a run-on sentence in high school English but let me carry on. In October 1997 Cornwall and Brantford were included as high unemployment areas. That is hard to believe. It looks pretty loosey-goosey here. It just goes on and on and on.

This sounds like a shell game, does it not? We have something under a shell, move it around, then we pick it up and we are not quite sure what we will find under it. Twelve per cent was the limit but let us always remember that it is not this government's money.

I will talk for a few minutes now about the actual HRD audit. This was what broke loose when everyone was recessed out of the House in January. I see that I am getting so relevant here that people are starting to hide behind the curtains. Tell them to brace up because there is more.

Let us go on to the question of how the HRD minister was made aware of serious problems with the grants and contributions. We have seen that it is a nightmare. Let us take a look at some of the problems with the grants and contributions and what the minister did or did not do about them.

On January 19, 2000 it was stated that Human Resource Development Canada manages grants and contributions programs that represent a significant investment in public funds. That means a lot of cash and taxpayer dollars. It was also stated that the audit looked at programs representing approximately \$1 billion of annual spending. That was a lot of cash.

It was further stated that HRD initiated the internal review to get an objective assessment of the administration of its grants and contributions programs. This type of review was part of an ongoing process to improve program management. Surely that is what we are all after. The audit looked at a random sample of 459 projects from April 1997 to June 1999. The review included a cross-section of projects from seven HRDC program areas across Canada. A number of areas requiring improvement were identified in the report, including project monitoring, contracting procedures and general financial practices.

• (1100)

For example, the auditors found that of the 459 project files, 15% did not even have an application on file. Of the remaining

applications, the following elements were missing. Some 72% had no cashflow forecast. In other words, what was going to be done with the money? They were not sure because they did not know what their forecasts were.

Some 46% had no estimate of the number of participants. Half the people, almost one out of two, said they did not know how many participants there would be. This is supposed to be job creation. We are supposed to be making sure that people are working. How many people were they going to have working? They were not sure yet. They had not figured it out yet.

Some 25% had no description of the activities to be supported. Maybe it was going to be a cribbage tournament. Who knows? Let us get together down at the local hall, and who knows what we are going to do?

Another 25% provided no description of the characteristics of participants. Who are these people they are trying to meet the needs of? Who are these people they are trying to minister to? They are not sure yet.

Some 11% had no budget proposal. How much were they going to spend on it? They did not know. There was no budget proposal whatsoever.

Another 11% had no description of expected results. What did they hope to accomplish by this? They were not really sure. Just give them the cash anyway and they will try to figure that out as they go along.

That was the review of 459 project files. I think there were about 60,000 projects, if my memory serves me correctly. If that is extrapolated, we are looking at a pile of cash. We labelled this the billion dollar boondoggle. Yet the minister continues to get up and say "No, we know exactly where that money is". Maybe they do. I do not know that I have accused her of saying that the money is missing, but I am sure saying the money is misspent. Where is it? This audit uncovered some amazing things.

Of all the files reviewed, 97% showed no evidence that anyone had checked to see if the recipient already owed money to HRDC. Nobody even asked if they had tried this one before. Did they get cash once already? No one even thought to ask that. It seems like a pretty basic question.

Eight out of ten files reviewed, that is 80%, did not show evidence of financial monitoring and 87% of project files showed no evidence of supervision. It seems to me that somebody somewhere ought to be asking these questions.

This is the billion dollar boondoggle that the minister tried to hide by saying that HRDC has already taken action to improve administrative standards and that a comprehensive action plan has

Routine Proceedings

been put into place. Dear knows we have heard about that action plan on and on again.

Let me look a little more specifically at the auditor general's report. He certainly was concerned about some of the things going on there and these huge percentages. The auditor general has made some comments on grants and contributions for many years now. In the December 1998 report of the auditor general, in chapter 27, section 12, he stated:

We have reported to Parliament on numerous audits of grant and contribution programs over the past 21 years. Many of those audits identified similar concerns.

In other words, here we go again. There was inconsistent application or interpretation of government policy on grants and contributions. We look at it and we say yes. There were inefficient use of funds and inadequate measures to ensure accountability by program recipients. Yes. There was lack of control, monitoring and evaluation. Yes. Reporting in the estimates and public accounts was inadequate to facilitate examination and year to year comparisons by parliament. Yes. That was in December 1998.

We saw exactly that going on in 1999. It was reported to the minister in January 2000 while the House was not sitting. We of course put in an access to information request on those documents. While that was over in the access department, the minister hurried and scurried and threw together a press conference to say that she wanted to be transparent and to bring this forward. I cannot exactly concur with that. It did not look transparent and forward to me. It looked like when your hand is caught in the cookie jar and someone is ready to give you a snap for it. You say you are sorry and apologize a little beforehand but only after you got caught.

• (1105)

Chapter 27.15 of the December 1998 audit of the auditor general on grants and contributions states that the 1985 audit of the direct assistance programs of the Department of Regional Industry Expansion reported a number of weaknesses in control processes and program delivery practices. In other words, it was not working. It has gone on for years. Any number of years ago I am sure the auditor general was making these same kinds of comments.

Chapter 27.17 states that in 1988, as part of the audit of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, ongoing concerns were reported in two main areas: the release of funds before complete documentation requirements had been satisfied and inadequate monitoring of band operations to ascertain whether funds were being spent for the purposes intended. It is unbelievable.

You run a business, Mr. Speaker. You know that you have to keep a pretty tight watch. You know also how much you lose through all

kinds of things. You know that well. We talked about it lately. You lose too much. You have to use an iron fist when you are the manager of something because stuff leaks. It disappears. Staff steal things. Someone says "I really like these baguettes at the French Meadow so I am going to help myself to them". Yes sirree. I would never accuse the member for Edmonton Southeast of stealing baguettes from French Meadow, but—

An hon. member: Does the member not have to speak to the item of business before the Chamber?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It is a question of relevance. I suspect we will have to leave it to the member's discretion.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, I thought it was incredibly relevant because you and I spoke about the problem of what happens when you are not able to keep tight control of things, whether it be a bakery or a book writing magnate. I have absolutely no idea.

Let me move on. In Chapter 27.17 he states that in 1998, as part of an audit of Indian affairs, concern was raised about the release of funds before complete documentation requirements had been satisfied. The paperwork must be done. It has to be finished, and it was not completed in Indian affairs.

In Chapter 27.18 in the 1990 audit of citizenship development programs of the Department of the Secretary of State the need to establish criteria for evaluating applications and results against program objectives was identified. Ten years ago they had the same concerns. It does not look like a lot has been solved since then. It was consistent with earlier observations concerning the need for departments to put more effort into monitoring and assessing program results. Even before 1990 they were concerned about it.

Chapter 27.19 states that in 1990 instances were reported where the Department of Industry, Science and Technology had not exercised due diligence. Imagine, no due diligence. Their work uncovered cases of projects being approved despite initial departmental analyses indicating that they did not meet eligibility criteria.

Chapter 27.20 of the auditor general's report of December 1998 stated that the 1993 audit of the northern cod adjustment recovery program administered by fisheries and oceans revealed the lack of a clear legislative authority to deliver the program, significant difficulties in targeting payments to those closely affected by the moratorium on fishing northern cod, payments to individuals who did not meet eligibility requirements, and weak financial management and controls. It looks to me like the nineties was kind of a painful decade for governments. Of course we remember that the

Routine Proceedings

Mulroney Tories were in office in the early nineties up until 1993 and then the Liberals took over. Frankly I have not noticed a whole lot of difference.

• (1110)

In fact, if we look at what is actually happening today regarding time allocation, it is just unbelievable. In the 33rd parliament which commenced on November 5, 1984, after the September 4 election of that year, time allocation and closure under Mulroney were brought in 20 times. There were 18 time allocation motions and 2 closure motions for a total of 20 times in that parliament.

They got a taste for it. I guess they figured it was not half bad. They could just ram through whatever they liked. The Tories were re-elected in November 1988. That parliament ended on September 8, 1993, when the writ was dropped by Kim Campbell. Remember her, she was the girl that had a summer job in this place.

In the 34th parliament the Tories got right into it and thought that they liked it so much they could ram anything through and perhaps they were divine. They brought in time allocation and closed debate off 46 times; 31 time allocation motions and 15 closure motions. They kind of liked this power thing. They could pretty well do whatever they liked here. They could just motor through. They could shove it through. They could ram it through. They could do whatever because, after all, perhaps they had the divine right to govern. They were here so they could do whatever.

If we add 20 and 46, that makes 66 times in the 33rd and 34th parliaments which commenced on November 5, 1984 and went until September 8, 1993. That is unbelievable. Now there are some Liberals snorting over there, shaking their heads in dismay. It was disgusting, certainly, but it was over nine years.

Let us look at time allocation and closure in this parliament. I know one of the members over there is new and she probably could hardly believe these numbers herself, but let me just refresh her memory. The 35th parliament began on January 17, 1994, after the October 1993 election. As I recall it was about 54 degrees below zero that day. Does anyone remember? Some would and some would not. In January 1994 when that parliament began it was cold, but boy it was hot in here. They were gearing up for unbelievable things.

Mr. Larry McCormick: It was not bike weather. That is for sure.

Miss Deborah Grey: It was not bike weather. The member got that right. In the 35th parliament which started on January 17, 1994, 37 times the government closed off debate with 32 time allocation motions and 5 closure motions. It is unbelievable.

In the 36th parliament, which is still ongoing and seems longer all the time because we watch them in operation and it is thoroughly amazing, 30 times already the Liberals have brought in closure on various motions: 29 time allocation motions and 1 closure motion. That is why we have a record setting event here today on this report stage to which I am speaking. It is hard to believe.

I do not think any one of them should be proud of it. I do not think any one of them is proud of it but they can explain it away so well. The Ottawa 67s, here they are right across the way: 67 times with 61 time allocation motions and 6 closure motions.

They would have all kinds of reasons, I am sure. They would have all kinds of reasons about how hard it is to govern and how they need to get all this magnificent legislation through. Some of it has been pretty thin gruel, as you have noticed, Mr. Speaker, because you sit in that chair for some hours at a time, thinking to yourself, I bet, what does this have to do with the nation's business. Precious little. He is seized of the issue. Yet there it is. It is all so important they just have to ram it through.

Some of it probably need not be brought forward in the first place. Some of the big legislation we have to deal with in this place gets short shrift. With 67 times these Liberals even outshoot and outscore the Mulroney Tories for closing off debate. They never thought they would hear that. I am sure they did not, but they are there. They are the record holder now.

I like Mark McGwire's record myself a whole lot better. There is a champ who knows how to hit a home run. He is supposed to hit home runs. That is what he gets paid for.

• (1115)

Government does not get paid to stifle debate and ram things through. The Mulroney Tory reign in power commenced on November 5, 1984 and ended September 8, 1993, approximately nine years. The Liberals under the Prime Minister came to power on January 17, 1994. They reached their 67th use of time allocation and time restriction on May 16, 2000, today. What a sad day for democracy. As I recall that bunch of people used to go pretty ballistic. I was here.

I would like to read a few quotes which are really precious. Let us go back to Mackenzie King. He was the longest serving Liberal prime minister. He said in the 1930s that closure was, "The most coercive and arbitrary act of which a government is capable". Imagine. Something has changed between then and now. He was a Liberal prime minister too. Is that not something. He said that it was the most coercive and arbitrary act of which a government was capable.

If given the chance the government members would leap to their feet and say that things have changed, that things are different now and they know what they are doing, that Mackenzie King had it

Routine Proceedings

easy. I do not think Mackenzie King had a really great time in government in the 1930s. Those were not happy times in our country. Yet it is okay now.

In a speech given by Mr. Stanley Knowles against the use of closure, he referred to former Liberal minister Frank Oliver's statements on the subject when he said, "Closure is not a blow at the rights of the Canadian people. When closure is imposed in this way by the moving of a motion that is out of order, it is a blow that strikes at the very heart of our democratic system". Those were carefully chosen words. That was a Liberal who said in 1956 that closure was not a blow at the rights of the Canadian people, it is a blow at the very heart of the democratic system.

Of course, the government members would say that things are different now too and that it is not closure. I love that little argument. They say it is not closure, that it is time allocation. Not one person in the House, even the Liberals when the day comes when they are in the opposition, could be convinced that there is a big fat difference between time allocation and closure. It is semantics. It makes a precious argument and it looks good in the scrum. But they will never convince me or anybody else across the country that there is any major difference between closure and time allocation.

No matter what the logistics of it are, the end run is always the same. The government stifles debate in the House. When I first came here I thought this was the house of debate. Yet whatever it is, it does not suit the Liberals' purposes and they want to ram it through so they use time allocation or closure. It really makes no difference what we call it.

Let me go to another one. This is the member for Ottawa West in 1989. For goodness sake, she is here to hear it. I am sure she will confirm it. Talking about Mulroney, she said, "This government has shown it has no respect for the public process, no respect for parliament and no respect for the opinions of the public".

Here she is today being dubbed as one of the Ottawa 67s. In government it is so much easier. It is fine when they are in government to ram it through.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: It is harder.

Miss Deborah Grey: It is harder but still not too hard. Otherwise they would not have to do it.

Maybe we should get a banner made up. Maybe we could go to the hockey team. Now that it is May we could get the Ottawa 67s jerseys and hand them over to those folks. They would not be able to wear them proudly like the Ottawa 67s hockey club does. The Ottawa 67s hockey club is proud to wear them. What does 67 mean? I was 15 and I remember that song. We were proud in 1967 of the Ottawa 67s hockey club. Yet the deputy whip said it is harder when in government. Maybe it is. But the question is, is it necessary? I think not.

• (1120)

Some of the legislation that has gone through the House probably was not necessary to even bring forward. That which was, surely to heaven, if everyone in the House spoke for 10 minutes on it, that would not be insurmountable. Members are given 10 minutes for speeches. The Leader of the Opposition is given an unlimited amount of time which we appreciate, but not everyone is so lucky. I am lucky and I am blessed.

Let me say again for all hon. members who are either listening or pretending they are reading that being in government is an incredible, serious responsibility. The government members cannot just toss this stuff off and say it was not okay in opposition, but it is okay now in government.

Here is the Ottawa 67s and it says Liberals on the jersey. Is that not cute. They would be proud to wear those Liberal jerseys, I am sure. Taxpayers' dollars were not used, an hon. member paid for it. I bet he wears this jersey with a lot more pride than he would wear an Ottawa 67s jersey today because he is a member of the 67th time allocation government that is proud of that.

Let me read a quote by another person who sits in the House, the current government House leader. When I first came here in 1989 I do remember the rants. Oh my. I sat back up over there between the Liberals and the NDP. I was the first and only Reformer for four and a half years, and oh, he was the professor, as one of his colleagues has said. He thought differently of time allocation when he was in opposition, I dare say.

Even though it is so difficult for him to bring it in, and harder as two of his colleagues have said, now that the Liberals are in government, this is what he said. I thought he believed it because I was here in November 1992 when he said, "I am shocked. Perhaps I should not be shocked. This government has used closure on dozens and dozens of occasions. This is just terrible. This time we are talking about a major piece of legislation. Shame on those Tories across the way".

That was the government House leader. How things change. How things change when they go from this side to over there. Oh, it is harder. It is like when your mom and dad say, "It kills me to have to give you a licking. It hurts me more than it does you to have to send you to your bedroom. I am so sorry I have to do this to you". Nobody buys it. Nobody buys it at all.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if you are ready for a shift change. I am delighted to have you here, but I have another good quote which I will set aside until the Deputy Speaker, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, takes the chair.

The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre who is now our Minister of Foreign Affairs had this to say on March 31, 1993, "Madam Speaker, do you realize that with the vote this afternoon, closure has been used in this House 25 times since 1988". Oh, my,

Routine Proceedings

he was scandalized. Twenty-five times does not hold a candle to what we are at today with 67. He said, "That equals the number of times closure was used from 1913 to 1988".

Wow, it is growing exponentially now. "In four years this government has used closure more often than all the other governments going back to 1913". From 1913 to 1988 of course he was scandalized by that as a Liberal opposition member. Boy, he has eclipsed them now. He went on to say on March 31, 1993, "That is a direct demonstration of the kind of disdain the Minister for International Trade and his colleagues have for the Canadian people".

I guess we have seen disdain with a capital *D* here today. The Liberals do not want to hear a dialogue or a debate. It is so awkward and just gets in the way of things. It is so difficult to ram things through if people are being obstinate and they want to debate the issues. Honestly.

• (1125)

To be willing to waste that much time is unbelievable. We would almost think the Liberals got elected to debate the issues or something. They do not want to hear a dialogue or a debate; they simply want to close the door so they cannot hear the real voice of the Canadian people.

A Liberal member in opposition back in 1993 said, "These kinds of arrangements concocted in the backrooms in the wealthy eating clubs the Minister for International Trade frequents are not working in the interest of Canadians. They are not working in the interest of other working people around the world". How things change. Yet they will say to me today, "Things are harder when we are in government. It is so difficult to bring in time allocation and closure when we are in government. It is hard don't you know, girl?"

I know a remedy for all that pain they are going through. Let people in the House address it and have a debate when it is over.

Let me read one more quote. I have some really good stuff here about the minister's reserve and I will get right back to that, but let me finish the quote. It hit the newspaper. Not much from *Hansard* hits the newspaper but this did. This was the article on April 1, 1993, "That is as many times as closure was used between 1913 and 1988 and displays the utter disdain with which this government treats the Canadian people, said an angry Minister for International Trade". It is hard to believe.

I was talking about the transitional jobs fund and I made mention also of the auditor general. I think one of the particular funding lines that I was using in terms of amounts, was pretty staggering, it was a doozy.

Mr. Leon E. Benoit: It is well worth waiting for. They are sitting on the edges of their chairs.

Miss Deborah Grey: Good, they ought to be sitting on the edges of their chairs.

I was talking about funding for the provinces and it was an amazing amount of cash. It is hard to believe, it was millions and millions of dollars. I would like to narrow that down a little and talk about some of the specifics of particular ridings.

The minister for HRD oversees the whole thing. I would like to use one example from her riding, that of Duchess Foods International which we asked a few questions about in question period not so long ago. Let us look at this particular riding. We do not want to be critical of Duchess Foods in particular, it is just the example I am using today.

There is an access to information document which we received in September 1999. Duchess Foods International is a prosperous six year old business from Hamilton which makes frozen food products, such as stuffed baked potatoes, for the President's Choice label. It relocated to the riding of the HRD minister after receiving a transitional jobs fund grant of \$369,000 on May 26, 1998. The minister had provided her approval on May 9, 1998.

The company purchased land from the city of Brantford for \$112,400 in June 1998 and received two Business Development Bank loans in January 1999 totalling \$1.5 million. It also received a targeted wage subsidy grant of \$20,305 on August 7, 1998. That is my wedding anniversary. I did not get exactly that on that day, but it got a grant of \$20,000. The local mayor and development board officer were keen to move the factory. A local Brant agribusiness opportunities agent also pressed for the grant. The total project cost was \$2.1 million and total federal assistance was \$1.89 million, not much to take up.

The member from Hamilton is here. I know that she was interested in this when it all happened. It is hard to believe that on March 20 HRDC Brantford staff faxed this memo to the Duchess owner, "As mentioned, we do have a major concern regarding the displacement of jobs from one community to another, i.e., Hamilton to Brantford. You may wish to clarify your position. Were these new jobs that were being created?"

HRDC itself said this looked like a transfer. We just asked a question in here a few days ago about that very thing. It is that shell game that I mentioned earlier. It takes this over here and shoves it over on this side and people get so mixed up they are not quite sure what happened in the first place. But it looks to me, and probably to any other taxpayer who might be watching this, that if it took *x* number of jobs from Hamilton and slipped them across to Brantford, not many miles down the road, how in the name of good sense could they call that job creation? I do not even think that is a possibility.

Routine Proceedings

● (1130)

The funding analysis and recommendation document from the local HRD office explained: “The employer has satisfied the issue of relocation from Hamilton to Brantford. The number of jobs to Brantford is significant, especially at the non or low skilled level, which will meet the needs of our labour market”.

Who convinced them of that? I do not think anyone was totally convinced. On April 10, 1998 Duchess Foods wrote to the HRD office in Brantford explaining that it planned to renovate a facility in Hamilton, but decided it was not suitable and dropped the idea. It pressed for a grant and made it clear that it would not move without it. Oh, here comes the threat: “We will not move without it. Give us the money or else”.

On March 9 Duchess Foods asked for a decision within three weeks. Later it changed the deadline to May 8, saying “I am doing business in your riding. I want to move my business because my facility is not big enough or good enough any more. Give me the money or I am out of here”. That does not sound like cricket, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure you would run your business that way: “Give me the money or I am gone”. No, you are in business because you think it is a good deal. You will work hard and it will help you in your retirement. You enjoy it while you are there. I have seen you enjoy it while you are swabbing the decks.

On May 7, 1998 the local HRD office stated that Duchess Foods had decided to purchase land and build, not lease, a building in Brantford. This was also stated in the minister’s approval document. Application was made for the money on May 14. The company preferred to stay in Hamilton to retain its employees. That sounds like ping-pong, going from Hamilton to Brantford and then back to Hamilton, saying “Give us the money. If you do not give us the money we are not going to go. Now we are going to stay here”. On and on it goes.

It decided to move because the facility in Hamilton was housed in three separate buildings. It wanted to consolidate and expand, yet the old facility was a total of 29,000 square feet and the new one it constructed in Brantford was 13% smaller. Woops. “We didn’t have enough space with 29,000 square feet, so we are going to build a new place with 25,000 square feet”. It is not bigger and better, that is for sure. It says, though, that it could be enlarged. When it gets some government cash down the road it might be.

In its application documents Duchess Foods indicated that it expected 96 employees to leave the company because of the move. These would be moved to Brantford and 60 more jobs would be added, for a total of 156, but only 60 of them would be new.

I heard the speaker, Mr. Speaker, and you did too, I am sure. In fact, I have every question that has been asked about this whole

thing in this document, which I will get to sometime later. I am sure she told me that 156 jobs were created. Whoops. In fact, most of it was shuffling the deck, transferring around—move them here, move them there, move them anywhere. Only 60 of them were new.

The TJF program approval document, signed by the minister, mentioned: “It is anticipated that a number of the current employees of the company will not transfer to the Brantford location”. That seems pretty clear. They are not going. They probably had a long enough commute anyway and they are not interested in commuting any farther.

In February a large layoff—and we do not know the size—principally of Brantford residents, prompted complaints to the minister’s office. The reason was unclear. The employer said they would not be rehired due to poor performance. I guess they were doing okay at the Hamilton facility if they were going to be put in the new facility, but all of a sudden, poof, due to poor performance.

The HRD office explained that the owner neglected to tell them that the jobs were seasonal—“Oh yeah, I forgot to tell you. You are laid off”—and then mentioned that a reorganization was necessary in order to maintain and attract new customers.

As of February 25, 1999, just over a year ago, 60% of the employees were from Brantford and the rest were from Hamilton. Those from Hamilton were slowly dropping off. I would not want to make that commute every day. I know that traffic is very busy in that area and it would not be much fun to drive, I am assuming.

Only \$101,762, or 27%, went to wage costs. The remaining three-quarters went to capital and building costs, and the cost of moving equipment. I do not think that is allowed under that grant. I think most of it was supposed to go to wage costs.

● (1135)

The approval document signed by the minister stated “The funding will be taken from the minister’s TJF special allocation for Brantford”. Dippity do. Presumably this referred to the \$500,000 allocation from the minister’s reserve. As of August 5 Duchess Foods had not submitted a final report on its project, due on June 2, the first anniversary of the official signing of the TJF grant. Of course, there are a few questions that would need to be asked. We have asked many of them. It is a pity they are not answered. But, anyway, we will ask them again.

The HRD minister said that the \$500,000 allocation from the minister’s reserve was never spent, yet the document signed by the former minister of HRD, now the Minister for International Trade, said that it was. One says it was signed; the other says it was not signed. Who is telling the truth? It is a pretty simple question. If one says *A* and one says *B*, and they are diametrically opposed,

Routine Proceedings

then surely somebody is not coming forward with the goods. We need that answer.

Here is another question. The approval documents signed by the minister showed that the unemployment rate was 10.3%. Why was the main TJF rule broken for the minister? We know it was 12%, but it is the old "We have pockets of unemployment. We can just pick a pocket and put the cash in".

Here is another one. Why was so much federal money given to the company? The project appears to have been 90% financed by the federal government. Who would not want a sweet deal like that? It was 90% financed by the federal government. Do hon. members think that if they had a business in the same area, in the same sector, that they might be a little frustrated because it might put them at just a hair of a disadvantage? That is unbelievable. How could anyone run a business side by side with this company? When it moved in it got 90% of its funding from the federal government. Are other businesses supposed to compete with that? I do not think so. How could any company resist this proposition? How could anyone turn up their nose at it? It only had to put up \$200,000 to get an entirely new building.

Here is another question. Why was a successful company, operating profitably in one community, given government money to move to another community? Why was federal TJF money used to displace workers, to ship them from here to there? That is unreal.

Here is another question. Why did the HRD minister claim that 156 jobs were being created when only 60 were created? That is quite a discrepancy.

Here is another question. The highest paying job created was \$10 an hour. Were federal tax dollars used to trade higher wage jobs in Hamilton for lower wage jobs in Brantford? I guess that is a legitimate question that needs to be answered. If there is a good straightforward answer for it, then we want to say "Sure, we will buy that". But I do not think the Liberals have ever come forward with an answer.

The highest paying job created was \$10 an hour. Were federal dollars used to trade higher wage jobs in Hamilton for lower wage jobs out in Brantford? That is another example of how the minister could get her paws, get her claws, get her hands on an amazing amount of money. That is the riding of Brant. I could go on and on about that riding, but I will spare hon. members. There is a better one coming.

Hon. members will remember that I told them about how much money went into Quebec. In large measure, of course, it was to buy some seats for the Liberals. But, boy, I would say that in the Prime Minister's riding it was a bonanza.

Let me give hon. members a little chronology. The Prime Minister's misuse of the transitional jobs fund: a chronology. This

one is precious. Hon. members read this in the newspaper, I am sure. Oh, yes, they read it in the red book. I am not sure if it was quoted directly in the red book, but it was in the newspaper when we were campaigning in Edmonton in 1993. The article is from the *Gazette* of October 15, 1993, which stated: "In each public appearance in the region Wednesday night and yesterday the Prime Minister reminded them that he will probably have enormous clout as Prime Minister to pull government strings. 'When a dossier for Saint-Maurice lands on a cabinet minister's desk—need I say more?' he said to rounds of laughter during one meeting yesterday".

There it is. Is that the *raison d'être* that a Prime Minister comes to power? Is it for this? "When a dossier for Saint-Maurice lands on a cabinet minister's desk, you bet I will be there".

● (1140)

Who could brag about that? "Just keep the requests coming. If I am the guy in charge and it lands on my desk, I will be there for you. I will look after you. I will pay you off". That was in the *Gazette* of October 15, 1993. That is not something I could even dream up. That is an exact quote from the Prime Minister when he was running for office. He ought to be ashamed of himself.

Let us look at number one in the chronology, the Auberge du Gouverneur Shawinigan. This \$6.4 million hotel project is owned by Pierre Thibault, a businessman from Belgium. He received federal government grants and loans. An amount of \$600,000 was announced on March 13, 1997 under the HRD targeted wage subsidy program, which was then changed to the transitional jobs fund when Mr. Thibault claimed that he needed capital funding immediately. He could not afford to wait for wage subsidies, he needed the cash right away. He had a promise from the man who would become Prime Minister, saying that if a dossier for Saint-Maurice landed on a cabinet minister's desk it would be looked after. What was Pierre Thibault to do? He had \$600,000. He could not wait to go the legitimate route.

Mr. Thibault lobbied for and received \$100,000 under the TJF in January 1999. He had a Business Development Bank loan in the amount of \$925,000 and a \$400,000 unsecured loan for his numbered company—and this is a good one, 9047-4412—from Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, a federal regional development fund, in September of 1998. This totalled \$2,025,000. That was a portion of the \$6.4 billion, but I am just getting warmed up.

Let me mention political donations. Quality Inn La Rocaille, which is also owned by Mr. Thibault, gave the Prime Minister a reception worth \$1,054 after the election on June 19. The election was held in October 1993.

The \$600,000 grant was announced without any departmental paperwork. That made it simple and fast. It was advertised in the

Routine Proceedings

Prime Minister's householder, dated April 1997. I am not privy to what the Prime Minister thinks, but I knew there was an election coming. The writ was dropped, I believe, on April 27, 1997. There was no paperwork on this grant, no nothing, but it was advertised in the Prime Minister's householder. Someone in his office knew to print this up.

Mr. Thibault is a self-confessed embezzler. He has said this and there are criminal investigations going on. He is the subject of a criminal investigation and involved in legal disputes.

On December 16, 1999 the opposition revealed a memo showing that the Prime Minister's office felt it had no choice but to approve the grant because the Prime Minister had already personally promised the money to Mr. Thibault. He had even announced it at a press conference, even though it did not meet Quebec regional TJF guidelines banning funding for restaurant and bar facilities. The Prime Minister said he had to approve the loan. He had a gun at his back. No way.

The Prime Minister had already personally promised the money to Mr. Thibault. He could not go back on his promise. He told him that he would give him the money and he announced it at a press conference. The Prime Minister could not be embarrassed. He told Mr. Thibault that he would get the money and he got it. That is nuts. That is the story of the Auberge des Gouverneurs de Shawinigan.

Things do not stop there. I am only at page one. I feel like Paul Harvey.

The Auberge Grand-Mère is a hotel owned by Yvon Duhaime. We have heard Mr. Duhaime's name before in the House. This hotel lies adjacent to the Grand-Mère golf course, purchased in 1988 by a numbered company, 161341 Canada Inc., in which the Prime Minister held a 25% interest. The address of the head office of 161341 Canada Inc. is still listed as the Auberge Grand-Mère.

• (1145)

The Prime Minister says that he sold his interest in the company to Toronto real estate developer Jonas Prince a few days before becoming Prime Minister, but Mr. Prince stated in the press that he only purchased an option to buy the shares and chose not to exercise it. There is a big difference between saying I sold it and you bought it and saying I sold it and they were actually options for shares and somebody chose not to exercise them.

In January 1996 the Prime Minister phoned the ethics counsellor at home and said that the deal had fallen through. He was advised that he could resume ownership of the shares but he would have to declare his interest publicly. Since he was never paid for the shares he knew that he owned them. Over three years later his lawyer, Debbie Weinstein, sold them. That is unbelievable.

I suspect this is getting painfully relevant here. We see a pattern when a government says how well it is managing everything for us and "Trust me. I am from the government and I am here to help you". This is the way personal affairs are conducted.

We see what is happening in the House today. The Prime Minister and many government members when they were in opposition said it was a dreadful thing. They were not able to control their shock and amazement at the idea of how scandalous it was for the Mulroney Tories. Now all of a sudden they say it is harder when in government. It is so hard and difficult they bring in time allocation. I can see the pain written all over his face as we watch the House leader when he is out in scrum. This is so relevant that it hurts every taxpayer in the country.

Mr. Duhaime received the following in loans and grants: \$615,000 from the Federal Business Development Bank in 1997; \$164,000 from HRD transitional jobs fund in July 1997, right after the election; \$50,000 from the federal regional development fund in 1997; and \$60,799 in five different HRD wage subsidy grants in 1997 and 1998. That is a total of \$889,799. That is a lot of money.

Let us look a little deeper into the numbered company, 161341. It sounds like a CB: 161341 calling. Let us say earth to 161341. Let us look at it. We received an access request in the official opposition from the office of ethics counsellor revealing that the Prime Minister did not formally resign his dictatorship in the above numbered company, which owns the Grand-Mère golf course, until March 4, 1994, almost five months after he became Prime Minister. The document was signed on March 8 and filed on March 14, 1994. It also states that the Prime Minister phoned the ethics counsellor personally at home on the evening of January 27, 1996, to discuss the fact that he still owned his shares in the company.

It seems to me that if he had a little problem he might phone the guy during office hours. If it was life threatening he might have to do something like that, but the Prime Minister again kept standing in the House and saying that everything was okay, everything was absolutely legit.

If I have to phone my staff at home in the evening it would have to be very serious. I do not think it is my business to just ring them up and say "Hey, I want you to look into this for me", unless it was a pretty big crisis. They have a life too. I do not know how busy the ethics counsellor is day or night, but if he is getting a call at night from the Prime Minister I know there is something going on.

It also reveals that Mr. Wilson, the ethics counsellor, kept in close contact with Peter Donolo, a handy little relationship. He was the communications director I mentioned some time earlier who crossed over to Italy, I think. The Prime Minister's lawyer, Debbie Weinstein, whom I mentioned a few minutes ago, perhaps helped the Prime Minister to defend himself against charges of conflict of interest. We have to get the whole team in on it now. Things are getting dicey. He has to phone the ethics counsellor at home. He

Routine Proceedings

has to phone the lawyer. He has to keep Peter Donolo in there because surely he could put a good spin on it.

First, the Prime Minister has repeatedly maintained that the sale of the shares has been in the hands of his lawyer since he became Prime Minister.

• (1150)

Oops, if that were the case, I would bet a dollar he would not have had to phone Howard Wilson late at night. Here is a quote from June 8, 1999:

Before I became PM I sold those shares and I gave the problem or the receivable to my trustee as with my other assets. She is in charge of managing it.

That was June 8, 1999, in *Hansard*. Then we see in March 1994 that he phoned the ethics counsellor. We know the Prime Minister phoned the ethics counsellor and the counsellor subsequently met personally with the Prime Minister about it on February 12, 1996 and July 18, 1996. The Prime Minister took a very active role and personal interest in the file. It is in *Hansard*, and dear knows *Hansard* is gospel, where he said:

Before I became PM I sold those shares and I gave the problem or the receivable to my trustee as with my other assets. She is in charge of managing it.

The question is why the heck is he phoning the ethics counsellor and meeting with him personally on various occasions about this thing.

Second, the Prime Minister has repeatedly said that his golf course shares were out of his hands. They were out of this world but not out of his hands. A chronology included in the access to information request implies otherwise. Let us look at the dates of that.

On January 27, 1996, the Prime Minister called Mr. Wilson at home to tell him the sale of shares had fallen through. On February 12 Mr. Wilson met personally with the Prime Minister. On May 8 Mr. Wilson met with the Prime Minister's lawyer, Debbie Weinstein. On July 18 Mr. Wilson met personally again with the Prime Minister. On July 18 Mr. Wilson sent a model blind management agreement to Debbie Weinstein. In other words this is the way it is done. It has not been done right. Do it this way.

It is a wonder he had time to run the country. He was busy, busy meeting with Debbie Weinstein, Peter Donolo and Mr. Wilson. It is hard to imagine he would have had the time or the energy to run the country in between golf games.

This implies that the Prime Minister was told that he would have to set up a formal blind management agreement in order to have his lawyer deal with the sale of shares. A blind management agreement is struck when one person manages the property of a politician on

his or her behalf. Some of us should be that lucky to be in that position.

The necessity for such an agreement would indicate that the Prime Minister, the ethics counsellor and the lawyer all assumed that the Prime Minister still owned the shares in the golf course. Otherwise why would he be filling it out?

Third, the Prime Minister has insisted that he resigned his directorship in 161341 Canada Inc. before he became Prime Minister. On June 1, 1999, a week before, he said again in *Hansard*: "I quit this company before I became Prime Minister".

Now we learn that he really did not formally resign his directorship until March 14, 1994, more than four months after he became Prime Minister. It appears that Mr. Wilson struggled to get him to quit.

It is similar to when we go to a fair and they have these little holes in which gophers keep popping up. We get a great big hammer and we are allowed to just bang and bash these guys down into their holes but they keep popping up again. I am sure that is how Mr. Wilson felt. I am sure he thought he looked after the problem and got him to put it in a blind trust but poof, up it comes over here. He tried to solve it by getting Debbie Weinstein to look into this blind trust, and then poof, it pops up over here. He had a heck of a time getting the Prime Minister to actually quit that directorship.

Let us look at the dates. On October 21, which is four days before the election in 1993, the ethics counsellor's office told the Prime Minister's lawyer, Debbie Weinstein, that he was still a director of the company and must resign. In other words, this guy might be the Prime Minister in four days. Get him to resign.

On December 8 the Prime Minister made a personal information statement on appointment to office of the ethics counsellor. On December 22, we are getting close to Christmas here, a confidential report written by the ethics counsellor indicated that something was wrong. Merry Christmas. He has had two months since October 25. It is now almost December 25 and there is a problem.

On January 27, 1994, the counsellor's office phoned the assistant to the Prime Minister, Monique Bondar, who promised to ensure that he was no longer a director of 161341. Oops, there comes the gopher head again. She says okay. She gets into it now and says she will look after it, as she bonks it on the head.

• (1155)

The contents of letter from Monique Bondar of February 1994 were severed. It said that the prime minister no longer had an interest in the golf course. Boing, she thought she had the gofer down in the hole. Whew, she had that out of the way.

Routine Proceedings

On March 1, 1994, the Prime Minister signed a statement of public declaration of past outside activities stating that he was a director of the Grand-Mère golf club, formerly 161341 Canada Inc.

On March 1 there was also a letter from Howard Wilson to the Prime Minister that raised an issue which was severed. What was that issue? Why is there a lack of transparency? Why did he need this little meeting with the Prime Minister? Why, through access to information, were the contents severed? It seems to me that if it is information which is helpful and legit it might as well be brought forward.

An hon. member: Who appoints that guy, anyway?

Miss Deborah Grey: Questions could be raised as to who appoints the ethics counsellor, what is his job and to whom should he report? He gets appointed by the Prime Minister and reports to the Prime Minister.

An hon. member: And he investigates the Prime Minister.

Miss Deborah Grey: He investigates the Prime Minister. He does not report to parliament. If I were to ask you, Mr. Speaker, to make me accountable, then I ought to be accountable to people who are watching. Instead, if I asked you to make me accountable and then we have a quiet coffee some place for you to tell me if you think I am accountable or not, what will it look like or what will it smell like? The whole thing is pretty suspicious.

I am sure this poor ethics counsellor is trying his darndest to make sure everything is legitimate. However he does not have to answer to anybody. He just has to have coffee with the Prime Minister and say here is how it looks, Joe, John, Harry or whoever.

On March 16, a couple of weeks later, a letter from the Prime Minister's lawyer to Mr. Wilson stated that the document removing him as director was filed with the incorporations branch of Industry Canada on March 14, 1994. Why would he say on June 1, 1999, that he quit the company before he was Prime Minister? Also he said it on June 8, 1999:

Before I became PM I sold those shares and I gave the problem or the receivable to my trustee. . .She is in charge of managing it.

It does not look good. On November 15, 1994, a minute sheet was signed by the ethics counsellor. Of course the contents were severed when we got the information. It is entitled "Ownership Interest of Grand-Mère Golf Club". This implies that the issue was not yet resolved. Otherwise, why would they have a document about it? It could be that the resignation was recorded in the private minutes of 161341 Canada Inc. before he became Prime Minister and the routine official documents were filed after the fact, but the exchange of letters and calls from Mr. Wilson's office obviously suggest otherwise.

I beg anyone in the House or outside to say that this is perhaps irrelevant. I do not think so. This is so relevant that it hurts. We see the business practices of the Prime Minister. We see a person who said before the election that if anything crossed his desk or any cabinet minister's desk which had to do with his riding, he was being a good little MP. Perhaps it is not so good. We are so far in debt and yet we see this kind of political manipulation and interference.

There are two important issues. First, the Prime Minister's word is what is relevant to the whole debate today. How good is his word? There appear to be contradictions between what he said and what he did. There is proof through access to information that is exactly what happened. That is a case we have uncovered. Lord knows how many more there are.

Here are some more unanswered questions which never get answered in question period but need to be raised. It would be great if they ever did get answered. Did the Prime Minister declare that he was a former director of 161341 Canada Inc. when he was in reality a current director?

It is obvious he was a director from the election in October 1993 to March 1994 when somebody caught up to him and said that he was still a director. Why did he declare that he was a former director when at that time he was a present director? If he was a director during those four months, was he in a position of conflict of interest at any time? Those were huge questions because the Prime Minister's attitude was "Cross my desk and I will look after you. Just let me know if you need help and I will look after you".

• (1200)

When the Prime Minister was appointed to office, what did he declare in his December 8, 1993 personal information statement about his directorship? We have proof that he was still a director. Howard Wilson would tell us that if we could ever find him. He only has quiet coffees with the Prime Minister but we would love it if he would come here and report to parliament, which is, I think, what his job ought to be.

What exactly was in his statement of December 8? The contents were severed from the request. We ended up with a couple of pages that were mostly whited out and five or six pages missing.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: They must buy that whiteout by the 45 gallon drum.

Miss Deborah Grey: Maybe 161342 Canada Inc. is a whiteout company for which he is partial owner. Who knows?

There was a confidential report by the ethics counsellor about this matter dated December 22, 1993. Why was it necessary and what did it say? It would be great if we could have a look at that document.

Routine Proceedings

Here is another one. When did the Prime Minister learn that his sale of shares had fallen through? What other active interest did he take in the management of 161341 Canada Inc. prior to and following January 27, 1996? I wonder just how closely his fingerprints were monitored there.

Here is another question. Did the blind management agreement have anything to do with the sale of land and the golf course owned by 161341 Canada Inc., which took place only weeks later?

Here is another one. Almost all the contents of the 700 page request were severed. There were 700 pages but we only got four. It was like being told that there were 700 pages but that we could only get six and a half. Most of the pages were just completely gone.

If the Prime Minister has nothing to hide, why will he not release all the relevant information and lay this matter to rest? It seems absolutely unbelievable why he would not just say that he has it and that he will come forward with it. There is an amazing chronology there.

Let me go to another case in Shawinigan.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Does it ever end?

Miss Deborah Grey: No, it never ends, but question period will be here soon. Maybe we will be able to ask some questions about that.

Let me get to Aérospatiale Globax Inc. and the illegal trust funds. On March 7, 1997 the owner, René Giguère, received a TJF grant of \$2.04 million, announced a month prior to the election call. There we go again, \$2 million right before the election. In other words "If something happens to us here we want to make sure you get the cash first". Its two daughter companies are Placeteco and TechniPaint. Questions have also been raised any number of times in the House on those two companies. As recently as yesterday, the minister said that if anything was coming out through access to information that we could have it.

However, if we look at the track record of the government when it comes to forwarding documents, most of the pages in the documents have either been whited out or shredded out and precious little is left to get our hands on to really look at.

Let us look at the political donations of this bunch: \$4,000 from Globax to the Prime Minister's personal campaign in 1997; \$10,692.40 from Globax to the Liberal Party in 1997; \$3,467.90 from Placeteco to the Liberal Party in 1997; \$604.48—I am not sure how someone gives 48 cents to a political party unless it is rounded out—from TechniPaint to the Liberal Party in 1997; and \$569.60 from Placeteco to the Liberal Party in 1998. This totals \$19,334.38. This is not a bad return. Get a grant and give back a donation and things are looking pretty sweet.

What a wonderful way to do business: Give some, take some, give some and on and on it goes. That is the way the Prime Minister says that business goes. He says that he is just being a good little MP for his constituents. That was in March 1997.

On April 23, 1997, just before the writ was dropped, the first instalment of \$440,000 was disbursed to the company. Yee hee, here is \$440,000.

• (1205)

On March 27, 1998, almost a year later, on the last day of the 1998 fiscal year, the second instalment was paid to a trust fund set up with the law firm Champagne Cleroux Avocats. To ensure that TJF funds did not lapse at the end of the fiscal year, the lawyer involved was Gilles Champagne. We have seen his name before if we have looked through *Hansard*. I have some *Hansard* clippings here, that I will get to in a little while, but they are precious. Gilles Champagne was talked about quite a little bit. He was a two-time political appointee of the Prime Minister to Canada Post Corporation. His contract was renewed on September 28, 1999 and he is still there.

On May 5, 1998 an HRDC staffer commented by e-mail, and I quote:

The subsidy being an interesting element for a future buyer, the Office of the Prime Minister wishes that HRDC do all that which is legally possible to do because if the sale does not take place, a bankruptcy and layoffs will result.

Businesses do go bankrupt and layoffs do happen but this is a staffer saying "Come on, better get this going here. Do all you possibly can". It is a very strange thing.

On June 11, 1998 TJF officer, Clément Parent, wrote that he had serious reservations about the sale. This was somebody who was pretty worried about this. Did the Liberals pay any attention? No.

On June 17, 1998, just a few days later, HRDC authorized that all but \$10,000 of the \$1.2 million in the trust fund be paid to the Globax subsidiary, Placeteco, now purchased by Claude Gauthier owner of Transelec Inc. We have seen him on the pages before.

It carries on. On December 10, 1998 Placeteco went bankrupt anyway. All the jobs that the minister and the Prime Minister talked about, all the wonderful jobs that were created, were created and then the employees were laid off. Mr. Gauthier re-purchased it. Do we not just love it? We can go bankrupt and then just re-buy the thing a few days later, eight days later. He stated that as the new owner he would not be bound by the hiring requirements contained in the contract with HRDC and resumed operations with just 62 employees, less than half of the 155 jobs he had agreed to. It never ends.

Mr. Gauthier got government money, went belly up and then re-bought eight days later and said "Here I am again, all you lucky people, and I do not have to abide by your guidelines. I do not need

Routine Proceedings

to hire 155 people. I will hire a skeleton crew of 62 to do the work". That is what we call cash in our pockets. It is a sweet deal.

On April 7, 1999, just a year ago, the last instalment of the \$400,000 was paid in trust to Deloitte & Touche at the request of Mr. Giguère who claimed that a big deal for TechniPaint was in progress. It is like someone saying "Stay tuned, a big deal is coming. We want more money and we are coming for more. Everything will be okay because we have a big deal cooking". If it was such a big deal there ought to have been enough private people to invest in it.

On May 25, 1999, almost a year ago, HRDC headquarters heard of trust funds and found that the first trust fund violated section 34 of the Financial Administration Act and Treasury Board guidelines. This was starting to get serious. It was not just my word against his word. This was the Treasury Board guidelines and the Financial Administration Act.

The second trust fund violated Treasury Board guidelines. The funds had to be closed and the money, with interest, returned to the consolidated revenue fund. Great, that is a really sweet and practical use of taxpayers' dollars. Why this money is being shipped out to these people in the first place would be a really good question to ask.

It goes on. Number five is the lobbying activities of René Fugère. I wish I could be reading members a novel and that this was chapter five of a fictitious work, but this is so true that it hurts and it so relevant that it hurts even more.

I am sure all members remember René Fugère. I am sure they read *Hansard*. Whatever they miss in the daytime they catch up on at night and they will know René Fugère. On May 28, 1997 René Fugère, an unpaid aide to the Prime Minister, appeared on the Prime Minister's behalf at a press conference four days before the 1997 election to announce a TJF grant of \$164,000 for Yvon Duhaime and the Auberge Grand-Mère. Why in the world, during a writ period when an election was on, was the Prime Minister muddling around giving cash to anybody? I suppose it looked legitimate because somebody was working on his behalf. René Fugère was out there. It would have almost gone against the guidelines that I read from a little earlier about the wonderful on site visits that Liberal MPs can have. These were really good. The criteria was, of course, that it was really good for site visits as well and designed to be used by the Prime Minister, ministers, secretaries of state and members of parliament when planning to visit regions and home constituencies. With an election on, the Prime Minister had to be somewhat astute and undercover, so René Fugère went on his behalf and said, "Here is the cash, Yvon". That was \$164,000 right at election time.

• (1210)

On August 9, 1997 we had the Auberge des Gouverneurs in Shawinigan. Old René Fugère had a hand in that as well. Access

documents showed that Fugère lobbied for and received an extra \$100,000 in January 1999 for Mr. Thibeault. That was not bad. That was on top of the \$600,000 TJF grant he had already received in 1997. He was a fairly profitable fellow.

On March 12, 1998 Celebrity Boats gave all lobbying authority to Mr. Fugère in writing.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: He must be a registered lobbyist.

Miss Deborah Grey: One would almost think that he would be a registered lobbyist. However, surprisingly, he is not.

Mr. Fugère was part owner of a former incarnation of that company. The company began but it had a few problems. It was not able to live on government money and it collapsed. However, before we knew it, it was reincarnated. Now I have never believed in reincarnation, and I still do not, but when René Fugère is involved in the business world it really makes one wonder. He lobbied for \$600,000 and got \$368,235. Well, he did not get it all, but he did get over 50%. That was not bad. He asked for \$600,000 and got \$300,000 and felt that it was all in a day's work.

On March 26, 1999 there was the Salle de Quilles Biermans. This bowling alley, owned by Claude Bellerive, burned down. Whoops. It then received \$45,000 from TJF with Mr. Fugère's help.

In 1997 Cirtech Inc., a company also owned by Claude Bellerive, gave \$4,000 to the Prime Minister's campaign. I am sure it was just a complete irony, but it looked like a 10% rebate.

An hon. member: 11%

Miss Deborah Grey: I appreciate being corrected. Nonetheless, he received \$45,000 and gave \$4,000 back.

On May 14, 1999 the *National Post* reported that EARTH Canada received a \$38,400 interest-free loan from Canada Economic Development after Fugère was made a director of the company on January 13, 1999. Is it any wonder that any company would want him on its list of directors? It seems to me that he would be a pretty worthwhile asset when looking for government cash. Mr. Fugère received 150,000 stock options in the company.

Gilles Champagne, and we have heard that name before, is a lawyer friend of the Prime Minister, from Shawinigan, who established two illegal trust funds for TJF recipients, was twice appointed director of Canada Post Corporation by the Prime Minister. He was made president, chairman and CEO. He got 500,000 shares. May 14 was a lucky day for EARTH Canada. It is saying "EARTH to Fugère. EARTH to Champagne". These two guys are very close and are now hitting the big times. They are

Routine Proceedings

members of the board, the president, the chairman and the CEO of EARTH Canada. They also have stock options.

On May 19, 1999, almost a year ago, the ethics counsellor wrote to the RCMP asking it to investigate the activities of Fugère for a possible breach of the Lobbyists Registration Act. Was it any wonder? He was certainly busy. When one writes to the RCMP asking for an investigation, it would seem that things are not exactly legitimate or above board.

Let us move on to November 1999, just a few months ago, and a company called Les Maisons Beam. The *National Post* said that Mr. Fugère asked for 6.5% of whatever he could get of a TJF grant for this company. The company paid him \$15,000 in service for 1988 but when he asked for \$8,000 more, the company refused. It is not a good thing to get greedy.

• (1215)

Fugère allegedly phoned the department and told it to shelve the application. In other words "Oh, oh, I got caught here. Better shelve the thing and keep it quiet".

December 15, 1999, just a few months ago, the *National Post* reported that 10 days after the first TJF disbursement of \$100,000 was received by the Auberge Grand-Mère, Yvon Duhaime cut a cheque for \$11,500 to Fugère.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Commission.

Miss Deborah Grey: One would wonder if it was a commission. I guess we cannot really say that it might be a commission or a cut, but boy, I will say it looks like dollars for dollars.

On February 29, 2000, leap year day just a couple of months ago, the opposition revealed that Mr. Fugère also lobbied for the Scierie Opitciwan sawmill on a reserve in Quebec in the riding of Champlain, next door to the riding of Saint-Maurice. Does the hon. member remember the old quote? I am not sure he was here when I was reading the quote of the Prime Minister before the election in 1993, so I will make sure I share that with him because it is incredibly relevant to the Scierie Opitciwan reserve.

On October 15, 1993, just a few days before the election, the Prime Minister reminded the people in a public appearance that he would have enormous clout as Prime Minister to pull government strings. He said, "When a dossier for Saint-Maurice, anything out of that riding, lands on a cabinet minister's desk, basically I will be there to look out for you".

It looks like that is exactly what happened with the Opitciwan sawmill on the reserve in Quebec. The sawmill received in 1998 \$300,000 from TJF, a \$1.8 million loan from Canada economic development for Quebec regions and a \$200,000 subsidy from the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Not bad.

Let us do a little tracking of the donations to the Prime Minister's 1997 campaign. Exactly one-third, 33% of the donations to the Prime Minister's personal election campaign can be linked to grants, contributions and contracts in his riding. There would be people who could make all kinds of claims that this is a terrible thing for us to do and we should not be connecting these things one to another, but these are the facts and these are the dollars.

Aérospatiale Globax Inc. gave \$4,000 to the campaign and got \$2 million in TJF grants. Les Confections St-Élie gave \$1,500 to the Prime Minister's personal election campaign and got two TJF grants totalling \$285,108. Megatech Electro gave \$400. That is not very good because it got a \$1.3 million TJF grant. It hardly makes it all worthwhile. The Liberals did all the paperwork for the grant and they got \$400 back for their campaign. It is not a very good percentage.

Here is a better one. Transelec gave a single cheque of \$10,000 to the Prime Minister's personal election campaign. It received a CIDA contract. There was \$1.19 million to Globax subsidiary Placeteco acquired by the owner of Transelec.

Les Industries Fermco gave \$2,000 to the Prime Minister and received a TJF grant of \$200,000. That is getting a little better percentage. It gets \$200,000 and gives \$2,000 back; I mean it made a donation of \$2,000.

Cirtech gave \$4,000 to the Prime Minister's campaign. It is owned by Claude Bellerive who received a \$45,000 TJF grant in the Prime Minister's riding for Salle de Quilles Biermans. Les Consultants Mesar gave \$1,000 to the Prime Minister and received HRD grants in the Prime Minister's riding worth \$13,000. That is a pretty good percentage too. That is a fair chunk of change.

Stone Consolidated gave \$5,000 to the Prime Minister's campaign. The Prime Minister was a former director of this corporation which received HRD grants of \$13,000 in the Prime Minister's riding. It gave \$5,000 back as a campaign donation.

Muniressources gave \$2,000. Shawinigan International Inc. received \$46,305 from Canada economic development for Quebec regions. Muniressources is a co-founding company of Shawinigan International. Is it not handy the way they are all kind of warm and intimately linked.

Then there is Abatoir A.L. Bellerive Inc. which gave \$500. It received a CIDA contract worth \$117,400 even while the RCMP were investigating its involvement in a \$1.4 million tax fraud. But it can still give the money over. That totals \$30,400. That is 30% of total personal and business donations of \$90,325. That is a fair chunk of change to come up with in someone's personal election campaign. That was not even donated to the party. That was just to the Prime Minister's personal campaign.

Routine Proceedings

• (1220)

There is another one we cannot forget about, the great water fountain in Shawinigan. Canadians have heard about that. A few questions have been asked in question period about it. This is pretty hard to believe.

On February 8, 2000 Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec which is the federal regional development agency for Quebec, announced a \$200,000 non-repayable contribution to build a lighted fountain in the Saint-Maurice River in the Prime Minister's riding. A non-profit group called Heritage Shawinigan is heading the project.

Here are some facts about the actual application. On March 31, 1998 the office of the minister for the economic development agency received a file from the Prime Minister's office. A note says, "The file was sent by Denise Tremblay of the Prime Minister's office". In other words, "Hint, hint, look out, this comes straight from someone important in the PMO, tick, check, pay attention to it". I bet there was a red flag on it.

On May 5, 1998 a letter from the EDA for Quebec regions indicated that the formal application for funding from Heritage Shawinigan was received on May 4, over a month after the Prime Minister's office sent the file to the EDA for Quebec regions. The file had already been in process for two weeks when the application was received. Might as well get a jump on it. Might as well move ahead a little bit, get a bit of a jump on it. It is so awkward when they have to wait for the application form to come in. They might just as well get the ball rolling.

Another note further explains, "The file was submitted by the office of the Prime Minister and sent to us for analysis on April 18, 1998". This suggests that the Prime Minister actually initiated the grant process prior to an application from the project's sponsor. The timing on this is unbelievable. That same note dated May 28 recommends that the project be approved. The internal approval process took just over three weeks. That is faster than greased lightning around this place. It is just unbelievable. All of a sudden the thing is through. The project was approved by letter to Heritage Shawinigan dated July 6, 1998.

Les Consultants Mesar undertook a feasibility study on the proposal for which Heritage Shawinigan paid it \$8,000; \$5,000 of this amount was received from the Department of Canadian Heritage. Les Consultants Mesar donated a total of \$1,000 in three separate gifts to the Prime Minister's personal election campaign in 1997. It is just so easy to say, "Here's to you. Thanks very much".

The project was supposed to have been completed by September 1, 1998 but the announcement was delayed until February 8, 2000,

at a time of controversy surrounding grants and contributions. No reason was given for the delay. In other words, "Oh, oh, it is getting a little close to home here. Those troublesome opposition members of parliament are asking questions about these things so we had better lie low for a while".

Under the terms and conditions of the agreement signed and accepted by the sponsor dated August 3, 1998, the client had to begin the project on September 1, 1998 and finish it no later than September 1, 1999. The announcement for the funding came five months after the project was supposed to have been completed. It had to go underground for a little bit, or under water let us say. By the time the thing was supposed to be finished, the announcement did not even come until five months later. It still has not happened. The project will be 80% funded by government. Imagine, such a worthwhile deal and it is 80% government funded.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. I know the motion we are dealing with today has to do in particular with HRD spending, abuse within the HRD system and so on. The member has been speaking at length about problems within the HRD system but she has been talking about other grants as well. I am wondering if she could point out the relevancy. I want to make sure that it is relevant to the debate, whether the grants and so on she is talking about are actually HRDC—

• (1225)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I am afraid the hon. member is debating right now.

Miss Deborah Grey: Madam Speaker is convinced that this is relevant. Members know it is not just HRDC. The government is dishing out \$13 billion in grants and contributions. HRDC is certainly a large part of it but boy, it just flows over every description.

There are lots of Liberal non-answers to the shenanigans in Shawinigan which we have talked about. The whole Shawinigan shakedown has gone on for quite a while now. The Liberals do not allow questions. Let me give a couple of examples.

On May 25, 1999 the Liberal member for Essex who chaired the industry committee in response to Tory questions about whether or not the two hotel owners in question were up to date in their loans, said that questions about individuals would not be allowed. That does not make a whole lot of sense to me. If during a debate we have some questions to ask in the House or in any standing committee, it is unbelievable that it would filter down from the top, from the Prime Minister to the committee chairmen, to everyone else to say something like that. Or they just do not show up.

Routine Proceedings

On May 6, 1999 ethics counsellor Howard Wilson appeared before the industry committee for the first time since June 1994. Did the red book not say he was going to report to parliament? I was sure it did.

How about the "I believe I sold them" line? The Prime Minister said "I will feel until I die". Do we not love that one, "I will feel until I die that I sold the shares in 1993". Remember the fracas I just went through in listing the whole chronology. He said he was a director then he said he was not a director. He said he sold his shares and was not a director of the company anymore, until he got caught and found out several months after the 1993 election.

What about claiming innocence? On June 3, 1999 the Prime Minister said "I have followed all the rules for 36 years". But he had just said in the House a couple of days earlier that he had sold all his shares and was not a director when he became Prime Minister. Howard Wilson, the ethics counsellor in March 1994, months after the 1993 election said that the Prime Minister was a director.

"The Prime Minister's grants are like any others" is another tactic used by the Liberals. On June 2, 1999 the Deputy Prime Minister said that the projects in the riding of Shawinigan were no different from the job creation projects approved in reform party ridings. Let me put that little myth to bed.

The Prime Minister has the levers of power and the levers of money. When people go to him as their little MP to get help or to lobby, it is not like going to even a Liberal backbencher or an opposition member because they have nothing to give in return. But in the Prime Minister's situation, a whole pile of stuff can be given in return.

On March 18, 1999 the Minister for International Trade said that one of the strengths of the transitional jobs fund was to consult with local members of parliament. As soon as local members of parliament get involved, there may be some good feedback and input, but the whole thing is subject to political interference. There are some members who would be tempted to interfere politically in order to get grants for their people. I know he wears his Liberal sweater proudly at the hockey games, so he would never be seen doing anything foolish like that.

• (1230)

An hon. member: Skating around in circles.

Miss Deborah Grey: Skating around in circles, but make sure that the skates are on.

Here is another one: "I am just doing my job". I love that excuse. I am just doing my job as a good little MP. The Prime Minister is more than just an MP. He is the one to say to any cabinet minister, to a deputy or an assistant speaker "Do this", "Do that".

There are a lot of members who know that feeling. How about this one for size. The Prime Minister says "You are in cabinet now. Do as I say. Vote as I tell you, or else". There are some in this Chamber who know exactly what that feels like.

The Prime Minister has a tremendous amount of power. When cabinet ministers have to succumb, they know perfectly well that he has the power and heaven help them if they do not follow through.

On June 1, 1999 the Prime Minister said: "With great pride I stand here and say I will always defend the best interests of my constituents so they can have a good living in the great country that is Canada. My electors were treated like the electors of any riding in Canada". If they had projects that were based on merit, then let them be based on merit. I have always said to the people in my constituency that I am not interested in going down to the HRD office and getting politically involved. I paid tribute to HRD bureaucrats here earlier and I will do it again.

I have said time and time again, with these summer programs that we are going through, when they give the MP the option to get involved with these seed programs, these summer employment programs for students, "You are the people who know this industry. You are the people who will make the decisions based on merit and merit alone. I am not getting involved in this project". I think the HRD people probably appreciate that.

Why should I be in there telling people who make their living at this, these public servants, what to do? They know what are good projects and what are not. Why would I trample on them and say "Move over, I am making those decisions"? It is not right. To me it belittles those people who work in those departments, who know what it is they are suppose to be doing, and yet they have to succumb constantly, time and time again, to the pressure of their political masters.

Of course the government threatens to sue the opposition. There is another little tactic it uses sometimes: "Say that outside the House".

On June 1, 1999 the Prime Minister said: "If they have any decency they will make a clear accusation that I have a conflict of interest and have the guts to make it outside. We will meet them in court after that". That is a lovely little tactic. "I will sue you". If we say something he disagrees with, he threatens to sue us. Is that not unbelievable? It is hard to believe that a prime minister of a country would be in a position to say "Let's meet in the parking lot", or something ridiculous like "Let's meet in the courtroom". Or, the Liberals call the opposition names. There is a good one.

The former Minister of Health, the member for Sudbury, said: "I have never seen such despicable behaviour. I have been in the House for over 10 years and never have I seen such shameful

Routine Proceedings

behaviour by members of parliament". I might agree with her, but I have not seen such behaviour from a Prime Minister.

I hate to think you are going to get bumped out of the chair, Madam Speaker, as I see the member for Kingston and the Islands. I digress and pray that this is relevant. I have a doozy for the Deputy Speaker. Forgive me for being irrelevant for just a moment, but I want members to hear this.

Some time ago I was speaking about the fact that when the Liberals were in opposition it used to bother the daylighters out of them when the Mulroney Tories brought in that thing called time allocation. Yes, members remember it well. My notes tell me that time allocation was brought in 66 times over nine years. Today we are not celebrating and having a party; we are having what might be called a wake. In six years' time the Liberals have brought in time allocation or closure more times than the Mulroney Tories. It is not a happy sight.

I read a quote from the current House leader, whom the Deputy Speaker knows well. I am sure he remembers some of his rants back in the good old days when they were in opposition.

• (1235)

Then I read one from the member for Ottawa West—Nepean. She said in 1989: "This government has shown it has no respect for the public process, no respect for parliament and no respect for the opinions of the public".

Then the government House leader said: "I am shocked. Perhaps I should not be shocked. This government has used closure on dozens and dozens of occasions".

Of course, they were haranguing the Liberals—I mean the Tories. Oh, it is so hard to tell the difference. It was the Mulroney Tories when they formed the government before 1993. Again, I digress. Forgive me.

This quote, though, is probably the best of them all. This comes from the current Deputy Speaker, the member for Kingston and the Islands. He said: "The government is using time allocation once again on this bill. Just to remind the House and the Canadian public of the Draconian"—and that is with a capital D—"approach this government takes to dealing with legislation in the House, closure has been used 15 times in parliament since the November 1988 election".

How scandalous. Fifteen times. That was in 1993. Imagine, 15 times.

He went on to say: "What we have here is an absolute scandal in terms of the government's unwillingness to listen to the representatives of the people in the House". For goodness' sake. "Never

before have we had a government so reluctant to engage in public discussion on the bills brought before this House". I digress. Now we do. It is here now.

He said: "I suggest that the government's approach to legislating is frankly a disgrace". That was not with a capital D, but I am sure he meant the same. "It cuts back the time the House is available to sit and then it applies closure to cut off debate". That was in 1992.

Then he said: "This is not the way to run parliament. This is an abuse of the process of the House". I say to him "Amen, brother". He puts on his sunglasses and is gone, almost like this is some kind of a joke. But the government has broken the record today.

Those members were scandalized on this side of the House.

Mr. Hec Clouthier: I was not here then.

Miss Deborah Grey: No, the member across was not here then. I am sure things would have been a whole lot different.

I love it when a candidate says "I will be a member of government and, boy, I will tell you, I will straighten out that government". The fellow who won the byelection a couple of years ago in Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam said "I am no yes-man". Wrong.

Another favourite little tactic is that they repeat everything. Everything is all right. Everything is normal. It is just business as usual and everything is going to be just fine.

The Prime Minister said on June 1, 1999: "I am very happy with the system because it is doing what has to be done for the good of the taxpayers of Canada". A few of them, I guess; the ones who were getting the grants, but certainly not all of the taxpayers of Canada. I do not think so.

What about leaving more of our money in our hands in the first place? It would seem sensible to me that if we send money to Ottawa, the government should not take such a huge cut from it when it is swirling around and then send a little back to the regions or whatever the government thinks with its personal largesse to make everyone feel good about it while at the same time claiming that it is giving tax cuts. I love that excuse too. "We are giving tax cuts".

I would ask any of the Liberal members, any of the huge number of them who are here, when was the last time someone came into their riding office and said "Oh, this tax cut just feels so good"?

I see the member from Edmonton Southeast is here. His riding is not very far from mine. We are just across the city from each other. I would love to know if someone has come into his office and said

Routine Proceedings

“Look at my tax statement. That tax cut just feels so good”. I would love to tell him how I am going to spend that money.

It is not happening, is it? It is not happening. The finance minister says that they are coming forward with tax cuts, but nobody is seeing it at the ground level. This whole idea that we are in charge and we are looking after you, everything is okay, is nonsense.

Here is a good one: “Someone else ordered the contract”. On March 12, 1999 the solicitor general was talking about why Yvon Duhaime’s father-in-law got an untendered contract for the guardhouse on the road to the Prime Minister’s cottage. Members will remember that a little while ago a new guardhouse was being built. The contract was untendered. He said: “The RCMP is responsible for the security of the Prime Minister. It requested that this firm be hired because it was in the area for security reasons”.

The firm just happened to be in the area. I do not know, they might have been camping over at Meech Lake. I am not too sure, but they were in the area, so give them the contract. It saves a bus ticket. Just hire them because they are close by.

Yet when I think about the solicitor general, it is pretty hard to believe. Yesterday in the House we were asking questions about murderers, prisons and some other things. As everyone in the House and anyone who watches the proceedings knows, the solicitor general always says that the RCMP and the Correctional Service are at arm’s length. I am not sure how long that is, but it ought to be about out to here. He says that he has nothing to do with them, that he cannot be the one to tell them what to do.

• (1240)

Yesterday there was a question about the dreadful situation of the two people who were put together in jail after murdering someone. He said that he phoned right away. He did not phone from downtown Ottawa but from downtown Washington D.C. He called the Correctional Service and told them to split those people up. That was not very arm’s length. There was a telephone on the end of that arm. He picked it up and used it. When we see these discrepancies it is hard to believe that the solicitor general continues to say that the RCMP is responsible and he does not get to talk to them. Yesterday he was on the phone in jig time.

Then there is this one: “The Prime Minister was involved, but not all the time”. He is kind of a part time prime minister or he is only involved part of the time.

On March 22, 1999, just a year ago, the Deputy Prime Minister said that he had a representative of his office attend meetings with officials. As far as he was aware, the decisions were made at other meetings when the Prime Minister and his staff were not involved. Can we believe that? Oh, no, he was not really involved. He was not at the meeting. No, he was not there, so it was someone else just acting on his behalf. That one is pretty hard to believe.

Let us say that we were HRD officials sitting around with the crew we work with all the time, with whom we are comfortable working, doing what it is we are supposed to be doing, and Poopsie, or whoever, comes in. She says that she is from the Prime Minister’s office and is just coming to take part in the meeting. Do we sit down and ask what are we going to do? That is nonsense.

If we are sitting there as a bunch of bureaucrats, doing our job, and someone walks in—

Hon. David Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know how long the hon. member has been speaking, but I think it has been well over three hours. I noticed that she was sitting on the side of a chair, which the rules bar us from doing. I think it is outrageous that the hon. member would do that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It was very thoughtful of the hon. minister to give the opportunity to the hon. member to sit for a moment and relax.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, just to take the minister back a few seconds, I was acting as Poopsie from the Prime Minister’s office who was coming to sit and take part in a meeting. However, I appreciate his concern. I know he has grave concerns about that.

How about this one? “The matter is in a blind trust”. It is just so easy for people to say that it is in a blind trust and they have absolutely nothing to do with it.

On June 8, 1999 the Prime Minister said: “It is in a blind trust. Blind means blind. I am just doing what is required. From the day I became Prime Minister I have had no decisions to make on it”.

Whoops. Remember what I just said about October 1993 to March 1994, that he really was a director? Maybe blind is not blind when it comes to blind trusts.

This is another precious one: “I have no recollection”. It sounds like Bill Clinton. I have no recollection of that at all. On June 3, 1996 the Minister of Human Resources Development, who is now the Minister for International Trade, back in the good old days when all of this was happening was talking about Transelec Inc. He said: “I have no recollection of only three Quebec firms having been kept on the short list. I have never seen three Quebec firms on a single short list since I have been minister. We will look into it and report back to the member”. That is another precious one. We will put a committee on that. We will just get a little committee together to study that for the next several years. It is just unbelievable how it goes on and on.

There are more miscellaneous things. Ignace Saw got a Canada jobs grant, which is the successor of the transitional jobs fund. That

Routine Proceedings

firm got \$250,000. That numbered company is 1191546 Ontario Ltd. It is in the riding of Kenora—Rainy River, which happens to be the riding of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. It was okayed December 3, 1999 by this HRD minister, only two weeks after she was briefed on the disastrous internal audit, which was released on January 19, 2000.

• (1245)

Of course she had known about it for some time but thought it would never get public, probably. She thought she would just look after it internally, everything would be okay and she might as well just keep dishing out the cash.

Even on the day the minister was briefed about it she repeatedly gave the appearance of normalcy in the House of Commons. I may get to this or I may not. It is hard to say, but I have every question that has been asked about this matter. We could give any number of examples of what she actually said. Here is a statement in response to a question from yours truly on November 17, 1999. She said to me:

As is the case in all regions where the transitional jobs fund has been used, Canadians are working. The unemployment levels are coming down and the government is working with communities together to make sure that this happens.

On December 1, 1999, she said:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear to the House that no rules were broken on the application for transitional jobs funds in my riding.

She would of course extend that to mean any other riding. Now, with the history of a few months behind us and under our belts, I am not sure how many RCMP investigations there are.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: About a dozen or so.

Miss Deborah Grey: A dozen, at least, that we know of. Dear knows how many more will be coming forward. Absolutely no rules got broken. Nothing happened. Everything is a-okay, but whoops, we have the RCMP investigating several of them. It does not exactly look cleaner than clean to me.

Ignace Saw donated \$1,150 to the personal 1997 campaign of the member for Kenora—Rainy River. The Canada jobs fund grant of \$250,000 was approved by the minister on December 3, 1999, according to the list made public by the minister. By year's end \$150,000 of the grant had already been paid to the company, and on and on it goes.

I mentioned earlier the Scierie Opitciwan sawmill which gave \$1,200 to the Liberal Party in 1998, \$3,700 to the Liberal Party in 1997 and \$164 to the Liberal Party in 1996, for a total of approximately five grand.

Then there was ACOA funding for the Clarenville Regional Sportsplex. This is one that we uncovered not so long ago. This

saga continues in Newfoundland as we speak. Here is a little detail about the actual project. The Clarenville Regional Sportsplex is a pool, fitness centre and restaurant. It was given ACOA funding in 1997 and 1998. Clarenville is in the riding of Bonavista—Trinity—Conception, one of the few Liberal ridings left in that area, as far as I know.

Application was made on February 12, 1997. Its evaluation began on April 24, 1997, three days before the writ was dropped, if members recall. The letter of approval for funds came on May 26, 1997, and the offer was accepted June 10, just a week after the federal election. All this stuff was milling around while there was an election going on. If that does not look like political interference, I surely do not know what does.

On April 7, 1997, ACOA sent 75 environmental screening applications to the Department of the Environment for 75 different projects including the sportsplex and requested they all be approved on a rush basis. There was no time to think it through. There was no time for applications. There is an election on. They had to buy a few seats, so they had to get at it.

They said they would appreciate having all the completed environmental screenings no later than April 25, 1997. It looks like someone else knew when the writ was going to drop. I was not exactly sure what day it was, but it looks like they did.

The province planned to announce all approved projects by the end of April 1997 and the election was called just days later. Government contributions were \$478,000 from Newfoundland, \$478,000 from federal infrastructure funds, \$127,000 from the infrastructure program for the cost overrun, and \$620,000 from the business development bank.

Federal assistance was \$605,000 in grants and \$620,000 in loans. That is a fair pile of cash. Total federal assistance was \$1.2 million. Whew, the project was one of the largest submitted in the province of Newfoundland. It was to create 40 full time jobs. It appears that no private funds were expended on the centre.

The sportsplex contains a fitness centre, squash courts, a sauna, hot tubs, massage rooms, solariums, a competition size swimming pool, two golf and putting simulators, classrooms, change rooms, a dance studio, a pro shop and a restaurant. Yikes.

On February 28, 2000, just a matter of weeks ago, after less than two years of operation the town of Clarenville confirmed that the sportsplex—I ask my colleague to guess the answer.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Do I get a lifeline? I guess it went broke.

• (1250)

Miss Deborah Grey: He is right. It went broke. It closed its doors. There is a sign on the front door indicating that the building

is closed because of “mechanical problems resulting from the design of the building”.

My husband is a builder. If a sign is hung on the front door of any building he ever built saying that “mechanical problems resulting from the design of the building”, he would be some upset. I know this is quite creative, but before he built the building he would want to make sure that it was designed to be mechanically sound and not have its doors shut two years later. Apparently there is a legal dispute regarding the lining of the pool in the building. Bren Power is suing the contractor who built the pool claiming defective work.

My husband has been building an addition on a house. All last fall he worked on it for someone who is building a swimming pool in the Edmonton area. He would not be impressed if the thing got shut down after a year or two because the swimming pool part did not work.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: He probably did not get a million dollars in government help.

Miss Deborah Grey: He did not get a dime in the form of a government grant. ACOA signed a contract with Bren Power stating that the facility had to remain open for 10 years. It did not make it. If he sells the facility before the tenth year, he must pay back the money in an amount declining by 10% each year until the tenth year. In other words, he still owes a pile of cash on that building.

There was local opposition to the project. In November 1998 business people started complaining. Chris Newman, the owner of a local sports shop, complained in the press by saying that was built with their tax dollars to provide in return direct competition with other local businesses. Here is some guy who owns a sports shop and then the federal government funds a huge percentage, almost all, of another sports complex. He asks how he is supposed to make a living.

I bet you would hate, Mr. Speaker, to see government coming in and building a nice big hefty bakery just a couple of blocks down the road on White Avenue. It would make it pretty hard to sell those baguettes and cinnamon buns. Ralph Matsson, owner of the local Jungle Jim restaurant actually went out of business after the Don Cherry restaurant opened. He cites the government assisted competition of Don Cherry as an important factor in the closure. Now the Don Cherry restaurant has moved into the old Jungle Jim location in the St. Jude Hotel downtown.

An undated ACOA backgrounder indicates that the media reports the sportsplex facility contains a Don Cherry sports bar which is not well received by local business. Bren Power advises that while the sportsplex was publicly funded, the restaurant and sports bar were funded with private funds. Don Cherry is a good businessman. He builds Don Cherry restaurants and he gives great commentary on *Hockey Night in Canada*. However we see what happens when we get tied into government phoney funding. It

Routine Proceedings

skews the whole business community and makes it very difficult for businesses to make a go of it. Don Cherry has moved downtown.

An ACOA backgrounder indicates that it did not know that a restaurant would go into the space in the sportsplex. All it knew was that space had been allocated for food services. It sounds like a cafeteria. ACOA’s environmental screening report dated April 24, 1997, indicates that a pro shop and a restaurant would be part of the facility.

The project received some letters of private support. However the mayor of Clarenville indicated publicly that the local town’s letter of support was sent to Mr. Power after a presentation he made to council. Council did not know that infrastructure funds would go toward the sportsplex.

We would probably define infrastructure funds as sewer, water and making sure that everything works okay regarding water and sewers so that if I build a building on top of it everything will be okay. That is infrastructure. Then the superstructure is built on top of it.

The mayor said that the town of Clarenville would never support the fact that the provincial or federal government would divert much needed infrastructure money intended for water, sewer and roads into a private development. That is our concern about the whole matter. Everyone in this area would support such a project, but everyone in this area would not expect the provincial government to take money away from the chronic care facility of Clarenville and put it into that. They just took the money, put it in there against the mayor’s good judgment and that of lots of other people. It is just unreal.

I will tell the House about the owner of this facility. His name is Bren Power. He is from Clarenville. He ran for nomination for the provincial Liberals, whoops, in the riding of Trinity North in 1992 against Doug Olford.

• (1255)

The centre has already been the subject of controversy in the Newfoundland house of assembly. Mr. Jack Byrne, member for Cape St. Francis, said during question period:

Are we looking at pure, partisan politics and Liberal patronage to the uppermost levels?

They could figure it out. These things are politically motivated. Mr. Byrne repeated in the press on March 1:

I’ll say it again, it’s another case of political patronage.

Mr. Power reportedly raised funds for the member for Trinity—Bonavista—Conception. No Liberal donations have been found. The gym equipment has reportedly been sold to another pair of businessmen who also received an HRD grant. On and on the saga goes.

Routine Proceedings

Here is just a grab bag of a few miscellaneous boondoggles. Rama Reserves, a tiny reserve near Orillia, Ontario, has 600 band members. The Majikaning band has operated Casino Rama for three years and has full employment. An HRD office opened in that area in June 2000 at an initial cost of \$164,000. The band just negotiated a deal with the province of Ontario to share casino profits. The deal is worth \$123 million. Not bad. That is \$200,000 for every man, woman and child on the reserve. This was reported in the Toronto *Star* on February 9, 2000.

Wal-Mart has a market capitalization of \$250 billion and profits of \$1.92 billion for the three month period ending January 31, 2000. It paid Metrus Properties, another huge company with longstanding Ontario Liberal connections, to build a huge \$60 million warehouse in Cornwall with 172 loading docks. Metrus received a \$300,000 transitional jobs fund grant, yikes, thus benefiting Wal-Mart. That is a pretty good deal with 300,000 bucks off the bill.

American based RMH Teleservices was enticed to the riding of the minister of HRDC using \$1.6 million in HRD grants over the protests of a neighbouring Liberal MP. Later RMH executive vice-president Michael Scharff said in an interview that they would have located there without the grant anyway. He said he was sure they would be in Brantford one way or another. It was kind of icing on the cake. Who would not take it? If he did not take it someone else would. The next guy would. That is the very frustrating part of trying to do business across Canada. We see phony, trumped up government grants. It is ridiculous.

Warton, Ontario, received \$50,000 from HRD to hold a groundhog festival featuring the rodent Warton Willie II. The original one is gone. He has crossed over. It is not like Peter Donolo who has crossed over to Italy on a plum post. Warton Willie has really crossed over.

The Canadian Aerospace Group in Nipissing, Ontario, received \$917,000 of a \$1.3 million TJF grant before going bankrupt without building any aircraft. Then the minister has the nerve to say that we are being critical of some of these programs. You bet we are, Mr. Speaker. When we call it the billion dollar boondoggle, that is exactly what it is. I am going through list after list.

It was supposed to be better. The Prime Minister campaigned in 1993 and again in 1997 that it was going to be good. He said as recorded in *Hansard* in 1991 when he was standing on this side as leader of the opposition:

When we form the government every minister in the cabinet that I would be presiding will have to take the full responsibility of what is going on in his office.

It could be her office. There are women cabinet ministers and competent ones at that. He continued:

And if there is bungling in the department, nobody will be singled out but the minister will have to take the responsibility.

Boy, Mr. Speaker, if you have not seen bungling, you have not been watching. The HRD department is an embarrassment because of the things and the bungling that have gone there. The minister says she has instituted a six point plan, which I will read in a minute, as if that will solve everything. The Prime Minister says he will make sure they take responsibility for it. There is no responsibility taken there.

The Prime Minister said on February 1, 2000, that administrative problems of this kind happen all the time. This was quoted in *L'Acadie Nouvelle*. They will just pick out the administrative people and say "Those horrible people over there at HRDC, I am going to get that department straight". It is blamed on somebody else.

• (1300)

Here is another one. He said, "Do you think it was better under Mulroney?" The member for Edmonton Southeast ought to know because he was a member of the Mulroney government before 1993. It makes it all right because, "It was worse under Mulroney so I am not bad". What a way to run a country. It is absolutely ridiculous that it was worse under Mulroney so maybe he is not doing too badly. He said that in the Ottawa *Sun* on February 3, just a couple of months ago.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: The Liberals are worse on time allocation, we know that.

Miss Deborah Grey: Yes, they have hit the record on time allocation now.

He said, "What is boondoggle? Give me the definition of that. Tell me, is there money that has disappeared?" I remember that great happy day when the Prime Minister came out of his office to the scrum. The HRDC minister was in the scrum trying desperately to answer questions. She was having a hard time answering. We all remember that. The Prime Minister whisked past her and turned around and came back, "I will take this from here, I will look after the questions from here, dear" in that patronizing way and shuffled her off down the stairs in humiliation. He said, "I will look after this now. What is boondoggle? Give me the definition of that. Is there money that has disappeared?"

As a matter of fact, there probably is. Even though we were not accusing the minister of money being missing, it is turning out from some RCMP investigations that some of the money really has gone missing. It is certainly not \$1 billion. A lot of the cheques can be traced but there is some money that has actually disappeared. I would say "Yes, Mr. Prime Minister, on February 5, 2000, maybe some money has disappeared".

And what is the definition of boondoggle? It is when a minister acts irresponsibly so that she is not in full control of her department to know exactly where the money is going and why. That would be a definition of boondoggle.

Routine Proceedings

He said in *Hansard* on February 9, “Of \$11 million of so-called problems there was an overpayment of a little bit more than \$250”. I hardly think so. Maybe it was that at the time, but of course only 459 files had been looked at out of 60,000. Now there are any number of RCMP investigations, many of which are in the Prime Minister’s riding.

Then he said, as Andrew Coyne cited in the *Ottawa Citizen* on February 22, “Listen, we are the government. I don’t see why we can’t get credit for what we do. I hope we do so. There is nothing to be ashamed of, we do it all the time. I am the government”. Remember the quote from 1993, “Any file from Saint-Maurice that comes across any cabinet minister’s desk, you bet I will be there for them. You get the cash”. He must feel like Regis Philbin on *Who Wants to be a Millionaire*; just pass out the cash.

Here he is again, “We ought to get credit for what we do. I hope we do. There is nothing to be ashamed of, we do it all the time”. At least he admits that the Liberals do it all the time. It is absolutely unbelievable and shameful and it ought to stop very soon.

He said, “I think it happens to you at the end of the month to see that you have spent a few more dollars than expected”. Spend a few more dollars than expected. This seems ridiculous. In the *London Free Press*, February 19, 2000—

[*Translation*]

Hon. Denis Coderre: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I want to congratulate the hon. member. I had a call from the people at the Guinness records and, never in the history of active politics has so much rubbish been heard in so short a time.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Well, there you are.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, I understood every word and frankly, I have made history before in this place so we might as well add that to the record.

He said further in the *London Free Press* on February 19, 2000, “I think it happens to you at the end of the month to see that you have spent a few more dollars than expected”. A few more dollars. We have all been in that position where we have spent a few more dollars but \$1 billion seems a little excessive. All of a sudden the Liberals had no idea where this money was with this great boondoggle. There were hundreds of projects and they had no idea where the money was and what the people were doing with it and he said that it is a few dollars at the end of the month. It is unbelievable.

In the *London Free Press* on February 19, it was a busy day, he said, “Recipients have not complained at all”. As the kids would

say, well, duh. Who will complain about getting free money? It is pretty sad. It goes on and on.

I made reference to the six point plan. The minister has told us time and time again, “We have instituted a six point plan and everything will be wonderful”. Everybody can just sit back and feel so much at ease that the government is really managing its money because it has a six point plan and all will be well.

• (1305)

The minister claims that she incorporated the views of Deloitte & Touche in the final draft of the six point plan to strengthen the administration of grants and contributions. She made the following claims on May 3 a few days ago. She said in *Hansard*:

We have added aspects of training and aspects focusing on accountability. We have ensured that senior management know what their roles are and what accountable role they will have to play. We actually put together a grants and contribution team, a team focused on this.

Should the focus team not have been in place before the whole thing started rather than after the boondoggle was blown loose?

She also said “We made sure that senior executives were making the final sign-off on those transfer terms”. She should have been doing that a long time ago. She went on to say “They said that we should make sure we address the root cause of the audit findings. We are doing a number of things in that regard, making sure employees have training”. That is great. They should have training. She went on to say “We did indeed address and assign authorities and responsibilities”.

The day before that, the minister for HRD said in *Hansard*, regarding her six point plan:

They said that we needed greater cohesiveness to orchestrate the various actions in an integrated fashion. What did we do? We established a grants and contributions team to ensure that we meet their recommendations.

Perhaps they have jerseys too or maybe the hon. member could buy them some. She went on to say:

They said that we needed assurance that funds had been transferred according to program requirements. What did we do? We put in place a departmental directive on the issuance of payments which require sign-off by senior executives to ensure that the payments are made appropriately.

An hon. member: Unless the minister’s fund is involved.

Miss Deborah Grey: Yes, the minister’s reserves are right there. We have to ask a question in rebuttal. The grants and contributions performance tracking group was established in September 1999. It was stated in the program integrity audit on page 14, released on January 19. This is hardly something new and creative which she came out with in February, March and April.

Routine Proceedings

The directive on the issuance of payments was issued January 20 requiring sign-off by senior executives prior to any new payments anyway. What is the big deal about everything being new and wonderful?

Deloitte & Touche brought forward its recommendations on February 2. It said in committee that the final draft was completed February 6. This version was put on the Internet on February 21 along with lots and lots of pages of grants and contributions made public by the department. Deloitte & Touche never even got another look at it. It was hired to look at it and made a few little changes. You will see in a minute, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you are rapt with attention on this, that the final version of the six point plan is precious little different from the draft version Deloitte & Touche looked at and said was abysmal.

The number one subject was to ensure that payments meet standards. Here is the six point plan. I am sure there are Canadians who wonder if there really was a six point plan. There is.

Number one is to ensure payments meet standards. Number two is to resolve issues with past files. Number three is to equip and support staff. Number four is to get the best advice available. As if they needed to come up with a new six point plan to say to get the best available. Number five is accountability in reporting. Number six is communications. As if this is something new and creative.

These basic things should have been in there since the beginning. Ensure payments meet standards; obviously. Resolve issues with past files; who is not going to give money who has not checked it out? Equip and support staff; that would be a really smart thing to do. That should have been done off the top. Get the best advice available; anybody would know that. Accountability in reporting; as if this is something new with government money. It should be accountable and report every cent. Communications; sometimes we need good communications to get our point across.

That is the six point plan. It is unbelievable that a minister of the crown would stand and trumpet that day after day, as if there has been an amazing discovery and everything is okay and from now on the government will look after us.

The draft version which Deloitte & Touche looked at said that there would be no new payments without verification, to review all files by April 30 and have two senior officials approve them, and to monitor new agreements. In the final version the same points were addressed, the same officials were named and there was the same timeline. When the minister stood in her place a couple of weeks ago and said they had taken its recommendations, they had not done a thing. They just reprinted them in the next column.

The draft version said to resolve all issues with past files by February 29; review 37 files and develop methods to choose others

for review; by August 31 apply screening methods; and to study cost effectiveness of looking at files prior to 1998-99. Those were the draft version recommendations. The final version says by February 18, review the 37 files. So the date was changed by 11 days. Oh, those are substantive changes.

• (1310)

On number three the draft version says to “equip and support staff, conduct training, arrange temporary additional resources, add staff response on the standing item on national management board agenda”. That was Deloitte & Touche in the draft version. In the final version the same vague steps were implemented, but the first round of training was scheduled to take place by February 28. That was a real sign of commitment, putting a date in there. This is hardly a substantial amendment.

Number four was to get the best advice available. Deloitte & Touche in the draft version said to “consult with TB, AG”—that is the treasury board and the auditor general—“other deputies, contract senior private sector financial expert for technical advice”—that is, the best advice available—“review progress quarterly with treasury board and meet monthly with the assistant auditor general”.

In the final version, the same steps were taken. It notes that it incorporated treasury board and AG advice. The website was changed on May 3 to read that it incorporated Deloitte’s as well as treasury board’s on-site executives’ advice. On May 3, much later, the website was changed, “Whoops, got to fix this up and make sure everything looks parallel”.

Number five in the six point plan is accountability in reporting. “Report regularly to the minister, staff, senior managers, obtain outside expert advice on progress of plan, by March 31 assess cost benefit of applying the ISO 9000 to programs”.

This is what happened in the final version. The dates were changed. The dates of June 2000 and January 2001 for external review of the progress of the plan were added. I hardly think the minister could stand in her place and brag about the fact that they have brought in all these recommendations. They changed a date here and there. This is hardly substantive.

Number six was communications. Deloitte & Touche said “Brief sponsors, press, correct misinformation as appropriate, brief all staff on February 7, communicate regularly with program staff”. This is what the minister’s draft version looked like. Deloitte & Touche had some serious concerns about all these draft versions of the HRD six point plan.

The final version added “report to parliament through parliamentary committee and performance report”. The final version said that they are going to report to parliament, through parliamentary committee and performance report. The minister clearly would

Routine Proceedings

come in, stand, make a fuss and say, “Everything is okay. Trust us. I am from the government and I am here to help you. Remember me? I have a six point plan implemented and everything is absolutely fine. It is going along well”.

That six point plan is unbelievable. The minister talks about the six point plan, and especially number six, the communications angle of it, I would bet a dollar that she is not terribly impressed with the communications. Many in her own department have come forward and she did not act of course, “Uh oh, looks like this could be a real land mine”.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: It is called spin doctoring, I think.

Miss Deborah Grey: It is very frustrating. Today I have talked about the government becoming the latest incarnation of the Ottawa 67s. It now has brought in time allocation 67 times, even beating the record of Brian Mulroney, who in just over six years closed down debate in this place 66 times.

Now we see a new champion across the way, a government that railed and went on and on about how horrible and sinful it was. Yet when we look at the Prime Minister who has a heavy hand in so many areas, we should not be surprised. People seem shocked by this, but maybe when we look at it we should not be so shocked. We are certainly saddened by it.

I have a history in this place of being the only reformer, now a Canadian Alliance member. Neither of these guys was here then. I used to sit with the Liberals in the lobby. I remember many of them. I ate with many of them. I visited on airplanes back and forth with many of them. I can remember times when they were so upset and outraged in that back lobby. Boy, they could hardly put a lid on it. The member for Kingston and the Islands would come back practically vibrating because he would be so upset about the Mulroney Tories and how terrible they were. I also remember the words by the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood, when he was sitting in the lobby right behind where I am standing now, over what happened in government.

• (1315)

I remember visiting and speaking to many of those people. When I was first sworn in here I sat up in the corner. I was surrounded by the member for Broadview—Greenwood and I think the former member for Acadie—Bathurst, Doug Young, who for some strange reason is no longer in the House. The minister for Indian affairs was also there. We were all left-handers sitting up in the corner, or the dummy corner as it was dubbed. We had some good visits and some good times up there.

When I visited with those members back in the lobby, while we all ate left-handed—but you have to love us—they told me that they would not be like the Tory government. They said “When we get to government it will be different. I asked them to promise me

that if they did form the next government that they would not do the same as the Mulroney Tories. They said “Oh, yes. Scout’s honour, Deb”. It was as if everything was going to be okay and we would not have a thing to worry about. I remember them saying that they could never be that arrogant. They said that they could never be as bad as the Tories on time allocation and closing off debate. They said that free trade was a horrible thing and that they were against it.

Does anyone remember the 1988 election? The Liberals ran some good ads. The only problem was that they did not believe them.

Mr. Hec Clouthier: Very bad. Vous êtes méchante.

Miss Deborah Grey: Free trade is all right? He became a member of a party whose word was not good on that. His party was against free trade in 1988. Now that it has become government, free trade is okay.

The Liberals should have known all along that free trade was okay. If we are going to close our walls in and not trade with other people, we are in big trouble. I do not mind admitting that perhaps the member saw the light, which I know is a goofy phrase, but I think what frustrates him is joining a government that is not true to its word.

Lucien Bouchard who was another Mulroney Tory. I mentioned him earlier. He ran the best byelection money could buy. I respected him and I know the member for Edmonton Southeast respected him. At least Mr. Bouchard admitted in the House that he was a separatist. His word was good. When he formed the Bloc Québécois, I disagreed vehemently with the separatists. There were a lot of people in the Mulroney government and in fact in the Mulroney cabinet who did not have the nerve to stand their ground and say they were separatists.

Although I disagree with the Bloc, with separatism and with Lucien Bouchard, at least we have to respect them. They were true to their word.

Hon. David Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My hon. friend is not alleging that all the people in the Mulroney cabinet were separatists. There were three. I think she will be kind enough to admit that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): A salient point of order.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not accusing all the Tories. Of course he is not a Tory anymore. There were a few of them who did not have the nerve to stand up. I cannot name them all but I know Marcel Massé was one of them. Maybe the member could jump up and tell me who they were. He was probably

Routine Proceedings

intimate friends with them. Nonetheless, Lucien Bouchard was true to his word. There are others in this Chamber, I am sad to say, who perhaps were not and are not. To me, that is a pity.

When we see the Prime Minister saying one thing about free trade and then doing another, who says one thing about not being a director of a company anymore when he was, when we see the Prime Minister saying "I am just making all these excuses and I am doing a great job" and maybe he is not, then we have to say something is wrong here with the Prime Minister who says one thing and does another.

Let me give a couple of examples of that. APEC comes to mind. At the APEC meeting in Vancouver a few years ago, the meeting was to be held on the UBC campus. We know what happened there. I am not making any accusations here. I have asked probably 100 questions about it in the House of Commons over the years and have never received a straight answer. The Prime Minister likes to laugh and say that he likes pepper steak. This is not funny. People are asking these questions in coffee shops. It would be good for the Prime Minister to clear his conscience if he went to the commission to give his answers.

• (1320)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien: I am not going to Stornoway either.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, let me say on the record that I am not living at Stornoway as the Leader of the Official Opposition. I have a place in Ottawa and I am staying there.

People are saying that the Prime Minister's office directed police to use pepper spray and dogs against UBC students so that a third world dictator would not be embarrassed when he visited Canada. Who should we be concerned about in terms of embarrassing?

When asked about the use of pepper spray, the Prime Minister joked "For me, pepper is something that I put on my plate". This is a head of state. This was the Prime Minister of our country who made this joke at his little press conferences. This gave *Air Farce* and *This Hour Has 22 Minutes* great stuff to use, but it was hardly something that we would expect from the Prime Minister of our country.

I might add that a riot breaks loose every time the Prime Minister goes to Vancouver. People had a fit in front of the Hyatt Regency Hotel when the Prime Minister attended a fundraising dinner in 1998 where he continued with his joking. He said "Usually it is a rubber chicken dinner, but when we come to the west we have beef. Sometimes we have pepper steak". Somehow there is nothing hilarious about this. He might think that it gets a great rousing laugh from the crowd but it is not very funny. He talked about the merits of using pepper spray over tear gas, baseball bats or water cannons. The point is, why were they doing that in the first place? Was it to make Mr. Suharto comfy in Canada? That is the question we need to be asking.

Let us not just look at the Prime Minister's behaviour on the APEC deal. What about the auditor general's staff, the guys who look over the books and make things so uncomfortable for a government when it messes around? In 1998 the auditor general, Denis Desautels, was reprimanded by finance department officials for presuming to criticize accounting practices of the government. What do the Liberals expect the auditor general to do? His job is to audit the books. If the government is not coming across really well he will criticize accounting practices.

Does the government use generally accepted accounting principles? It seems to me that it shoves a whole lot off to future years to be reckoned with then. The auditor general was reprimanded by the finance department for pointing out those criticisms. I guess we have to ask the Liberal members whether we even have to trifle and be inconvenienced by an auditor general, because, as I said, he often does get in the way when we talk about government financing.

In 1998 inspectors at Environment Canada were warned not to testify before a commons committee on the cutbacks in their department. There is no real freedom of speech when a government member can stand up and say "If you get up in that committee and say *x*, *y* or *z* you will be in big trouble and there will be repercussions". These people should be begged for information because they are the people who are working on the front lines. They are the ones who can give us the real practical help.

I talked to someone the other day in the finance department. This was a person from whom I wanted to get information because the person knew what was going on over there. This person was warned not to testify before a committee.

In 1998 six Health Canada scientists said they were warned not to speak publicly about their concerns over a bovine growth hormone. This was another threat.

We see a government in power that is just so full of mismanagement and fear tactics that it should cause fear in all Canadians.

Health Canada Director Joseph Losos was chastized by the privacy commissioner for rummaging through the files of departmental critic Michèle Brill-Edwards. Michèle Brill-Edwards is a very bright woman. Joseph Losos was chastized by the privacy commissioner for rummaging through her files.

Mr. Sarkis Assadourian: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think we have a dress code in the House of Commons. I see the hon. member has no shoes on.

• (1325)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I really do not know what to say about that. I guess the hon. member for Brampton Centre is a very observant person.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I am not sure if the hon. member has a quotation from either the standing orders, Beauchesne's or some other precedent setting moment that he would like to quote. I am sure we would all be interested. However, as the hon. member well knows, the dress code in the House of Commons has to do with men wearing ties and being able to vote and certain other dress codes. If he has something to add to that, perhaps we would all be enlightened if he could bring it forward.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I suppose that if we were looking for a rule dealing with shoes it would be under the standing orders.

Mr. Sarkis Assadourian: Mr. Speaker, it is only common decency that when we are in the House we should have our shoes on.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, obviously something is afoot here, and it is that members on the government side do not like to hear the truth that the leader of the opposition is giving them. I suggest that they just sit in their place, take it on the chin and bear with it. These are the facts and the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We will settle it right here. We have been here before and in other circumstances we have said that it is not what is on the feet but what is in the head that counts.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, you are absolutely right. I am just getting more and more impressed by the moment.

Members will recall a comment made a while ago by the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and the Status of Women. My own status is about 3/4 inches shorter right now than it generally is. She accused me of being barefoot, pregnant and in the kitchen. I am barefoot but I am certainly not in the kitchen.

I will carry on. I was talking about 1998 when the courts said that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans does not have the authority to proceed with the aboriginal commercial fishery. The government replied that it was one man's opinion. It just tossed the ruling aside and ignored it. What a way to toss things off.

In 1998 the Prime Minister refused to appoint two senators elected from Alberta. Now there is a good one. Everyone knows that we had an election in Alberta. I think the hon. member for Edmonton Southeast even supports those senatorial elections because he has seen what has gone on in the Senate over the years, which might lead me to another good point. Those men, Ted Morton and Bert Brown, were elected by hundreds of thousands of people in Alberta and they were told that they could not go into the Senate.

One might ask how that could happen to people who were elected. Of course no one is elected in the Senate. Just look at who has been named to the Senate.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills: Did you call me?

Miss Deborah Grey: Oh, the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood. Come and sit over here.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills: Do I get to speak?

Miss Deborah Grey: No, I am sorry.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills: You just want to take shots but you won't let me speak.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, I will take all kinds of shots.

I just mentioned the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood and the fact that we used to visit up in the dummy corner. I am sure he remembers. I thought I was making kind remarks earlier when I talked about the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood. I said that when we used to sit up in that corner and have the odd bite of food out in the lobby, I asked him if he would promise me when his party came to government that it would be different than the Mulroney Tories. His response to me was "Absolutely, we will be different than the Mulroney Tories or better".

An hon. member: They're worse.

An hon. member: Better.

Miss Deborah Grey: Well, on this particular day I guess he has nothing to brag about because it is not better.

There are some who would say that bigger is better but when it comes to time allocation and stifling debate, the Liberals are bigger today. They are at 67 rather than 66. Oh, my, how they used to rail about Mulroney and the Tories and how horrible it was that they had brought in so much time allocation. How dreadful it was—

• (1330)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Denis Coderre: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I seek the unanimous consent of the House to congratulate my colleague, who had a vision when he sat on the other side, now that he is in the government. I seek unanimous consent to congratulate him.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Routine Proceedings

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the Senate. I know my friend from Broadview—Greenwood and I have had a few discussions over the years about the Senate. Let me have a little look at some of the Senate appointments and some of the Liberal connections. Again, I know there is no theme to this. Nobody would ever think that there was political manipulation or anything like that, which I have mentioned time and again.

Who has been put into the Senate since this Prime Minister has taken office? Sharon Carstairs, the former Manitoba Liberal leader. She was appointed on September 15, 1994. Landon Pearson, who is married to the son of the former Liberal Prime Minister Lester Pearson, was appointed on September 15, 1994.

Mr. Gar Knutson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There is a rule to prevent members from being disrespectful to the other place.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. parliamentary secretary has a very good point. We refer to the other place as the other place, and as an organ of governance we respect each other. They respect us; we respect them.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, I was not paying disrespect. I was listing their names and their political connections to the Liberal party. You have said that we should refer to it as the other place. You know perfectly well that the Speaker of the House has allowed us to call it the Senate for some years now. If it would make the hon. member happy, I will call it the other place.

Let me talk about some members of the other place and their Liberal connections. I mentioned Sharon Carstairs and Landon Pearson, both of whom are very pleasant people, but they ought to have been elected to the position and then they would have a mandate and authority.

Lise Bacon, a former Liberal deputy premier of Quebec, was appointed on September 15, 1994.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am trying my best to stretch my imagination to imagine what the relevance might be of the hon. member's comments to the topic she is presumably discussing, which I believe is the report of a committee of the House. That has absolutely nothing to do with the other place, the people who sit in it, or how they got there.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The point of order, of course, is relevant to the relevance. I, for one, was also most interested to see how the Leader of the Opposition was going to weave this back into relevance.

Miss Deborah Grey: I will do it immediately, Mr. Speaker. I am going to weave this together to show that these senators, who basically have no authority and no mandate, approve every single

dime that goes through this place and through the Senate, including all HRD spending. I did that in less than 35 seconds.

Let me tell hon. members who those people are in the other place. Jean Robert-Gauthier was appointed on November 23, 1994. He was a long time Liberal member of parliament. John Bryden, a candidate for Liberal leader in New Brunswick, who managed the Prime Minister's 1990 New Brunswick Liberal leadership campaign, was appointed on November 23, 1994.

It is still relevant. Then we have Rose-Marie Losier-Cool, Céline Hervieux-Payette, Marie Paule Poulin, Doris Anderson, William Rompkey and Lorna Milne.

Let me back up to Bill Rompkey for a minute. He and I served together in the House. I saw him this morning. He is a fine fellow, again, but I bet he would have a whole lot more relevancy if he were elected to the place.

Shirley Maheu is another former member of parliament who used to sit in the chair. She has now gone over to the other place.

Nick Taylor was the Alberta Liberal leader in days gone by. Nick is a great guy. We had lots of fun together. His provincial riding took a portion of my federal riding in Beaver River. He and his wife Peg and I had some wonderful visits back and forth. He could have run in that election in Alberta and I bet he would have won.

I would like to ask the hon. member for Edmonton Southeast if he agrees with me that Nick Taylor could have won a Senate election had he run. He looks doubtful, but there we are.

Jean Forest is, again, another pleasant woman with whom I have ridden back and forth on the plane any number of times.

Eugene Whalen was a former Liberal cabinet minister under Trudeau.

Then we have Léonce Mercier, Wilfred Moore and Lucie Pépin. Catherine Callbeck is another member I sat with in the House in days gone by. Then we have Sister Peggy Butts. Fernand Robichaud is another former MP. Then we have Marisa Ferretti Barth and Serge Joyal.

Thelma Chalifoux is another great woman from Alberta with whom I travel back and forth on the plane all the time. She said to me one time "I probably could not get elected because I am a woman". I think she said she was Metis. Surely she could have been elected. Thelma has some real abilities. She is serving in the other place. I do not disrespect her, but she would have a lot more of a powerful punch if she were elected.

• (1335)

The list goes on: Joan Cook, Archibald Johnston, Ross Fitzpatrick, and Tommy Banks, whom I have not yet seen on the plane. He was just appointed on April 7, 2000. He is the one who was put

Routine Proceedings

in Ron Ghitter's place, when we have two fine senators-elect from Alberta, Bert Brown and Ted Morton. They are the senators in waiting. They are the legitimate senators. Although Tommy Banks plays a fine tune, he has no legitimacy here because he was appointed.

The list continues: James Bernard Boudreau; Ione Christensen; Sheila Finestone, another Liberal member with whom I sat in the House; Joan Fraser, who is a great woman; George Furey; Aurélien Gill; Richard Kroft; Frank Mahovlich, the big *M*.

Members are concerned about this. We can see how touchy this is. It has sparked some fireworks. The problem is that these people who are appointed to political work, to get their reward and their favour in the other place, put through every single dollar of spending by this government, and that is illegitimate.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills: What is wrong with it?

Miss Deborah Grey: The member for Broadview—Greenwood asks what is wrong with it. That is exactly what is wrong with the Liberals and the political system.

Frank Mahovlich: "He shot; he scored". Then we have Marion Maloney, Melvin Perry, and Vivian Poy, another wonderful woman. She is Adrienne Clarkson's sister-in-law. She is a great woman who has no legitimacy in the other place. Then we have Douglas James Roche, another fellow from Alberta who has made a real name for himself; Calvin Woodrow Ruck; Nick Sibbeston, who was the former N.W.T. premier; John Wiebe from Saskatchewan; Lois Wilson; and Jean Louis Roux.

The point is, we have these HRD scandals. We have a government which has proven that it is truly illegitimate because of the heavy hand of the Prime Minister, all of the grants that I have documented today, the HRD mess that this government has put us into, and the idea of political interference. The member for Broadview—Greenwood knows perfectly well that there is political interference. He and I have had discussions over the years when he has been so frustrated that he has marched up and down the hall. He knows it. He is still frustrated. I probably cannot help that. It is part of life. Sure it is part of life, but we do what we can to get over the frustration. We do not just carry on with the system the way it is and say "That is the way it is".

Let me get back to government spending and government mismanagement in terms of grants and contributions. We have just finished the end of the fiscal year. I would like to point out what happens to grants and contributions when March madness takes—

Mr. Dennis J. Mills: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member is aware of my deep respect for her. However, I think there is something she said earlier that might be misunderstood by the millions of people who are watching this debate.

Yes, this is a place where nearly every day of the week one can experience frustration. However, I would not want my community in Toronto or other communities across Canada to think that I am opposed to Human Resources Development Canada. Do we have mistakes and do we—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am sorry. That is getting perilously close to debate. I gave the hon. member as much latitude as I could. I would ask the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood to come to the point please.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills: Mr. Speaker, I was just about to make my point. It is very important.

• (1340)

The point I want to make is that, in spite of frustration, in no way, shape or form should the member leave the image with the people of Canada that we do not support Human Resources Development Canada.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, standing to set the record straight is a good try. I understand that the member gets frustrated, but I think his constituents know that he is a tireless worker on their behalf. They probably also know that he believes in HRD funding. I know he has supported the minister time and time again. I disagree with him on that, but I certainly respect his right to do so. I want to set the record straight on that.

I was talking about the Senate, but I think I should go on to something else because I am upsetting the people on the other side.

I want to move on, Mr. Speaker, because my time is short. I want to talk for a few minutes about March madness, fiscal year end spending, which I mentioned before I was interrupted.

The Canadian Alliance Party has analyzed an access to information request received from Public Works and Government Services Canada, listing all grant and contribution spending over four fiscal years by all departments and agencies of the federal government. Spending by 30 departments and agencies is listed over the period April 1 to March 31 for the years 1996-97 to 1999-00. The month of March 2000 was not available at the time of request.

Year end spending was an issue addressed by the disastrous program integrity internal audit of human resources development. It noted that HRD money was spent to avoid losing it at the end of each fiscal year. In other words, there was *x* amount of money in the budget and if March 1 arrived before a department spent it all, the department would look for ways to spend the money to avoid it being taken away at the end of March.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills: Put it back into the economy.

Miss Deborah Grey: Here we go with the Liberal viewpoint of hurry up, spend it, get it back into the economy. I can see why the

Routine Proceedings

people in charge think that March madness is the way to go now that we have a \$600 billion debt.

The review found that across all 1998-99 contribution programs examined, some \$261 million, or 26.3% of all project expenses, was paid out after March 1. One-quarter of the year's spending was spent in one month, the month of March. These expenditures are typically advanced for the coming fiscal year to avoid lapsing funds at the end of the year.

The total amounts of grants and contributions spent by fiscal year across all departments and agencies of the federal government were as follows: 1996-97, \$14.12 billion; 1997-98, \$14.26 billion; 1998-99, \$15.22 billion; and 1999-00—and of course the month of March is not available—\$11.60 billion. This brings the total to \$55.2 billion. That is unbelievable.

Given the fact that I have drawn attention to these things I can understand why some Liberal members are frustrated when they look at these facts. It is probably a little embarrassing.

I will get ready to wind down because we do have to get to question period. I am sure that Liberal members are grateful because I know they want to be drilled and grilled again about some of their general mismanagement.

Members have been pressing me to tie this issue together. It is easy to tie together. This government is out of control. It says that it is managing our money and looking after Canadians. Yet we see massive amounts of money being spent that is based on, I believe, political manipulation. We see a government whose members say that they are in control and claim that everything is okay. Yet the same government has invoked closure more times than the Mulrooney Tories. I never thought it would happen. I believed these guys. I guess that shows how naive I was. I believed members when they told us that things would be a whole lot different when the Liberals formed the government. I do not see a lot of difference and I do not think my friend from Broadview—Danforth does either.

I would like to cite a few things from question period. I am sorry that I will barely be able to touch the surface of this binder.

• (1345)

Some of the questions we have asked and some of the answers that have been given to us have frustrated us because the Canadian public is not getting the answers,

Let me refer to question period on February 7, the day after the HRD boondoggle had blown loose. The former leader of the opposition, the member for Calgary Southwest, said:

Mr. Speaker, Canadian taxpayers pay the highest personal income taxes in the western world. No wonder they are angry therefore when they find out that more than a billion of those hard earned taxpayer dollars have been grossly mismanaged by the Minister of Human Resources Development.

If the human resources minister had any respect for Canadian taxpayers and respect for the principle of ministerial accountability, she would rise in her place today and resign from cabinet.

Remember the note I talked about earlier from the Prime Minister when he said his ministers would take responsibility. She did not. Would the minister resign? Of course the Prime Minister said he would not accept the resignation if it were offered. That goes a little counter to what he had said earlier. Then the former leader asked:

The Prime Minister intervenes not to protect Canadian taxpayers, but to protect the discredited minister.

These are the folks who are footing the bill on all this stuff. He went on to say:

In 1991 the Prime Minister said "When we form government, every minister in the cabinet will have to take full responsibility for what is going on in their department. If there is any bungling in the department, the minister will have to take responsibility".

When did the Prime Minister abandon the principle of holding cabinet ministers accountable?

The Prime Minister responded by saying that she was just doing okay and that everything was fine. The member for Calgary Southwest went on to say:

—a fish rots from the top down.

We pointed out last year that moneys from the transitional jobs fund were being misused in the Prime Minister's riding. The Prime Minister excused it. He accepted no responsibility. He set the wrong example. Now that little scandal from Shawinigan has become the billion dollar boondoggle in human resources.

Why does the Prime Minister not start accepting responsibility for this gross misuse of taxpayers' money and fire the Minister of Human Resources Development?

That did not happen and it has dogged them. It has gone on and on and on. It has now come down to the coffee shop level. In fact, my husband and I were at the Alberta land titles place a while ago. A fellow came up to me. I forget what he was asking about, but he said he ought to get an HRD grant for it. When people are talking at the ground level about it, we know that it has resonated from the holy hill all the way down to people at the ground level. When they start talking like that, it makes us wonder how much general respect there is for a government and a Prime Minister who is not terribly concerned about it.

When we came back on February 7, I asked the following question:

It is one thing for the minister to say that everything is going just great in her department. She has borrowed a pair of flip-flops from the industry minister.

He had just gone through a wonderful deal for the NHL hockey teams that lasted about 24 hours. She was following his lead. I went on to say:

First she said everything was really well managed and that she was just proud as punch of it. On November 4 she said, "Nothing inappropriate was done in terms of the

administration of the approval process". But now she admits that maybe some things were overlooked, little things, like application forms and things like that.

Why will the minister not just accept the responsibility she has for this billion dollar bungle and resign?

She said no, that everything was okay. She said "Let me repeat again that there have been no \$1 billion lost". I did not say that there had been a billion lost. I said there was a billion dollars bungled and pretty hard to track down. Of course the RCMP are trying to track some of it down right now. She said "We know where the money is". On and on it goes. One of my colleagues from Edmonton—Strathcona said:

The human resources minister should take advice from the Prime Minister. Back in his righteous days he said "When you are a minister and your bureaucrats do well, you take the credit. I always took the credit. On the other side. . .when I made a mistake, I took the blame.

The Prime Minister said that earlier. Who has the HRD minister, in fact probably all of them, blamed? The bureaucrats. It is not their fault. They are getting the political direction from the top and they are doing what they have been told to do. To me that is the pity of it because their political masters are getting involved in some of the things they should be making wise decisions on.

Let us look at the questions we asked in February. There were no answers. In March it was the same thing. We asked any number of questions. If we were to get an answer there would not be so many pages of questions that we have to ask.

• (1350)

In April, not long ago, we were asking all kinds of questions. The unfortunate part is they are not being answered correctly by the government. Sure, answers are tossed off to have something in *Hansard*, but at the same time the minister knows that she is not out of the woods yet. We continue to find more and more information.

Let me just make a couple of remarks in closing about what has gone on in the HRDC committee. I could go on for a long time about it. We have seen some of the results. When a minister gets brought to committee, it is unbelievable some of the things he or she will say which simply do not make a lot of sense.

When the minister was called to committee on Thursday, February 10, the chair, the member for Peterborough, said:

The gavel has now gone down. I would ask the media to leave.

There is an open and happy little affair. Upon asking the witness to take her seat, the minister did so. On and on and on we go. She talked about all kinds of things. None of them gave answers, though. Basically I could condense probably 150 pages to quote the minister as saying it is okay; we have the six point plan; everything is all right; everything will be okay. It goes on and on and on.

Routine Proceedings

Then Claire Morris was called in. She was asked a lot of questions. Then Mel Cappe was brought in and he was asked a lot of questions. I went to that particular meeting that day. It was fascinating because Mel Cappe basically said that he was not really free to answer that question. If we are talking about government money and taxpayer dollars, there had better be a lot of people who are willing to answer.

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hate to interrupt the member's remarks, but she did mention me, the member for Peterborough, as chair of the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development. She implied that the media were not present at the meeting. This is not true, as she knows. All the meetings were fully televised. At meetings which are televised by the House of Commons it is normal practice not to have commercial television there. That was the reason for the statement which the member quoted from me at the meeting.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that correction. I think I probably said that the media was asked to leave the room. I forget the comment I made after that. I will have to check the blues. I know those meetings were publicized and I appreciate that rebuke. I thank the member very much.

An hon. member: As well they should have been.

Miss Deborah Grey: As well they should have been. As time is drawing to a close because we have to move forward to question period to ask some more questions—

Some hon. members: More, more.

Miss Deborah Grey: I would be happy to say more. I would like to ask if we could have unanimous consent in the House to cancel question period and I will carry on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. Leader of the Opposition has asked for unanimous consent to cancel question period. I do not know if we can do that even with unanimous consent because it is a standing order. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, many people over there came here in the 1997 election. It is easy to throw the shots across. I like to take it as well as I can give it. I appreciate the comments from the other side today, but they were not here in the 1988 election. The minister of state was not here in the 1988 election. She was not sitting in the back with many of us. The member from Broadview—Danforth was not here listening to all the promises.

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development from Kenora—Rainy River was here. We sat side by side. Things were

S. O. 31

going to be a whole lot different. Things were going to be better. He could say maybe they are, but in terms of shutting down democracy in this place, or what we would hope would be democracy in this place, it seems to me something dreadful has gone wrong in their dreams or their plans.

• (1355)

I have quoted members of the House today about how horrible it was under the Mulroney Conservatives. It was an affront to democracy that they did not get a chance to speak. Democratic debate was shut down in the House. They were exercised about it. They were sick about it. Things were going to be different. Things were going to be better.

I heard from two members today earlier in the debate that it is much harder to do this when one is the government. Bunk. They have not had to shut down debate. In terms of major pieces of legislation since this bunch formed the government back in 1993 there is precious little of longstanding repute.

It seems to me, when we look at some of the major pieces of legislation, that we could have had any amount of time to have every member of the House bring forward a regional flavour on how a particular piece of legislation would affect them. Yet the government says it is too busy doing the great things of the nation and moving forward. The House leader rants in a scrum and talks about horrible opposition members.

When Mulroney was on the other side bringing in time allocation, the House leader was one of the worst people over here for making a fuss about it. Members who were here know that. Yet here he is today, the proud champion of the head of the Ottawa 67s. Some 67 times the government has brought in closure or time allocation on debate in six years.

An hon. member: You are still here.

Miss Deborah Grey: I am still here. I am saying how frustrating it is for people across the country. They think something will be debated in parliament and then they see a government absolutely shut it down.

Now they are the champs. They railed about it. The Deputy Speaker railed about it in 1991 and 1992. How he went on. The table clerks remember. They were here. They remember what an affront to democracy this was and how terrible it was. Now they are in government it is different. It is so bad from this side, yet it is so good when in government. It is absolutely ridiculous.

In six years, 66 times the Mulroney Tories shut down debate in this place. Now it is 67 times as of today for this government, even more than the Mulroney Tories. It is unbelievable to me.

Let us look at the legacy of shame: Bill C-18, electoral boundaries, 1994; Bill C-34, Yukon First Nations Act; Bill C-33, Yukon

First Nations Act; Bill C-32, Excise Tax Act; Bill C-35, Department of Citizenship and Immigration Act; Bill C-74, supervision of longshoring and related operations at west coast ports; Bill C-77, Maintenance of Railways Operations Act; Bill C-77, Maintenance of Railways Operations Act, another report stage or second reading; again Bill C-77, Railway Operations Act; and Bill C-68, Firearms Act. That was a special one.

The Speaker: I regret interrupting the hon. member, but I see that it is almost time for Statements by Members. The member has one minute to wind up.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, I am watching the clock carefully. I see it is almost two o'clock. In my one minute of wrap-up, I cannot believe with HRDC, the billion dollar boon-dogge and all that has gone on, that the government says "Trust me, I am here to manage your money". What a disgrace for every government member in the House to say that they are managing our money. It is hard to believe.

They railed about the Mulroney Conservatives when they were on this side, as you were, Mr. Speaker. You heard it all, as I did. Now they are over there and they have broken the record of Brian Mulroney by using time allocation and closure 67 times in the House. I say shame on them.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[English]

VANCOUVER SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

Mr. Lou Sekora (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday as a federal government representative, I observed 6,452 musical students and the Vancouver Symphony Orchestra play Beethoven for nine minutes and 53 seconds in order to beat the world record. They are now in the the *Guinness Book of Records* because they beat the old world record of seven minutes and 43 seconds. I was delighted to be there to represent the Deputy Prime Minister and the minister responsible for the millennium fund, and to announce that they were getting \$129,667.

* * *

YORKTON REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL MARCHING 100

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to bring attention to one of Canada's greatest bands, the Yorkton Regional High School Marching 100.

These high school students from my constituency are in Ottawa as part of an eastern Canada tour called “Combining Canadian History With Performance”. They will be performing in Ontario and Quebec and will also be learning about the cultures, history and languages of this great nation.

The Marching 100 have acted as excellent ambassadors for Yorkton, Saskatchewan and Canada in their extensive travels. These students have become well known for their abilities as band performers with their most notable performance being at the world famous Rose Bowl parade. Larry Pearen, the director, has also been to four Grey Cup games with this award winning band.

Today this band will be performing on Parliament Hill. I urge all members to come and see what makes this band so great. The band’s many awards are the result of hard work and supportive parents who have encouraged its members to excel.

Hats off to the Yorkton Regional High School Marching 100 who are in our gallery today.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE

Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Brampton West—Mississauga, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this past weekend 30 years ago, the IDRC was created and its mission launched to promote scientific research in the interests of the people of the developing world.

Back in 1970 the IDRC chose an innovative approach by placing resources and responsibilities in the hands of the people in the south. IDRC’s efforts to help the south build its own pool of knowledge and expertise have some notable milestones. In South Africa and Chile for example, IDRC’s early support to researchers helped ease the transformation of these countries to democracies. Simple technologies, such as bed nets dipped in insecticides and salt fortified with iodine and iron, have saved lives.

Success stories like these have garnered IDRC an international reputation, enhancing Canada’s stature abroad as a caring nation committed to helping the world’s poor to improve their lives.

* * *

[Translation]

THE FAMILY

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Ahuntsic, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to International Day of Families celebrated yesterday, May 15.

Families are found at the heart of our society. Our children, who are the future of our country and of the world, develop within the family. It is vital to provide and maintain a stable, balanced and

durable foundation so that our children can make a contribution to society.

[English]

The government through budget 2000 and other initiatives has placed an importance on bettering the lives of children and their families, but we still have more to do.

I take this occasion to thank my family, especially my daughters and my husband, for their love and support, especially in the hard times many of us often face in this privileged institution to which we have been elected by all Canadians.

* * *

GENERAL MOTORS OF CANADA

Ms. Susan Whelan (Essex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that a delegation from General Motors of Canada’s Women’s Advisory Council will be meeting in Ottawa today.

As members of the House know, General Motors of Canada is one of Canada’s leading automakers. Its Women’s Advisory Council is a group which advises senior management on issues impacting women in the workplace.

Founded 17 years ago, the council has been instrumental in prompting advances in company policy. Its efforts have contributed to bringing forward programs such as job sharing, telecommuting, formal mentoring and more. The group’s efforts to develop practical solutions to issues which face women in the workplace have resulted in a better, richer work environment for all General Motors of Canada employees.

On behalf of my colleagues I would like to extend a warm welcome to the General Motors of Canada Women’s Advisory Council. I hope they enjoy their time in Ottawa.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the CBC is grappling with the issue of whether or not to cut local and regional TV shows across the country.

There needs to be a new approach and a new way of thinking in planning the future of Canada’s public broadcaster. If not, the current tug of war between the CBC and the CRTC will ensure the demise of essential CBC services. In today’s multi-channel universe and with the evolving role of the Internet, the status quo is not good enough.

As chief critic for Canadian heritage, at this time I am against any increase of public funding for the CBC.

S. O. 31

• (1405)

Today at the heritage committee the CBC president confirmed that there is a shortfall of between \$80 million and \$120 million annually but that an influx of money would not fix the supper hour newscasts across the country. He said that the private sector is already being used to help produce programs. The CBC should focus on news and documentaries, many of which come thanks to regional input.

I come from a rural riding. The CBC is the lifeline which links many rural communities in Canada.

* * *

KURDISH REFUGEES

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Fanshawe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years the international community has witnessed many atrocities against the Kurdish people. We have seen a variety of nations in the region use violence against the Kurds to achieve their political goals.

Thirty-five million Kurds live in the Middle East and they do not have a country to call home. Without a country they have been denied human, social, political and cultural rights. This conflict has the potential to create instability in the region.

The Kurdish question cannot be settled by force. Canada has a role to play in the region by advancing our human security agenda. We are a multicultural nation and through our example we can show the region that a nation that protects minority rights can prosper.

The situation involving the Kurdish people is too serious to ignore. To do so will lead to more conflict and suffering in the area.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL LIBERTÉ-JEUNESSE

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ): Mr. Speaker, representatives of the student parliament of alternative school Liberté-Jeunesse are honouring us by their presence in the gallery today.

These young people are distinguishing themselves through their volunteer efforts to improve their school. They are also involved in raising money to help them organize a variety of social activities in their community and to travel abroad.

I would like to acknowledge the presence of one parent, Jean-Paul Piquette, and thank him for his involvement, and of my favourite teacher, my daughter Nicole. Congratulations, you young people, keep up the good work, you are cool stuff.

[*English*]

NIAGARA-ON-THE-LAKE

Mr. Gary Pillitteri (Niagara Falls, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Environment Canada has just determined that what hit Niagara-on-the-Lake last Friday was a localized condition referred to as a downburst with winds of up to 180 kilometres an hour. Damage was extensive and public works as well as hydro crews are still on the job and continue to clean debris and make repairs.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the residents of Niagara-on-the-Lake who have been truly remarkable throughout this ordeal. After cleaning their own property, many of them provided wonderful assistance to their neighbours. Hydro crews put forth a continuous and concerted 24 hour a day effort to restore power as soon as possible, working throughout the night.

I would like to thank the municipality of Niagara-on-the-Lake for its quick response to the crisis. I would like to recognize the neighbouring municipalities that came to our help immediately and without hesitation.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, e-commerce and the high tech economy are driving new growth markets around the world. The tax and spend policies of the old line parties have put Canada behind in this new economy.

The Prime Minister is in denial about brain drain. His who cares attitude about brain drain sends the wrong message to our best and brightest and they leave.

Canada has the ingredients to be an e-commerce powerhouse. We have a well established and educated workforce, high levels of computer literacy and well established telecommunications infrastructure all waiting to blossom if the heavy Liberal tax clouds are blown away. The answer is for the tax and spend Liberal legacy to go.

Instead, the Canadian Alliance tax plan called solution 17 is understandable, straightforward and endorsed by experts. It is a plan that gives extensive broad based tax relief so people have a lot more of their own money in their own pockets. Businesses can succeed and Canada can for once reach its potential free from the burdensome weight of big tax and spend governments.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today the president of the CBC confirmed to the heritage committee that due to 16 years of Liberal and Conservative cuts, 17 local supper hour shows are to be reduced to one per time zone each co-hosted from

Toronto. The president believes that the only way to save our public broadcaster is by eliminating local English television shows.

Government members were upset about this but I wonder why. They ran in 1993 on a promise of reinvestment in the CBC and then cut the CBC's base budget by hundreds of millions, about as much as is needed to preserve local TV.

Now the Liberals have a decision to make. Either come up with the very significant ongoing funding to rebuild the integrity of local journalism in Canada or endorse the planned cuts through inaction.

• (1410)

I compliment the CBC on having a vision, but I do not share its belief that the private sector will pick up the slack in the 12 abandoned communities. It is a sad day for local television in Canada.

* * *

FORMER PARLIAMENTARIANS

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today former parliamentarians have come together with us in our parliament for a memorial service to commemorate parliamentarians who have passed away in the prior year. The commemoration replaces the tributes from all parties extended in the House over prior years.

This year we have celebrated the memory and contributions of 26 men and women who have served Canada in our parliamentary houses and who have passed away. Their works and contributions are recorded in our *Hansards*, in our statutes, in our policies, in our history and in our national symbols. They and their families have given Canadians a piece of their lives and that gift will live forever.

We also pay tribute today to the many living parliamentarians meeting here today whose commitments and affection for this place are reflected by their presence here. They have honoured one of their own, Mr. Stan Darling, with their Distinguished Service Award.

On behalf of all Canadians, we record our sentiments on the loss of those parliamentarians who have passed on. We acknowledge the continuing service to Canada of all living former parliamentarians who are with us today.

* * *

ST. JOHN'S WEST BYELECTION

Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC): Mr. Speaker, reports of our death were greatly exaggerated. I extend my congratulations and best wishes to Loyola Hearn, the Progressive Conservative MP elect for St. John's West. I would also be remiss if I did not

S. O. 31

congratulate Greg Malone and the NDP for putting on a very strong campaign and Anthony Sparrow of the Liberal Party for his great effort as well.

The past weekend's successful policy convention and last night's victory show there is still a need in this nation for an alternative national party that is fiscally responsible and socially compassionate. That party is the PC Party of Canada.

As for the reform party, now the Canadian Alliance, which once told me here in the House that the smallest violin plays for Atlantic Canada, I guess an even smaller violin played for them last night.

Congratulations Loyola, and welcome aboard.

* * *

[*Translation*]

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is not every day that one gets the chance to see lawyers demonstrating. They would rather defend their point of view before a judge than in front of the Montreal courthouse.

But they stepped out of character yesterday and took to the streets to protest Bill C-3, a bill that will mean repression rather than rehabilitation for young offenders. The president of the Montreal Association des avocats en droit de la jeunesse, René Binet, had the following to say:

We are on the front line. We have handled thousands of cases. We know whereof we speak. We do not want this bill.

Bloc Quebecois members heard this message long ago. The time has come for the federal Liberal members from Quebec to go along with the consensus in Quebec and to demand that their government withdraw Bill C-3. There is still time to listen to reason. The future of many young people hangs in the balance.

* * *

[*English*]

LORI'S ROOM WALKATHON

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 13, I attended the first annual Lori's Room Walkathon to benefit St. Joseph's Health Centre Foundation and the Lori's Room fund.

Established by her parents, Doug and Lorna Martin, in 1996, the Lori's Room fund honours the memory of Lorna-Lynn Martin, a young woman who struggled against a particularly virulent form of cancer which eventually caused her passing.

The endowment fund is used to create healing environment rooms that support patients at St. Joseph's. Through the refurbishing and refurnishing of rooms, St. Joseph's hopes to make Lori's

Oral Questions

room more like a residential setting that is more conducive to rest, relaxation and healing.

The five kilometre walk began at Humber Bay Park and finished off with a celebration at St. Joseph's Health Centre. To date, \$22,000 has been raised from the walkathon through pledges and donations.

I would like to congratulate the organizing committee and a very special thank you to Lorna-Lynn's parents, Doug and Lorna Martin.

* * *

• (1415)

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: Before we begin question period today, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River, we have with us former members of parliament and former senators who have come for their annual reunion for two reasons: to honour those members who have passed away during the year and to honour one of our own with a distinguished service award. I would like members to welcome home our former parliamentarians who are here with us today.

[Translation]

I am going to ask our former parliamentarian brothers and sisters to rise so that we may welcome them.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

Miss Deborah Grey (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. The government has now broken the all time record set by Brian Mulroney for shutting down debate in the House. Mulroney used closure 66 times but with this government we are up to 67.

Let me quote the government House leader back in his purer times when he was in the opposition. He said:

I am shocked. . . This government has used closure on dozens and dozens of occasions. This is just terrible.

How hard was it for the Prime Minister to force his House leader to abandon his principles 67 times and counting?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hate to give a lesson in parliamentary procedure to the Leader of the Opposition. I have not used closure once since the last election.

Miss Deborah Grey (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, he can get technical about time allocation and closure, but he knows perfectly well it means the same thing, that we are not allowed to debate in the House.

Let us see if he can guess who this is. I quote:

What we have here is an absolute scandal in terms of the government's unwillingness to listen to the representatives of the people in the House. Never before have we had a government so reluctant to engage in public discussion on the bills before this House.

That was the Deputy Speaker of this parliament. I guess he spoke too soon. Why did the Liberals have one set of principles in opposition and quite another in government?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the only thing that is shameful around here is the continuous obstruction on the part of the Leader of the Opposition and her colleagues, which is what they have tried to do in the case of this particular bill.

By the way, we have not yet moved time allocation on it even though it might come later today. The hon. member has moved two measures of obstruction to prevent last year's budget bill from coming into place. That tells us the kind of imagination hon. members across the way have. None.

Miss Deborah Grey (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it might tell us about a House leader that is not able to shepherd things through the House properly.

The Liberals make Mulroney look like a slowpoke. It took him nine full years to invoke closure or time allocation on debate 66 times. It has taken this government barely six years to do it 67 times. It has done it one-third faster.

Here is another dandy quote. This one is a doozie. It is from a Liberal who flew a little too close to the sun. I quote:

It displays the utter disdain with which this government treats the Canadian people.

That was the Minister of Foreign Affairs back in his days of purity in the opposition. If shutting down debate 66 was utter disdain, what is 67? Is it contempt?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. I know it must be a noise from another place, because I keep hearing one sound down at the far end. I would ask hon. member to keep their voices down.

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am quite pleased to respond to the question of the Leader of the Opposition and her colleagues who moved 450 amendments to one bill, the purpose of which was to change commas to semicolons.

Oral Questions

• (1420)

Hon. members across wasted as much as \$2 million of taxpayer money to have the House sit 24 hours a day. That is the real abuse of parliament. I will not apologize for making this parliament function. That is why we were elected.

* * *

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Department of Transport stated that the transfer of WestJet's inspection to Ottawa was just a paper exercise. When WestJet was only serving western Canadians, the government felt that it was sufficient to inspect it in Edmonton. Now that it flies in eastern Canada, it has to be inspected in Ottawa.

Will the minister explain why inspections in Edmonton were good enough when it was western Canadians flying but not good enough now?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a silver lining in this, that these changes have been made because WestJet has become truly a national airline, something the government thinks is a very good thing.

Going back to the 1970s, the regulatory oversight process was established which said that certain airlines operating coast to coast over a certain weight limit, 100,000 pounds, would have its inspection co-ordinated in Ottawa.

There will be no additional cost to WestJet. There is no inconvenience. What it means is a western Canadian airline has become national and is subject to national standards. I think that is good.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for assuring WestJet that it will not have to move its planes and its pilots to Ottawa for inspection purposes and that there will not be any cost.

Maybe the minister could explain why when WestJet complained about Air Canada's anti-competitive practices of slashing fares and increasing capacity on the Toronto-Moncton route nothing was done. However, when Air Canada called transport to say that WestJet should be inspected in Ottawa, the department immediately complied.

Who is calling the shots in Transport Canada? Is it the minister or Robert Milton?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is entirely wrong. The decision with respect to WestJet was made long before any inquiry was made on behalf of Air Canada. I will say quite frankly in this Chamber that the safety regulatory oversight process is none of Air Canada's

business. That is something that is done by the inspectors of the department without interference from any airline.

The hon. member gives the impression that somehow all of WestJet's equipment has to come to Ottawa to be inspected. That is not the case. The inspections occur right through the country, including Calgary and Edmonton. All it means is that the paper-work now is co-ordinated centrally as with all other airlines.

* * *

[Translation]

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the premier of Quebec, Lucien Bouchard, sent a letter to the Prime Minister of Canada asking him to withdraw Bill C-3 on young offenders or, at least, to exempt Quebec from its application in order to protect Quebec's approach, which everyone recognizes is the best.

I therefore ask the Prime Minister if he will look favourably on this request by the premier of Quebec, a request that has Quebec's unanimous approval?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have before, let me reassure the hon. leader of the third party that there is absolutely nothing in Bill C-3 that interferes with the way Quebec deals with young offenders.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will point out to the minister, one of the few members from Alberta, that Quebec's approach is clearly better than everything else going on in the country, and that this is acknowledged across the country. All the stakeholders in Quebec oppose this bill. She alone sees the light, it seems.

I would ask her to give us one good reason why this bill will improve the situation in Quebec. I would like her to give us one reason showing the usefulness of this bill in Quebec.

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me again reassure the hon. leader of the third party that there is absolutely nothing in the legislation that interferes with policies and programs presently in place in the province of Quebec dealing with young offenders.

In fact, there is much in the legislation that will enhance the existing programs. With additional financial resources from the federal government, the province of Quebec will be able to do more to assist young offenders.

Oral Questions

• (1425)

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, just yesterday, the National Council of Welfare tabled a report in which it praised Quebec's approach to young offenders.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: The minister does not want to understand.

An hon. member: She is not capable of understanding.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Now that a federal agency is telling her what we have been saying for months, will the minister understand that the problem is not the Young Offenders Act but the manner in which it is enforced?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me clarify what the National Council of Welfare said yesterday. It said that incarceration is used too much in this country when one is dealing with first time and non-violent young offenders. In fact, we on this side of the House agree with that.

One of the main purposes of Bill C-3 is to divert first time and non-violent young offenders out of the formal justice system and hopefully to avoid incarceration.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how does the minister explain that all those who represent Quebec's criminal justice system, all those who have, for years now, been working with the Young Offenders Act, who are familiar with the young offender problem, describe the minister's Bill C-3 as backward and repressive? She must withdraw Bill C-3, as all Quebecers are asking her to do.

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me reassure the hon. member, as I have before, that there is absolutely nothing in Bill C-3 which would require the province of Quebec or any agency or program in Quebec to change what it is presently doing.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Despite the Liberal spin doctors, based on his discussions with the Prime Minister the president of the CBC today confirmed that "the CBC is not a financial priority of this government".

Will the Prime Minister admit what has become painfully obvious to people across the country, that it is this government, not CBC management, that is behind the cuts to regional programming?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the House of Commons had in front of it the CBC budget. The budget is well known. The budget has been stable for some time. We have assured the CBC that there will be a level of financing for the years to come.

The managing of the CBC on a daily basis is up to the directors and the president. There are some consultations going on at this time to try to make CBC more efficient so that it will play the role it is supposed to play in Canadian society.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the mandate of the CBC. The spin continues but the truth is out. Again let me quote what the president of the CBC confirmed this morning. "The CBC is not a financial priority of this government", according to the Prime Minister.

Will the Prime Minister stand in his place and acknowledge what was made crystal clear this morning, namely that the death of regional CBC is his responsibility?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the CBC budget, the money voted by parliament, is almost \$1 billion. It is strange for people to say that it is not a priority. To me \$1 billion is a lot of money.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Association in Defence of the Wrongly Convicted held a press conference today concerning the tragically flawed conviction of Stephen Truscott. The association will undertake an exhaustive review of this case and plans to file an application under section 690 of the criminal code.

The suspect investigation which led to Truscott's 1959 death sentence conjures up nightmarish memories of past injustices suffered by Marshall, Milgaard and Morin.

In the interest of justice, will the minister act quickly to establish an independent inquiry to review and finally provide some closure and fairness in the Truscott case?

• (1430)

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that Mr. Truscott and his counsel are holding a press conference probably at this very moment. At this point I have not heard and I have not received anything, either official or unofficial, from Mr. Truscott's counsel, but as soon as I do I will act upon it in a timely fashion.

Oral Questions

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, we know the minister is in favour of timeliness. I have a question for the solicitor general.

Kim Hancox, the widow of murdered Toronto police officer Bill Hancox, was outraged to find that CSC was allowing the female same sex lovers convicted of killing her husband to serve their life sentences together. That has since been corrected, but this is the second time in six months that the solicitor general has had to override the atrocious decisions of the CSC commissioner.

Will the solicitor general please show some semblance of leadership, restore some confidence in our justice system and our correctional system and remove the CSC commissioner?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my responsibility and the government's responsibility is to create policy, and that is exactly what this government is doing.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, there is an understandable unease about the current move to redraw employment insurance zones. In the past it seems that political considerations influenced this exercise to allow some MPs to deliver more benefits to their area—

The Speaker: Order, please. If members want to have conversations I would ask them please to take them outside the House. We cannot hear the questions.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy: Mr. Speaker, there is an understandable unease about the current move to redraw employment insurance zones. In the past it seems that political considerations influenced the exercise to allow some MPs to deliver more benefits to their area in defiance of labour force realities.

How can Canadians be sure that any new boundaries will be based on need and not just pre-election political gerrymandering?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Here we go again, Mr. Speaker, with the member ranting innuendo.

This process is an administrative process. It is done by statute every five years. It is gazetted. It was gazetted on Saturday. Members of parliament have the opportunity, along with other citizens of Canada, to make comment on the proposals. I hope the hon. member will do that.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, this minister has a pretty uninspiring track record when it comes to putting political considerations over clear rules, fairly applied. The fact that MP turf wars over new EI boundaries have already heated up is a sign that this is a political exercise more than anything.

Given past history, why should Canadians trust that the coming changes will all be above board?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the coming changes will be above board.

Talk about political tactics. Let us look at the speech that is being given by the leader of the party opposite in the House today.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Jane Stewart: Mr. Speaker, it is nothing more than a tactic to distract Canadians from the fact that yesterday in St. John's West the party of the extreme right in this House barely beat the extreme wrestling party.

The people of Canada understand the importance of grants and contributions. The people of Atlantic Canada proved that yesterday.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the audit report on the Modes Conili affair led to the payment of a \$700,000 grant. Yet this report contradicts an opinion by departmental employees that indeed employees were merely transferred, proven by cross-checking SIN numbers.

The minister claims to have nothing to hide, so will she agree to table the report in question this very day so that it may be examined in order to find out who asked for a report of convenience in order to pay Modes Conili \$700,000?

• (1435)

[*English*]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, last Tuesday the department received new information on this file. On Wednesday the information was reviewed. On Thursday it was passed on to the RCMP for its review and consideration. That is where it lies.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister knows that

Oral Questions

this report is important and she also knows that, going the access to information route, we are likely to wait a very long time, as we have for all Human Resources Development Canada files, even until the next election.

Is the minister aware that it is her responsibility to provide us with the needed information now, not after the election?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again on this file I would point out that the information rests with the RCMP. It is up to the RCMP to make determinations on the next steps.

* * *

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the scandal flowing from the Shawinigan fountain continues. Not only did taxpayers get hit with a \$200,000 bill for the construction of the fountain, but new access to information documents show that the Prime Minister's office also lobbied for thousands of taxpayer dollars for a feasibility study for it and the Minister of Canadian Heritage personally signed off. Why?

Why does the Prime Minister's seatmate approve thousands of dollars flowing in Shawinigan for the Prime Minister?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that, although I have never been personally lobbied by the Prime Minister on this particular subject, I have in fact been lobbied—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Sheila Copps: Mr. Speaker, as early as yesterday I was lobbied by a member of the opposition, who has a meeting in my office at 4.15 p.m. to lobby for a project in his riding.

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the member will not have the same result because here we see a pattern continuing. The Prime Minister's office asked the heritage minister for money that went to a company in the Prime Minister's riding for a feasibility study for a \$200,000 fountain. What happened? The company got the money to do the feasibility study and the Prime Minister's campaign got a donation. That is very interesting.

This appears to be an oft-repeated theme. Is it that the Prime Minister actually cannot see that this is a violation of the public trust, or is it that he just does not care?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the hypocrisy of the party that ran—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. I would ask that we please stay away from the word hypocrisy.

Hon. Sheila Copps: Mr. Speaker, the charade of hon. members opposite will become obvious when I look, for example, at dozens of projects where members of the reform/alliance party wrote to me seeking support because they saw that projects in their ridings were very good projects. I will look at the numbers for TJF projects: Kootenay—Columbia, \$3.5 million for six projects; Nanaimo—Alberni, \$2.3 million; Nanaimo—Cowichan, \$1.3 million; Okanagan—Coquihalla, \$478,000; Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, \$2.5 million—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

[Translation]

BANKING SYSTEM

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the banking legislation the Minister of Finance is thinking of introducing would have the effect of facilitating takeovers, even foreign ones, of small and medium cap banks, such as the National Bank and the Laurentian Bank.

Would the Minister of Finance explain to the House why he has decided to protect the large banks and not the small ones in Quebec?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member must know that the legislation has not yet been introduced. I assure him that all banks will be treated equally.

That having been said, the government intends to give the smaller banks, some of which are concentrated in Quebec, a bit more flexibility.

• (1440)

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, what guarantees is the Minister of Finance offering that the only two Quebec-owned banks located in Quebec will not fall victim to takeovers by Canadian investors from outside Quebec or foreign investors, because of these new ownership rules?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the member that the Government of Canada will act in the public interest, and in the case of a bank concentrated in Quebec, in the interests of the Canadians and Quebecers who have a stake in it.

*Oral Questions**[English]***CANADIAN HERITAGE**

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the coincidences are just so happy for the Prime Minister.

His office wrote the heritage minister for money to do a feasibility study for that famous Shawinigan fountain. Certainly the minister quickly accommodated him. Then the company that did the study gave the Prime Minister's campaign a contribution of \$1,000, and everyone except ripped-off taxpayers are real happy.

Is it just a wild coincidence that 33% of the donations to the Prime Minister's campaign come from grant recipients?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is rather ironic if we follow the logic of the hon. member, because my understanding is that the \$5,000 which was approved by Canadian Heritage for this project was matched by the Government of Quebec, so I suspect that the Prime Minister should have a political alliance with Lucien Bouchard.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that was an irrelevant answer, was it not? These sorts of flip answers—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Monte Solberg: Mr. Speaker, the process I have just described happens over and over again, which is probably why we have, what is it, four police investigations now in the Prime Minister's riding. He seems to be pretty popular with the RCMP these days.

Is the Prime Minister not concerned about the optics of grant recipients who routinely grease the palms of Liberal candidates?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. I want the hon. member to withdraw the words "grease the palms".

Mr. Monte Solberg: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the words "grease the palms".

The Speaker: The Right Hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have done my job for 37 years helping my country, and I will continue to do that.

With this project, like the other projects, there is federal money, there is provincial money, there is municipal money and there is private sector money. These projects are to create jobs in the ridings.

The work of parliament, in collaboration with the other levels of government, has managed to reduce the level of unemployment in my riding and in the Saint-Maurice Valley from 19% to 11%. These people now are paying taxes, and they are happy to do so. They are grateful that governments look to people who need help.

* * *

*[Translation]***NATIONAL DEFENCE**

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence is preparing to send a team of technicians to Sierra Leone.

The situation there is getting worse, as we know, and the Prime Minister has already expressed his intention to give serious consideration to a request from the UN for troops.

Would the minister promise to hold a debate in this House before sending any troops to Sierra Leone?

[English]

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have responded to the request from the United Nations in a number of ways. We have provided officers at the peacekeeping headquarters in New York to assist in the planning for Sierra Leone. We have a military observer there. We have provided an Airbus and some 20 personnel.

If we are going to consider any major involvement in Sierra Leone, or anything for which we traditionally engage the opinion of members the House, then of course we would come to the House. But at this point in time we have been responding in these ways, with these small numbers, with significant effectiveness in helping the situation.

* * *

● (1445)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The minister will know that in about 10 months time section 110 of the American immigration act will come into effect which will force each Canadian to fill in a type of visa application every time they enter the United States.

Can the minister give us his prognosis on this law of paper trails? Will it be implemented or will it be repealed?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question and for his efforts on behalf of stopping this legislation.

We have been working actively with the U.S. administration and members of congress to develop an alternate plan. Presently there

Oral Questions

is legislation being considered by members of congress that would basically remedy section 110. I think progress is being made but I cannot give a conclusion yet because it is up to the U.S. congress.

I can assure the hon. member and the House that we are actively working with a number of our allies in the United States to make sure the bill is brought forward.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, today the environment committee released its report on pesticides that will take Canada back to the dirty thirties.

This report calls for, among other things, a full phase-out of pest control products in Canada. The fact is that the committee report is 40 years too late. Stakeholders have been taking proactive measures for years to make sound science, health and safety the first priorities in pest control product development and use.

Why is the government considering this recommendation when there is no scientific evidence to support it?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the distinguished chair and the hardworking members of the environment committee for their report which was received today and is a result of many weeks of hearings and research by the committee.

I want to assure the member and the committee that the government will carefully take into account the recommendations and the observations in the report.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, all Canadians want a healthy and sustainable environment but the outright banning of pesticides is outrageous. I wonder how the Prime Minister would feel if his handicap started going up because the quality of his golf courses started going down.

There have been scientists in both industry and the PMRA who have dedicated their lives to protecting human health and the environment.

Does the minister support the full phase-out of pesticides?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, we are grateful for the report we just received today. We will of course examine it in detail and the government will respond once it has had the opportunity to do that.

Mr. Dennis Gruending (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, now for a question from a party that really does care about the environment.

Canadians are becoming increasingly aware of the health risks associated with exposure to toxic chemicals in the environment, especially when it comes to our children.

In the last throne speech, the government promised to take action on environmental health issues, and that included modernizing and protecting against health risks presented by pesticides.

When will the health minister keep his government's throne speech promise and introduce legislation to modernize and improve the Pest Control Products Act?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member may have heard my response to the previous question. We are grateful for the report we have received today and grateful to the committee members for the hard work they have done in putting it together.

We will carefully examine the recommendations and the evidence that they have pulled together, and we will respond after we have had an opportunity to do that.

Mr. Peter Mancini (Sydney—Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that is one throne speech promise gone by the wayside. I will give the Liberals a chance to honour another one.

In the same throne speech, the government committed to making the clean up of toxic sites a priority. Last week the Minister of the Environment acknowledged that the Sydney tar ponds is, and I am using his words, "perhaps the single most polluted site in Canada and presents a serious health risk". However, he refused to indicate whether the clean up was even a priority of the government, saying that it was in the hands of the joint action group.

The chair of JAG has publicly complained about the foot dragging by his government partners. Will the minister commit today to making the clean-up his number one environmental—

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Governments of both Nova Scotia and Canada have tried before to impose decisions with respect to the Sydney tar ponds on the residents of that area.

I find it astonishing that a representative of that area would want the government to overrule the system that we have set up which includes the local people participating in making decisions. It is certainly the type of socialistic directed government that we in British Columbia have learned to distrust so much.

I think he should think more about bringing these people in with the federal and provincial governments so we can get an acceptable solution and do not waste—

Oral Questions

The Speaker: The hon. member for Brandon—Souris.

* * *

• (1450)

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 1996 the Minister of Foreign Affairs stated that CFB Shilo would have a long term commitment from the Government of Canada. The Minister of Foreign Affairs has recently waded into the debate on the future of CFB Shilo and may have well put CFB Shilo in jeopardy.

My question is for the Minister of National Defence. Does he guarantee to the people of Manitoba that the final decision on Shilo operations will not be based on political influence but on what is best for our military?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the short answer is yes. We are certainly looking at all the options at the moment. Nothing has been decided with respect to the facilities in Shilo.

I can assure the hon. member that we are looking at what is best in terms of our troops, in terms of their quality of life and in terms of the effectiveness of their operations.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, some decisions have been made. Military experts have stated quite emphatically that CFB Shilo has the necessary infrastructure already in place to accommodate the transfer of two PPCLI from Winnipeg to Shilo.

Does the minister recognize that CFB Shilo must have full utilization in order to survive and stay at CFB Shilo?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes, we would like to keep CFB Shilo open. We are looking at all the options and the costs with respect to that and with respect to the facilities that we have in Winnipeg. We have not closed any options. I know where the hon. member is coming from. He represents the area. I understand his interest. We are having a very fair and close examination of what is best.

* * *

SIERRA LEONE

Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

As the crisis in Sierra Leone continues, can the minister advise the House if a further specific request for support has been made to Canada from the United Nations? If so, how has our government responded?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have received a further request from the United Nations with respect to air cargo handling at the airport near Freetown in Sierra Leone. As a result, we will be deploying approximately 30 troops to that airport to assist the British in terms of the the loading and unloading of equipment at that airport. We expect to have them sent within a few days.

This adds to the contributions that I previously noted in terms of the airbus transportation, in terms of the officers at the headquarters in New York and in terms of the protection equipment that we have provided. We are doing our share in terms of helping out in the situation in Sierra Leone.

* * *

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, after question period yesterday, my office received a very surprising call from the commissioner of Correctional Service Canada requesting a copy of the Grierson Centre report that I questioned the solicitor general about.

Why does the solicitor general's commissioner of corrections have to request a copy of a report from my office that was bought and paid for by his department?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are many reports done by correctional institutions across this country. They are done to make sure that the relationship between the staff and the institution is as good a relationship as possible.

* * *

• (1455)

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

The maison du Cap du Nord in Quebec City provides accommodation for native people when they have to come for treatment in various forms at the hospital in Quebec City. Since 1990, this institution has been chronically underfunded by the department.

Should the Minister of Health, instead of going ahead with his plan to intrude into the field of jurisdiction of the provinces, not work to properly look after his own jurisdiction by providing sufficient funding for this institution? That is where his responsibility lies.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health spends nearly \$1 billion annually on health care for native peoples. If the hon. member has details on this situation, I would be very pleased to examine them and answer in detail.

Oral Questions

[English]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

The president of CBC told the heritage committee today that due to chronic underfunding the CBC would be cutting local supper hour shows. After the president left, the committee passed a unanimous motion asking the federal government to provide adequate and stable funding to the CBC to provide enhanced regional television capacity.

Will the Prime Minister intervene and save local television?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the decision is one that has to be made by the president and the board of CBC. We provided in the budget almost \$1 billion for CBC. It was voted as adequate by the House of Commons. At this moment, we are not reviewing the budget. It will not be reviewed until next February.

* * *

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, the government is purchasing fishing licences in Atlantic Canada in order to integrate first nations into the Atlantic fishery.

Of the licences purchased so far, can the minister tell us whether any of them were already owned by the Mi'kmaq, the Maliseet or Passamaquoddy band members?

Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report to the House that we have signed 17 agreements as of today and 4 more agreements in principle.

We said right from the beginning that the way to resolve this was through dialogue, co-operation and by making sure we negotiate and not litigate. That is exactly what we are doing. The voluntary licence buyback was something the committee recommended. The hon. member is a member of that committee. It is something that the fishing community recommended and that was exactly what we followed.

* * *

SIERRA LEONE

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the situation in Sierra Leone reminds us that thousands of children around the world are exploited in armed conflicts. The Minister of Foreign Affairs recently co-hosted a conference in Ghana on war affected children.

Could the Minister of Foreign Affairs tell the House today what follow-up will come from that conference?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has pointed out, one of the most tragic stories in Sierra Leone is that 50% of the rebel soldiers are young children who have been abducted, drugged and turned into killing machines.

Canada has been actively working with the 15 states in West Africa to try to provide a response to that problem. At the ECOWAS conference that we co-hosted, leaders of the West African state agreed on a blueprint of action. We will have very specific measures for rehabilitation and response.

Canada will be supporting a special unit from ECOWAS to help in that measure. It is one way we can come to grips with the horrible violation of children that is taking place and the contribution we can make to the security of that region.

* * *

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the phone call that I referred to with the commissioner ended abruptly with him stating that any further information needed from his office would no longer be available. The report from Grierson Centre detailed intimidation and threats by management to staff. I personally know how they feel after the bullying my office staff got yesterday.

I understand the institution has now been threatened to be shut down because of this report.

When will the solicitor general tame this organization, which is obviously out of control, and fire—

The Speaker: The hon. solicitor general.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if I was to fire everyone that my hon. colleague across the floor wanted me to fire, I would be busy doing a lot of firing.

The fact is we have an excellent correctional system in this country that is renowned. Many countries around the world come to Canada to learn how to run a proper correctional service. We do studies to make sure that there is a good relationship between staff and management in our institutions.

* * *

● (1500)

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Eamon O Cuiv, Minister of State of Ireland, responsible for Gaeltacht and the Islands.

Privilege

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

BILL C-25

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege arises out of a motion that the government intends to move with respect to time allocation on Bill C-25. Yesterday, the government House leader gave notice of his intention to close off debate on this important bill.

• (1505)

The Speaker: I believe you are raising a question of privilege on something that has not occurred as yet. Therefore, I do not know how we can argue a point of privilege as a matter of fact on something which may occur or may not occur. Perhaps the hon. opposition House leader could explain.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me to give this entire point, I think I can explain why you should not even recognize the government House leader and you should look the other way when he tries to move the motion. The problem is, once the motion is moved the House must be seized of it. I hope to argue and convince you, Mr. Speaker, with this question of privilege that you should not even hear the motion to invoke a record number of time allocations.

The Speaker: My colleague, I find it difficult to accept that we should be arguing a point that has not come up and that is not before the House. I would rule that we should not be discussing a point of privilege on a matter that has not occurred. Therefore, I rule that this point of privilege is not acceptable at this time.

I am going to go to the second point of privilege which is from the member for Wild Rose.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege in regard to a matter relating to what I believe constitutes intimidation and a deliberate attempt to withhold information from me because of my activities in the House during a proceeding of parliament.

Yesterday after I asked a question during question period, Lynn Ballice, the assistant to the commissioner of Correctional Service Canada, phoned my assistant for particulars of a report which I spoke about during question period. She told my assistant that it was a report done by an independent consultant they had hired and it was given to Jan Fox, their regional director in March.

While my assistant offered to fax the report to her, she pointed out that the report came from Correctional Service Canada and that is where Ms. Ballice should start looking. Ms. Ballice then called back a few minutes later and said all her management people were out west at a conference and insisted that my assistant fax her the report.

When I returned to the office I instructed my assistant not to fax the report. To me, the situation was getting beyond what was at first maybe humorous and quite frankly was beginning to get just a little frightening. I was beginning to wonder if anyone was in charge at Correctional Service Canada.

At 4:30 p.m. Lynn Ballice phoned back to my office and said she had the commissioner of corrections, Ole Ingstrup, on the speaker-phone. She asked why my assistant had not faxed a copy of the report. When advised of my decision, Lynn Ballice said that Correctional Service Canada would not offer me any help or information on this particular report in the future.

This threat came about because of a question I asked in the House. I appreciate the frustration and the embarrassment that this may have caused the commissioner but that does not give him the right to deliberately deny information to a member of parliament, and it does not give him the right to intimidate the staff of a member of parliament.

On December 16, 1980 a Speaker made a ruling in regard to information to which a member of parliament was entitled. The Speaker said it would be bold to suggest that no circumstance could ever exist for a prima facie question of privilege to be made where there was a deliberate attempt to deny information to an hon. member.

Joseph Maingot's *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada* on page 71 states:

—the events necessarily incidental to petitions, questions and notices of motions in Parliament—are all events which are part of the “proceedings of Parliament.”

• (1510)

On page 72 there is a quote from a report of the Select Committee on the Official Secrets Act of 1939 which states “a proceeding in parliament covers both the asking of a question and the giving written notice of such a question”.

Erskine May's 21st edition describes contempt as:

—any act or omission which obstructs or impedes either House of Parliament in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any Member or officer of such House in the discharge of his duty, or which has a tendency, directly or indirectly, to produce such results may be treated as contempt even though there is no precedent of the offence.

It is imperative that members of parliament have the confidence to perform their duties with accurate information which is not deliberately misleading or deliberately withheld from them. When a public servant deliberately withholds information because of

Points of Order

what was said in the House of Commons is a clear contempt of parliament. Information that is entitled to members of parliament should not be linked to the actions of a member inside or outside the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you consider this a prima facie question of privilege so that this House can determine whether the actions of the commissioner of Correctional Service Canada is in contempt.

The Speaker: Before I listen to the member for Kootenay—Columbia, did I understand correctly that the hon. member was speaking directly to the commissioner? Was the hon. member speaking directly to the commissioner?

Mr. Myron Thompson: No, Mr. Speaker. My staff was speaking directly to the commissioner and his staff. They were all on a speakerphone.

The Speaker: Was the hon. member privy to that conversation on the speakerphone? Did he hear the conversation?

Mr. Myron Thompson: No, Mr. Speaker. This was reported to me by my staff member who asked what she should do. I informed her not to send the report until further notice. I then told her not to send these people anything for having that direct contact with her in that manner.

The Speaker: On this point of privilege, I will hear interventions, but I would much prefer to have people take part in this part of the point of privilege who have direct knowledge of what transpired. If they have direct knowledge, I will hear from them.

My colleague, I consider this a very grave matter. What you have raised impacts on all members in this House if indeed it did occur. It occurred in the Department of the Solicitor General. I would like to hear a response from the solicitor general or his parliamentary secretary or one of the spokespersons for the government. I will reserve judgment until I hear from them but I do want to hear from them, or I will make a ruling in the absence of any intervention from the other side.

I am going to hear a point of order from the hon. member but I have two points of order which I said that I would hear. One is from the hon. member for Kootenay—Columbia.

* * *

• (1515)

POINTS OF ORDER

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in response to a question from my colleague from

Calgary Centre, the heritage minister said that I had written her department on numerous occasions about getting loans or grants, or things of that nature.

I think the minister would want to have the opportunity to correct that impression, because it was without any basis of fact or statement.

The Speaker: The hon. member has put his views on the record on the issue.

TIME ALLOCATION

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, earlier today you ruled that I could not raise a question of privilege regarding the putting of a motion on time allocation, even though the notice of time allocation had been given by the government House leader and we knew that it was going to be before the House.

If I could point out three other points on that point, I would like to raise it as a point of order.

First, on October 8, 1997 the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona raised a question of privilege regarding the closing of debate on Bill C-2. He did it in exactly the same manner in which I would have liked to have done it today. In other words, there has been notice of time allocation. We know it is coming. The member for Winnipeg—Transcona raised a question of privilege and spoke to it. You accepted the question at that time, Mr. Speaker, and he made his arguments to you at that time.

Second, on Motion No. 8, which was previously before parliament, we had discussion before the motion actually was tabled in the House. It was on the notice paper and we in the House were seized of it before it was actually moved. Eventually that motion was withdrawn.

Third, in the last parliament the Speaker also ruled that a member could not raise a point of order about the acceptability of a motion if the motion had already been accepted by the Chair. In other words, Mr. Speaker, once you accept the motion we have to accept that it is in order.

You have put me in a bit of a catch-22 in asking me to wait until the motion is tabled, because once it is tabled I am not allowed to speak to it.

If I could, I would like to raise as a point of order the reasons I think you should hear this as a point of order. I think it is a point of privilege, but I will present it to you, if you wish, as a point of order as to why the motion of time allocation put by the government House leader is unacceptable.

The Speaker: Do you think you are in a catch-22? You have put the Speaker in a catch-22. Let me quote to you.

Points of Order

What I quoted, I believe, in 1997 is found at page 570 of our new book, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, by Montpetit and Marleau, which states:

As with closure, the Speaker has ruled that the Chair possesses no discretionary authority to refuse to put a motion of time allocation if all the procedural exigencies have been observed.

That is what the hon. member said. What I am saying is that you cannot argue your point until the motion is put. On the other hand, you are saying that you cannot argue it after because I am going to make that decision. You are right. That is the decision I would have made.

If you would like to try to convince me, I will listen to you for about three minutes. If you can convince me in three minutes that I should be listening to you, then I will listen to you.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I can do it in three minutes, but I will rush to it.

Today would be a record setting number of times that time allocation would have been used. In Beauchesne's sixth edition, citation 3 outlines some elements of our Constitution Act, and it is relevant. It states:

More tentative are such traditional features as respect for the rights of the minority, which precludes a Government from using to excess the extensive powers that it has to limit debate or to proceed in what the public and the Opposition might interpret as unorthodox ways.

In other words, there is another way to look at it.

• (1520)

Going back to the argument presented by the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona, he suggested that the Chair intervene on the collective rights of the minority. The case has been made that the Chair possesses no discretionary authority to refuse to put a motion of time allocation, but I do not agree with this claim and I will prove that the Speaker does not possess this authority.

On May 2, 2000, during a discussion of the rule of time allocation at the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, the Clerk of the House of Commons, Robert Marleau, responded to a question regarding the Speaker's authority to protect the minority in the manner prescribed earlier. The Clerk said:

—it exists intrinsically in the role of the Speakership all the time—where there could be the tyranny of either side. It could be the tyranny of the majority or the tyranny of the minority.

At a subsequent meeting on May 4 the Clerk suggested that with time allocation the Speaker is less likely to intervene. There is a reference to this at page 570 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*. However, he used the extreme example that if the government time allocated every bill the Speaker might intervene.

My interpretation of what the Clerk said is that there does exist a limit to what a majority government can do with respect to time allocation. There comes a line in the sand, Mr. Speaker. I mentioned that earlier when I quoted Beauchesne.

The Clerk used the extreme example of every bill in his response because he knows it is not up to the Clerk to establish the limit. Obviously 66 times was not the limit because it went ahead last time. However, yesterday the government gave notice of its intention to move time allocation for the 67th time. In search of a benchmark of what constitutes excess, I would suggest that 67 closure and time allocation motions moved within six years for the sole purpose of muzzling the opposition is excessive.

At page 369 of Marleau and Montpetit there is reference to an intervention by the Speaker on time allocation related tactics used by the government. It describes how Speaker Fraser ruled on the government tactic of skipping over Routine Proceedings in order to go to orders of the day. As we are all aware, this tactic, if allowed, secures for the government the opportunity to move time allocation regardless of where it is in the orders of the day.

While Speaker Fraser ruled such a motion in order on April 13, 1987, page 369 of Marleau and Montpetit references another ruling where the Speaker ruled out of order a similar motion only months before. In other words, the discretion is with the Speaker as to whether it is acceptable.

The rules governing time allocation can be found in Standing Order 78, but when the government allows only a minimum amount of time to debate each stage of a controversial bill, this prevents the opposition from doing its job. It prevents the opposition from enlisting public support. The right of an opposition to raise the profile of an issue is an indispensable principle. Beauchesne's sixth edition states:

—to protect the minority and restrain the improvidence or tyranny of a majority; to secure the transaction of public business in an orderly manner; to enable every member to express opinions within limits necessary to preserve decorum and prevent an unnecessary waste of time; to give abundant opportunity for the consideration of every measure, and to prevent any legislative action being taken upon sudden impulse.

This is all about debate, and the reason we are here is to have debate. Speaker Fraser put it this way:

It is essential to our democratic system that controversial issues should be debated at reasonable length so that every reasonable opportunity shall be available to hear the arguments pro and con and that reasonable delaying tactics should be permissible to enable opponents of a measure to enlist public support for their point of view.

In 1949 the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker said this to the Empire Club in Toronto:

If Parliament is to be preserved as a living institution His Majesty's Loyal Opposition must fearlessly perform its functions. The reading of history proves that freedom always dies when criticism ends.

Points of Order

In 1967 another distinguished parliamentarian, the late Stanley Knowles, added this comment to the debate:

I submit, therefore, that you do not have full political democracy, let alone the economic as well as political democracy, unless you include a full and unquestioned recognition of the rights and functions of the opposition to the government of the day. Only in this way can you protect the rights of the minorities; only in this way can you make sure that the force of public opinion will be brought to bear on the legislative process.

One of the reasons the opposition exists is to someday replace the government. The opposition should conduct itself in parliament so as to persuade the people of the country that it could be an improvement on the government of the day. Our system of government works best when there is a change of government, or at least an opportunity to change government at reasonable intervals.

If the government continues to silence the opposition at every turn, the opposition will never be able to use parliamentary debate to persuade the people of Canada. While the rights of the opposition are immediately and most visibly at stake, ultimately the threat is to democratic rights and freedoms generally.

In conclusion, I would like to offer three points. One is for the Chair to consider and two are for the House.

• (1525)

First, perhaps now is the time for the Speaker to look the other way, as the member for Winnipeg—Transcona suggested at the beginning of this parliament, not see the minister and prevent the 67th motion from being moved.

My second suggestion is that the government and this House should seriously consider reforming the way we do business by sitting the proper calendar period, sitting the days we are supposed to sit, and consider using free votes so that the government is not forced to use time allocation so often.

Another way is to change the rules of debate so that we get to important business and controversial business in a timely fashion, instead of waiting until the last dog is hung.

A short delay of even a day would send a message to the government that you, Mr. Speaker, believe the line in the sand has been crept up to and is in danger of being passed.

In Dante's *Inferno* he described the nine circles of hell. In the context of the Canadian parliamentary system, I believe the government has brought us into circle number eight. Circle number eight is the place for the sowers of discord. This government has brought us dangerously close to a dysfunctional parliament by risking the rights of the minority and by using such a controversial way to bring so much legislation through the House.

The Speaker: I too have searched through the books which would say that the Speaker has the discretion after the government

has brought in time allocation 20 times. Some people would say 20 times is too much. Other people would say, as you have, that because it broke a standard which was set by another government, then that point is too much.

The Speaker has no guidance from the House as to what is too much or what is too little. At this point I would imagine, as Speaker Fraser said, if every bill and every motion were subjected to time allocation, that would be a bit much.

However, I am very much interested, as Speaker and as a servant of the House, in what the hon. member had as a second suggestion. At this point at least the hon. House leader of the opposition wants me to draw a line in the sand, saying that this is as far as it goes. I would much prefer that the House deal with this problem, as House leaders have for 133 years. They were able to sit down to figure out what would be a reasonable amount of time for debate and, after that amount of time, what would be reasonable in terms of the use of time allocation.

If there is discord in the House, surely it is not up to the Speaker to jump in and cause more discord. The five House leaders are here to listen to what I have to say. If there is this discord which the hon. House leader of the opposition has brought up, then I would encourage the House leaders to get a system which would work for all of us.

I think, at least at this point, that I would not be prepared to intervene, but I am very much prepared to encourage the House leaders who are here today to come together to find a solution that we could all live with so that members of the House can perform the functions for which we were elected.

The government is here to present motions and bills. The opposition is here to make them better; to question them along the way. We all understand that the opposition, the dissenting voice, has every right to be heard. On the other side, Speaker Fraser has said, and I am paraphrasing him, that the government has the right to govern.

At this time, is the House dysfunctional? I would argue that if there is this discord, that it be addressed by the House leaders. I would ask you to do this as soon as possible and, if at all possible, before we adjourn for the summer. I think that suggestion is an excellent one.

I see that the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona, who is a respected parliamentarian, wants to make an intervention and I will permit a very short intervention if he wishes to add something.

• (1530)

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as one of the House leaders I would certainly undertake and be

Points of Order

willing to be part of a discussion among the House leaders as to what might be done in this area.

There are some difficulties that would certainly have to be overcome if the House leaders were to be able to arrive at the kind of advice that I think the Chair is seeking with respect to how to exercise this discretion. It has not been exercised very often, or one could argue at all, certainly in the time that I have been here.

I wanted to make the argument in principle, as I have before, that this discretion on the part of the Speaker should exist and should be practised. I take the point that the Chair might want some guidance, if that is possible. There is room for judgment that emanates from the Chair itself and not just from the House leaders in this respect.

I do not think it is a matter of numbers, although it does stand as a condemnation of the government that it has now broken the record of a previous government with respect to the introduction of time allocation. I nevertheless think that if the Chair were to exercise this discretion it would have to be judged on the merits of each and every time allocation and not now that we have reached 55, 65, 10 or whatever. I do not think that is a very strong argument. It may be a strong argument in terms of how the government behaves, but I do not think it is a potential source of guidance to the Chair as to when this discretion should be exercised.

It is unfortunate that the record was broken on an old piece of legislation when it probably should not have been. It is an old piece of legislation. It is not something that is momentous. I can think of lots of pieces of legislation that have come before parliament that have been time allocated which were very significant and never should have been time allocated. It would have been nice to have had this debate around those pieces of legislation rather than the bill we are having it around.

I just wanted to make the point that I think there are occasions when the Chair should take it upon itself. It is also true that I think the Chair has the right to ask for some guidance from the House, if it is possible, on these matters. Hopefully we might be able to do that in the near future.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add some brief remarks as well. Being a member of the party that held the previous record, one of which we are not necessarily proud, we are certainly glad that although the hon. House leader in his wisdom railed against such high handed tactics when in opposition, wailed like a banshee, he has now surpassed the dubious honour of invoking time allocation.

I know a fine nuance was invoked in question period today when he referred to the fact that it was not closure. It is akin to differentiating between a club and a sword as to the method of shutting down debate.

I would as well offer support for the Chair in its wisdom of seeking advice and in the suggestion that House leaders convene a meeting to discuss this matter. It seems to me that in principle part of the problem which has led us to this point is a breakdown in communication. It is incumbent upon the opposition in its willingness to try to come to some agreement with the government House leader as to how we resolve matters of debate in the House without coming to a breaking point where the government House leader feels that he has to invoke the heavy handed measure of shutting down debate in such a unilateral fashion.

In the short time that I have to make these remarks, I want to offer support for the suggestion the Chair has brought forward to convene a meeting where this communication perhaps can be improved.

● (1535)

Perhaps in the future, although it has been only six years that the government has taken to surpass this benchmark or high water mark that it took the previous administration nine years to achieve in a dubious way, we can hopefully make better use of alternative channels of communication, the meetings of the House leaders being one and perhaps the best. In this way we could try to avoid getting to the point where all members of the House are being affected in a very substantial way.

I agree with the member for Winnipeg—Transcona when he says that there are more important pieces of legislation and matters of debate that would have led to discussions of this nature earlier. I do not mean to call this bill inconsequential, but it is simply, as pointed out by the opposition House leader, that we have reached a point in this short time where there is almost something like creeping softness and acceptance of the use of time allocation as a procedural blocking mechanism for debate. It has become an accepted manner of shutting down what is only to be deemed as the last bastion of debate on matters for the opposition to call the government to task on.

I strongly encourage the Chair to give this matter urgent attention. We cannot have this as an accepted practice. I would suggest that for us to do otherwise is to acquiesce and show apathy toward the deterioration of the procedures, the workings and the functions of the House.

The Speaker: I am going to give the floor to the member from the Bloc Québécois, but another statement has been made by the House leader of the Conservative Party. I believe he called for moderation on all sides of the House, and that includes all five parties.

We now have two suggestions. The first is that the House leaders in some way discuss this matter and, second, that there has to be openness and give and take on both sides. It is in the best traditions of the House that the House can grapple with a problem and that the House, through its House leaders if necessary, can come to some kind of conclusion.

*Points of Order**[Translation]*

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wish you to know that, in my opinion, your suggestion that the parliamentary leaders seek a way of settling this problem, as is often done, is a reasonable one.

I would, however, like to point out that, every time the government or the opposition makes use of mechanisms to hold up debate, to speed it up, to limit its length, it must be an exception. We all agree on that.

Today the official opposition and the other parties are complaining of what seems to us to be an excessive use of time allocation motions by the government. I think that the figures will show that there has been a certain increase.

I take this opportunity to remind my colleagues that this is not the only point of dispute in our discussions. Hon. members are aware that a motion was backed by the government in the procedure and House affairs committee, and it was also supported by other political parties.

The purpose of that motion was to have the mechanism used by the opposition to allow it a little longer, on occasion, to vote on a number of bills set aside, by giving each party whip the ability to vote on behalf of his colleagues. I and my party have always been opposed to such a mechanism. I have been told that it has not yet and may possibly never be introduced in the House at this point.

I take this opportunity to point out to my colleagues on this side of the House that, in both cases, the problem is exactly the same. It is no more interesting for the opposition to watch the government abuse time allocation than it is for the opposition to watch the government adopting mechanisms to prevent us from using our own exceptional mechanism, or one of our own exceptional mechanisms, in order to prolong the debate, that is, multiple votes or other strategies such as long debates.

• (1540)

I would simply like to say that if we came away from this place today at the end of a debate, which has not lasted long, but which has taught us a lot, if we came away with some sort of unanimity recognizing that your suggestion is very wise, that we should all discuss time allocation motions, that we should all discuss means that might be put forward in order to limit the opposition's ability to impede the work of the House but that could as well allow us to discuss the government's right to move files along, we would see this parliament as balanced.

If, for one reason or another, parliament does not function in a balanced manner, if the opposition or the government abuse their respective privileges, we are headed for a bleak period in this place.

Whenever this happens, democracy is always put on hold and thwarted, and this is not what anybody really wants. What we want is to be able to function as democratically as possible here, and to use the means passed on to us by our predecessors to best advantage.

In my view, the only way forward in the dispute that concerns us, as well as the House leader of the Canadian Alliance and all other members of the House, today is to go along with the Speaker's suggestion that the House leaders get together and discuss the matter. I believe that, if balance is to be maintained, any decisions made must involve agreement between the parties.

I agree with your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that nothing will be done without agreement between the House leaders. Since it is everyone's goal to leave a positive mark in this parliament, I sincerely believe that we will do everything we can to work out an arrangement.

I am willing to go along with your suggestion and I hope that the government leader will show the same openness to your recommendations, and that the other party leaders will do likewise. I think this is the way to go if we want to function efficiently.

[English]

The Speaker: The House leaders have spoken today. They have given their opinions. As I reiterated, it is not up to the Chair to make a hard and fast ruling, but it is up to the Chair surely to encourage not only House leaders but all members of the House to make it so that the House functions in a reasonably amicable way and that we can carry out our functions.

Two suggestions were made, one by the opposition House leader and one by the House leader of the Conservative Party. The words which were added by the hon. House leader of the New Democratic Party and by my colleague from the Bloc Québécois should help us.

Having said that, I cannot order House leaders to come together to settle this matter. That is a given, but I can surely encourage House leaders to come together, at least in the spirit of trying to find some kind of solution to an area which probably could take a bit more looking at.

I have given my advice to the House. The House leaders generally have given their opinions in the House.

Hon. Don Boudria: Some have.

The Speaker: Yes, I am corrected. I invite all House leaders, if they wish to partake in the particular discussion, to do so.

The floor of the House of Commons is not the usual place for these discussions to take place, but surely in private if the House leaders wanted to come together I for one would look upon this favourably so that the Chair is not called upon at different times in

different circumstances to say that 67 are too many, 97 are too many, or 180 are too many. The House leaders have traditionally found ways to get along in the House and that is what I would encourage for the House, the House leaders and, indeed, all members.

• (1545)

If you would take my words, each others words and even the lack of words into consideration then perhaps we can work our way out of this. The House has usually found a way.

Having said that, I will put this matter to one side. I am always hopeful that we can find ways out of whatever dilemmas were are in.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

INCOME TAX AMENDMENTS ACT, 1999

BILL C-25—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

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

That in relation to Bill C-25, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Excise Tax Act and the Budget Implementation Act, 1999, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the second reading stage of the said bill and, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provide for the government business on the day allotted to the consideration of the second 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.

The Speaker: The motion is in order. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt 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:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1635)

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

(Division No. 1291)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Anderson
Assad	Baker
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	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	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Miffin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Peric	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanelief	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood —122

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Blaikie	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Brison
Cadman	Casey

Government Orders

Casson	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Debien	Desjarlais
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Elley
Epp	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goldring
Gouk	Grey (Edmonton North)
Gruending	Guay
Guimond	Hardy
Hart	Herron
Hill (MacLeod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Jaffer
Johnston	Konrad
Laliberté	Laurin
Lebel	Lill
Loubier	Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marchand	Mark
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Muise
Penson	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Proctor	Reynolds
Riis	Ritz
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Solberg	St-Hilaire
Stinson	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Wasylcia-Leis	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—90	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, the Environment; the hon. member for Dartmouth, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, Human Resources Development.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Discussions have taken place between all parties and the member for Sarnia—Lambton concerning the taking of the division on Bill C-276 scheduled at the conclusion of Private Members' Business today, and I believe you would find consent for the following:

That at the conclusion of today's debate on Bill C-276, any recorded division requested to dispose of report stage and third reading of the said bill be deemed deferred until Wednesday, May 17 at the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

● (1640)

INCOME TAX AMENDMENTS ACT, 1999

The House resumed from May 4 consideration of the motion that Bill C-25, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Excise Tax Act and the Budget Implementation Act, 1999, be read a second time and referred to a committee, of the amendment, and of the amendment to the amendment.

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak today at the second reading stage of Bill C-25, the 1999 income tax amendments act.

Last fall Canadians were promised, in both the speech from the throne and the Minister of Finance's economic and fiscal update, that the government would set out a multi-year plan for further tax reductions.

Budget 2000 delivered on that commitment through a five year tax reduction plan that indexes the tax system against inflation, reduces the middle tax rate and overall cuts taxes by at least \$58 billion by the year 2004, an average annual tax cut of 15%, with even greater relief for families with children. It is a plan that will provide further real and lasting tax relief for all Canadians. It is also a plan that had its foundations laid in previous budgets, including that of 1999.

Bill C-25 deals with the measures announced in the 1999 budget. The measures in Bill C-25 demonstrate the following principles of tax fairness: tax relief must be fair and we must start with those who need it most, low and middle income Canadians, especially families with children; priority must be placed on personal income taxes where the burden is greatest and where we are most out of line with other countries; ensure that Canada has an internationally competitive business tax system; and, tax relief must not be financed with borrowed money.

Bill C-25 goes a long way in addressing these issues. Many of these measures are the result of consultations with the industry or clients affected, a process to which our government is dedicated in any major policy change. Each measure addresses an inequity, inconsistency or a discrepancy in the tax system.

I want to focus on the measures that deal with the concerns of low and middle income Canadians and those who need it most. In particular, I want to speak about the following measures: tax credits for individuals, the Canada child tax benefits, medical expense tax credits and tax co-ordination with first nations.

Government Orders

On the issue of personal tax credits, which will bring tax relief to all Canadians, with the high cost of living in the north this will go a long way to alleviating some of the strain on families, especially those with children. Women will also benefit greatly as they remain among the poorest of the poor in Canada. Nearly half of the retired widows live below the poverty line.

The following personal tax credit measures will be of great assistance. First, the 1998 budget raised the amount of money that low income Canadians could receive on a tax-free basis by \$500. The 1999 budget extends this relief to all taxpayers and increases that amount by \$175. As a result of these two measures, all taxpayers will benefit from a basic personal credit sufficient to allow the receipt of up to \$7,131 of tax free income. That is an increase of \$675 over what was available in 1997.

The amount upon which the spousal credit is calculated will also be increased by \$675 to \$6,055. The threshold where the spousal credit begins to be reduced will increase from \$538 to \$606.

The 1998 budget began the process of eliminating the 3% surtax that was brought in by the previous Conservative government. The surtax was eliminated for taxpayers with incomes of up to \$50,000 and reduced it for those with incomes between \$50,000 to \$65,000.

The 1999 budget completes the process by eliminating the 3% surtax for all taxpayers, so all Canadians will no longer have to pay the 3% surtax. This is a very significant amendment.

• (1645)

In addition there is the removal of 600,000 Canadians from the tax rolls. Together the 1998 and 1999 budget measures removed 600,000 Canadians from the tax rolls and reduced taxes for all 15.7 million Canadian taxpayers.

While all taxpayers will benefit from these measures, low income earners have the most to gain. A typical one earner family of four that receives an annual income of \$30,000 or less will pay no net federal income tax. A similar family earning \$40,000 will enjoy a 15% federal income tax reduction.

The next point is the Canada child tax credit. The 1998 budget announced a further \$850 million under the child tax benefit for the national child benefit system. The 1999 budget sets out the design for the increased assistance agreed to by the federal, provincial and territorial governments targeted at low income families with children.

Effective July 1, 1999 the national child benefit supplement is \$785 for the first child, \$585 for the second and \$510 for each subsequent child. As of July 2000 the supplement will be increased to \$955 for the first child, \$755 for the second child and \$680 for each subsequent child. The increases are quite evident. This will be an increase of \$350 for each eligible child.

For both Canada and the Northwest Territories the percentage of lone parent families has steadily increased over the past 15 years and slightly faster in the Northwest Territories. They have faced greater challenges in terms of income and labour force activity. Some 57.1% of single parent families led by women with children under the age of 18 live in poverty based on the 1997 statistics. The child tax benefit will be of benefit to these families in particular.

Turning to tax relief for Canadians with disabilities, hon. members are aware of how this will affect those individuals. They are aware of the government's continuing commitment to help these Canadians by building on the assistance that is already available.

In the last two years additional assistance has been provided through such measures as a caregiver tax credit, a refundable tax credit for low income earners with high medical expenses and the addition of new eligible expenses under the medical expense credit known as METC.

The METC is being extended further to cover expenses for the care of people with severe disabilities living in a group home, therapy for those with severe disabilities and tutoring for the learning disabled with severe disabilities.

In addition talking textbooks for individuals with perceptual disabilities who are enrolled in educational institutions will be included on the list of eligible equipment for persons with disabilities. This will make the lives of those people immeasurably easier. It will help. It will not be the total solution but it will help. This measure will be of great assistance to those who need it most in our society.

The first nations taxation co-ordination measure was not announced as part of the 1999 budget. It is designed to help implement taxation agreements with the first nations providing for a reduction in federal tax for individuals who are subject to the income tax legislation of certain first nations. This amendment puts the federal government's tax sharing agreements with self-governing Yukon first nations into force.

With respect to the personal income tax collected from residents of these Yukon first nations settlement lands, the federal government will vacate 75% of its tax room for the Yukon first nations government to occupy. The bill will also ensure that the tax burden of an individual subject to first nations taxation is the same as in its surrounding jurisdiction. This is an example of great progress on the issue of first nations taxation and self-government.

As hon. members know, the government remains committed to providing substantial tax relief to Canadians on an ongoing basis. Bill C-25 and budget 2000 deliver on this commitment.

I conclude by saying there are many measures here that are going to help the average Canadian and which will help those people who

Government Orders

need it the most. We must not forget when we as government take certain steps to alleviate pressure on those impacted groups that we do it with the sensitivity that is needed and in a universal manner that reaches all those people who need it the most.

• (1650)

Mr. Roy Cullen (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is sad to see the opposition taxing the patience of members of the House by trying to delay legislation that would reduce the taxes of Canadians, but then logic and consistency have really never been the strong suit, or should I say the long suit, of the party once known as reform.

The motion proposes that:

“this House declines to give second reading to Bill C-25. . . since the principle of the Bill does not provide for a Single Rate Tax Plan as proposed in Solution 17.”

If I may offer some friendly advice to the hon. member and his colleagues, if they ever want to build a truly national constituency, it is time they got out of the single rate rut. The flat tax proposal of the Canadian Alliance fails miserably in the two most important tests: the test of equity and the test of simplicity. I hope I can show that in my remarks which follow.

Instead of trying to sell a phoney silver bullet solution, they should be helping the government enact its program of tax relief, including the \$58 billion in tax savings proposed in the February budget. They are real tax savings for all Canadians and fair tax savings that provide the greatest benefit for families in the greatest need rather than reward the rich.

[Translation]

Our government knows that Canadians are tired of the tax burden. That is why, with the deficit eliminated for good, we have taken clear, concrete action to get taxes down. We have made it clear that the actions in budget 2000—including those contained in this bill—are just a minimum. As revenues improve, we will do more.

[English]

But a single tax rate is not on that agenda because it is not on anybody's agenda. They should put effective, equitable public policy ahead of desperate partisan politics. This point was emphasized in a column last week in the *Ottawa Citizen*. In referring to the hon. member for Medicine Hat, it states that he:

—points out that (Premier) Harris ‘has been agnostic’ on the (single rate) tax. Yet, in last week's budget, the Ontario Premier missed the opportunity to move in the direction of a single-rate tax. And there are few other examples for the Alliance to point to: Only Latvia and Hong Kong have flat taxes, and five American states have single-rate taxes.

More impressive is the list of those (from Thatcher's Britain, to Reagan Republicans, to an early Reform Party task force) that have studied the flat tax and rejected it.

The reason that so many jurisdictions have rejected the opposition's solution 17 approach, just as a decade's worth of U.S. primaries rejected the flat tax mania of millionaire presidential wannabe Steve Forbes, is that it is both wrong-headed and wrong-hearted.

The fact is that solution 17 with its 17% single rate would provide much larger tax reductions for high income individuals compared with middle and low income individuals. This would violate the widely held view in our democratic system that a key objective in providing tax relief should be to deliver it first to those who need it most: middle and low income individuals and those with families.

Thinking caring Canadians understand that it is important to ensure that the tax system recognizes the ability of individuals to pay by taxing at a lower rate middle and low income families. But reform's solution 17 heads in the opposite direction. It would significantly reduce the progressivity and fairness of the tax system.

Mr. Monte Solberg: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Speaker ruled some time ago that our party would from here on in be known as the Canadian Alliance. I have heard many instances where other parties have referred to us otherwise. I am going to ask that you rule that in every case that we be known as the alliance or else we will find new names for the Liberals.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The hon. member certainly has a point. I would ask the hon. member from the government side to address the other side as the Canadian Alliance.

• (1655)

Mr. Roy Cullen: Certainly, Madam Speaker. I am not sure whether it is an alliance party or a movement but I am happy to comply.

The Canadian Alliance solution 17 heads in the opposite direction. It would significantly reduce the progressivity and fairness of the tax system. For incomes above the basic exemption, it would tax a lone parent earning \$30,000 a year at the same rate as a wealthy CEO making \$2 million a year.

Let us step back for a second and look at this issue on a broader conceptual basis. Indeed several different flat tax proposals have been put forward in recent years both in Canada and abroad. Typically such proposals involve the replacement of a progressive rate structure with a single tax rate and the elimination of many deductions and credits. The resulting tax structure is of course appealing for its superficial simplicity. However, these flat tax proposals raise a number of issues.

Flat tax systems can be designed to be progressive, like the current income tax system, through the provision of a relatively high basic personal exemption for low income filers. Providing

such an exemption with the reduced single rate would result in a significant reduction in income tax revenues. We have to consider the cost of any proposal especially over the long term.

The opposition's 17% solution, including an increase in personal exemptions to \$10,000 and a new \$3,000 exemption per child, would cost in the range of \$34 billion a year. That is almost one-third of the entire federal program spending budget for this year. Even including the tax cuts we have announced, it would entail major cuts to federal programs. Which programs would the hon. member want to cut: health spending, support for R and D or old age security? It would be cuts like these that are the real cost of the tax savings the opposition seeks.

What about the issue of simplification? Here too the opposition is playing fast and loose with both fact and philosophy. The real fact is that most taxpayers would not find tax calculations much easier if only one rate were used. Simplicity generally comes from the elimination of deductions and credits, not from reducing the number of tax rates. Again we get a glimmer of the real bottom line agenda of the opposition.

In the real world many of the deductions and credits that would have to go to deliver tax simplification and to pay for the reduction in the tax rate would hit painfully and punitively on modest and middle income Canadians. It could mean for example getting rid of the child care expense deduction, the medical expense and tuition fee tax credits. Perhaps the hon. member for Medicine Hat has no problem getting rid of this targeted relief aimed at those who are in the greatest need.

That is not the solution this government would ever embrace because Canadians demand better of us. Canadians understand that eliminating these deductions and credits would provide less recognition of the ability to pay tax of individuals in different circumstances. Canadians recognize that such action would mean less flexibility for the government in delivering social and economic policy in a volatile global economy; policies designed to help our country seize new economic opportunities while protecting those who can be buffeted when the winds of change blow too harshly.

Here is where we can see clearly and cleanly the basic philosophy difference between our government and the opposition. We both may agree that a key objective of national policy must be to lower tax rates in order to leave Canadians with as much money as possible so that they can provide for their needs. However, we differ diametrically when the advocates of flat taxes justify the elimination of deductions and credits by arguing that the government should not use the tax system to pursue social and economic policy. The sad irony is that if these deductions and credits are carried forward in the solution 17 flat tax proposal, then clearly they would not have made the income tax system more simple, as many Canadians believe to be the advantage of flat tax system. We cannot have it both ways.

While I agree that taxes should be lowered, this government also believes that how and how fast we cut taxes is also critical. To

Government Orders

make those decisions, we believe that fairness should be paramount. The government must ensure that the most vulnerable in society are not left behind. This in turn has a concrete corollary which recognizes that the ability of Canadians in different circumstances to pay must remain a key concern.

• (1700)

In conclusion I emphasize that looking for ways to improve the fairness of the tax system while keeping it as simple as possible are ongoing objectives of the government. We are committed to bringing the overall tax burden down as fast and as far as we can without jeopardizing Canada's hard won fiscal stability. Never again will we risk a return to deficit financing, especially not with pie in the sky tax solutions.

[*Translation*]

And that is the problem with the idea that underlies this time-wasting motion. Against every element of a proper template for tax action—fairness, effectiveness, compassion, and long-term fiscal prudence—the opposition's approach fails, and fails badly.

[*English*]

Let us not reward that failure by wasting much more time here today. We should get the motion defeated and get on with the real tax cutting as contained in the income tax amendment act before us.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to debate the amendment to the amendment to Bill C-25. I will start by saying that either my friend across the way is completely out of his depth on the issue of single rate taxes and flat taxes, or he is misrepresenting the position put forward by the Canadian Alliance.

As he scurries away, I would simply say to him that it is not the Canadian Alliance that caused a situation where today in Canada there is not a single—

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order only because it has happened several times already today. The rules of the House have been ignored by the opposition in commenting on the presence or absence of members in the House.

I would ask that the Chair inform the member that it is not permitted under the rules, or I will be forced to start commenting on the presence and absence, which is noticed right now, of Canadian Alliance members.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, I heard it and I should have made mention of it too. We do not reference the absence or presence of other members. We know that they are busy in committee and have other responsibilities.

Government Orders

Mr. Monte Solberg: Mr. Speaker, let me just say that he beat an intellectual retreat. My friend across the way has to know that it was not the Canadian Alliance which put Canada in a position where we now see that not a single province in Canada has disposable income that matches even the poorest of the poor American states. It was not the Canadian Alliance that caused that situation. It was government members across the way.

Over the weekend the Standard & Poor's DRI report on Canada pointed out that disposable incomes in Canada continue to plummet relative to the United States. That report showed very clearly that the state of Mississippi, the poorest American state, has disposable income which is 10% higher than the wealthiest Canadian province, Alberta.

Why is that? It is precisely because of some of the disincentives we find in the tax system in Canada today that our country has fallen so far behind, which is why solution 17 makes so much sense.

I will simply address head on some of the accusations and misrepresentations I heard from across the way a few minutes ago. My friend across the way suggested that somehow solution 17 was unfair to people on the low end of the income scale. I simply have to point out that under solution 17, 1.9 million low income Canadians would be lifted right off the tax rolls. They would no longer pay the taxes which the government forces them to pay.

It is unbelievable to me that they stand there and pretend they are the champions of the little guy. The only little guy they care about is the little guy from Shawinigan.

• (1705)

The truth is that 1.9 million low income Canadians pay taxes today who should not and solution 17 would solve that problem. They would no longer have to pay taxes to the finance minister and to the Prime Minister to fund all the questionable causes, shall we say, that we currently fund. I want to deal with that one head on.

Second, I want to address the accusation that somehow what was inferred was that people at the high end of the income scale would pay the same tax rates as people at the low end. That simply is not true. They would pay a rate that is the same but the effective tax rate would be completely different.

I will illustrate what I mean with an example. Let us consider someone who makes \$1 million a year in income and compare that to someone who makes \$24,000 in income, say a single mom with one child. The difference between those two incomes is about 40 times. The person with the million dollar income has an income 40 times larger, but under our system that person would pay 1,000 times more tax than the single mom making \$24,000. She would

pay \$170 and the person with the income of \$1 million would pay roughly \$170,000.

What the member across the way was suggesting completely misrepresents the situation. It is simply not the case. It is a desperate attempt by members on the other side to try to scare people away from a proposal which they know is intuitively appealing to Canadians. We know that is the case because we even have finance department polling which shows that people favour this kind of idea. They understand that Canada is in a competitive situation and that we have to start to remove some of the impediments to wealth creation which have caused us to fall so far behind.

I mentioned a minute ago that relative to the United States our wealthiest province has after tax disposable income on average that is lower than the poorest of the poor American states. That is not the only evidence we have to bring forward that the government has dropped the ball when it comes to finding ways to increase the productivity of the nation and through that the standard of living of Canadians.

One of the most revealing reports we have is from the OECD. It demonstrates very clearly that over the decade from 1988 to 1998 Canada languished in terms of producing real per capita output or, to put it another way, Canada's standard of living grew by 5%. Over 10 years, a lot of it under this government, our standard of living grew by a scant 5%.

How fast did it grow elsewhere? In France it grew three times that fast; in the United States, four times that fast; in Australia, four times that fast; in Norway, six times that fast; and in Ireland it grew by a remarkable eighteen times the rate that it grew in Canada.

My friend across the way from Hamilton says that is remarkable. It is. I want my friend to understand the reason for it. Is it that Ireland has so many more resources than Canada? Hardly. It has good management. It made the right public policy decisions.

In fact the DRI report I referred to earlier talked a bit about Ireland. It said that many things were similar between the situation Canada is in and the situation Ireland is in. We both have well educated workforces. We concede that. That is true. We are both next to big prosperous markets. In Ireland's case it is Europe; in our case it is the United States. We have these things going for us. We have access to those markets. We have a free trade agreement. Ireland is part of the European economy.

One thing that separates us, and DRI pointed it out, is that Ireland took the commonsensical approach of reducing taxes to attract investment. In Canada we have marginally lowered taxes so that we do not fall behind quite as fast.

What has been the difference? As I mentioned a minute ago, the economy in Ireland grew exponentially, 18 times faster than Canada's over that 10 year period.

• (1710)

What has been the impact on the Irish economy? We know today that a country like Ireland, which for 150 years lost population, is now actually starting to add numbers to its population. It is increasing in population for the first time in 150 years, just because of public policy decisions. It is in a situation now where with 1% of the population in Europe it now attracts 20% of all new investment in Europe.

It is an amazing story. In fact its economy is growing rapidly now and it is projected to grow just as rapidly into the next five years. It is bringing in so much revenue with much lower taxes that it now provides free university education for all its people. It is an amazing story.

What do we do in Canada? The government tries to convince people that it is addressing the situation by bringing down the last budget and arguing that it delivered \$58 billion in tax relief. It simply was not so. The DRI report points to the flaws in what the government has done. In the \$58 billion that it talks about we find that about \$8 billion of it is the child tax benefit. It is a sweetening of the child tax benefit. It is a social program, and the Liberals are calling it a tax cut. It is hardly the same. A tax cut is when we leave the money in people's pockets in the first place. We do not take it out and then run it through—

Mr. Rahim Jaffer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am wondering if it is possible to seek unanimous consent to return to Routine Proceedings so I may have the chance to table the minority report which I did not have a chance to do this morning.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): As a matter of fact during Routine Proceedings today the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona was on his feet. I did not see him during the tabling of reports from committees. We asked for unanimous consent at that time to revert to presenting reports from committees to give him a minute to present the report and we did not obtain it.

We will ask for it again. Will the House give unanimous consent to the member for Edmonton—Strathcona for one minute to present his minority report?

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, may I ask which report?

Mr. Rahim Jaffer: It is the report on pesticides which was tabled this morning by the hon. member for Davenport.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Does the House give its unanimous consent to revert to daily routine of business for one minute?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Government Orders

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the official opposition felt that it was important to include a minority report with the committee's report this morning because we feel that the committee report lacks balance. The recommendations that were made would unfortunately divide stakeholders rather than bring collaboration between groups.

The Canadian Alliance simply could not support the tone and overall direction of the report that failed to recognize the tremendous gains which manufacturers and user groups of pesticides have been making for years, and to make human health and especially safety top priorities. Stakeholders in particular, manufacturers, agricultural producers—

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The House gave its unanimous consent for the member to present his report, not to speak to it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): When the report is presented and tabled, the opposition always has the opportunity to make a brief intervention, and that is what is being done.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: He just did.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): No. He had 40 seconds and he has 20 more seconds.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer: Mr. Speaker, I was on my last statement. Stakeholders in particular, manufacturers, agricultural producers and other user groups have been taking extraordinary measures to promote a safe, transparent and effective regulatory system in a co-operative way with the PMRA, and this has been largely ignored in the committee report.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1715)

[English]

INCOME TAX AMENDMENTS ACT, 1999

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-25, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Excise Tax Act and the

Government Orders

Budget Implementation Act, 1999, be read the second time and referred to a committee, of the amendment, and of the amendment to the amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): 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 second reading stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour of the amendment to 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 nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

• (1745)

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

(Division No. 1292)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Anders
Bailey	Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Duncan
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Goldring
Gouk	Grey (Edmonton North)
Harris	Hart
Hill (MacLeod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad	Lowther
Mark	Meredith
Obhrai	Penson
Reynolds	Ritz
Schmidt	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—39	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Blaikie	Bonwick
Bonin	Boudria
Borotsik	Brown
Brison	Bulte
Bryden	Caplan
Calder	Carroll
Cardin	Catterall
Casey	Chamberlain
Cauchon	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chan	Clouthier
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Collenette
Coderre	Copps
Comuzzi	Crête
Cotler	Dalphond-Guiral
Cullen	Debien
Davies	DeVillers
Desjarlais	Dion
Dhaliwal	Dockrill
Discepola	Dromisky
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Drouin	Duceppe
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Dumas
Duhamel	Easter
Earle	Finlay
Eggleton	Fry
Fontana	Gagnon
Gagliano	Gauthier
Galloway	Godfrey
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Gray (Windsor West)
Goodale	Guarnieri
Gruending	Guimond
Guay	Harvard
Hardy	Hubbard
Herron	Jackson
Ianno	Jordan
Jennings	Karygiannis
Karetak-Lindell	Keys
Keddy (South Shore)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kraft Sloan
Knutson	Lastewka
Laliberte	Lebel
Laurin	Leung
Lee	Limoges
Lill	Longfield
Lincoln	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
MacAulay	Malhi
Mahoney	Mancini
Maloney	Marceau
Manley	Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Marchand	McCormick
Matthews	McGuire
McDonough	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McKay (Scarborough East)	McWhinney
McTeague	Mercier
Ménard	Miffin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Peric	Perron

Government Orders

Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Robinson
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Shepherd
St-Hilaire
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Turp
Valeri
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Sekora
Sgro
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—197

Ritz
Solberg
Strahl
White (North Vancouver)

Schmidt
Stinson
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Williams—40

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Assad
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Brison
Bryden
Calder
Cardin
Casey
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cullen
Davies
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Gruending
Guay
Hardy
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Laliberte
Laurin
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marchand
Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Ménard
Mifflin

Alarie
Anderson
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caplan
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
De Villers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
Finlay
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lebel
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marceau
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mercier
Milliken

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre
Nunziata

Normand
Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost.

The next question is on the amendment.

● (1750)

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe that you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the motion now before the House.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

(Division No. 1293)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Casson
Duncan
Epp
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lowther
Meredithe
Penson

Ablonczy
Bailey
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman
Chatters
Elley
Forseth
Gouk
Harris
Hill (Macleod)
Hiilstrom
Johnston
Konrad
Mark
Obhrai
Reynolds

Government Orders

Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Vautour	Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—197

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to be recorded as voting in support of the amendment.

The Speaker: You will be recorded.

The next question is on the main motion.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening will be voting against this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are opposed to this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the New Democratic Party are voting vote no to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party are voting no to this motion.

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

(*Division No. 1294*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Baker	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lee
Leung	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Peric
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pratt
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
St. Denis	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—134

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Cadman
Brisson	Casey
Cardin	Chatters
Casson	Crête
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Davies
Dalphond-Guiral	Desjarlais
Debien	Doyle
Dockrill	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dumas
Duceppe	Earle
Duncan	Epp
Elley	Gagnon
Forseth	Girard-Bujold
Gauthier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Gouk
Goldring	Gruending
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guimond
Guay	Harris
Hardy	Herron
Hart	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (Macleod)	Jaffer
Hilstrom	Keddy (South Shore)
Johnston	Konrad
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)	Laurin
Laliberté	Lill
Lebel	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Lowther	Marceau
Mancini	Mark
Marchand	Ménard
McDonough	Meredith
Mercier	Nystrom
Muise	Penson
Obhrai	Picard (Drummond)
Perron	Price
Plamondon	Reynolds
Proctor	Ritz
Riis	Sauvageau
Robinson	Solberg
Schmidt	Stinson
St-Hilaire	Strahl
Stoffer	Turp
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Wasylycia-Leis
Vautour	Williams—103
White (North Vancouver)	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Finance.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

* * *

CITIZENSHIP OF CANADA ACT

The House resumed from May 11 consideration of Bill C-16, an act respecting Canadian citizenship, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Thursday, May 11, 2000, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of Bill C-16.

The question is on Motion No. 1.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the House would agree, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening will be voting in favour of this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are opposed to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP present will be voting no to this motion.

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party will be voting no to this motion.

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

(*Division No. 1295*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Harris
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Jaffer	Johnston
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad
Lowther	Mark
Meredith	Obhrai
Penson	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Solberg	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—40

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Barnes
Beaumier	Béclair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Blaikie	Bonwick
Bonin	Boudria
Borotsik	Brown
Brisson	Bulte
Bryden	Caplan
Calder	Carroll
Cardin	Catterall
Casey	Chamberlain
Cauchon	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chan	Cloutier
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Collenette
Coderre	Copps
Comuzzi	Crête
Cotler	Dalphond-Guiral
Cullen	Debien
Davies	DeVillers
Desjarlais	Dion
Dhaliwal	Dockrill
Discepolo	Dromisky
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Drouin	Duceppe
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Dumas
Duhamel	Easter
Earle	Finlay
Eggleton	Fry
Fontana	Gagnon
Gagliano	Gauthier
Galloway	Godfrey
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Gray (Windsor West)
Goodale	Guarnieri
Gruending	Guimond
Guay	Harvard
Hardy	Hubbard
Herron	Jackson
Ianno	Jordan
Jennings	Karygiannis
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Keddy (South Shore)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kraft Sloan
Knutson	Lastewka
Laliberte	Lebel
Laurin	Leung
Lee	Limoges
Lill	Longfield
Lincoln	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
MacAulay	Malhi
Mahoney	Mancini
Maloney	Marceau
Manley	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Marchand	McCormick
Matthews	McGuire
McDonough	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McKay (Scarborough East)	McWhinney
McTeague	Mercier
Ménard	Milliken
Mifflin	Minna
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Muise
Mitchell	Myers
Murray	Nystrom
Nault	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Brien (Labrador)	

O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vaunclief
Vautour	Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—197

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following motions: Motions Nos. 2, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

• (1755)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

(Division No. 1296)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Harris
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom

Government Orders

Jaffer
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Lowther
 Meredith
 Penson
 Ritz
 Solberg
 Strahl
 White (North Vancouver)

Johnston
 Konrad
 Mark
 Obhrai
 Reynolds
 Schmidt
 Stinson
 Thompson (Wild Rose)
 Williams—40

McDonough
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McTeague
 Ménard
 Mifflin
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Mitchell
 Murray
 Nault
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 O'Reilly
 Paradis
 Peric
 Peterson
 Picard (Drummond)
 Plamondon
 Price
 Proud
 Provenzano
 Reed
 Riis
 Robinson
 Saada
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Serré
 Shepherd
 St-Hilaire
 Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Turp
 Valeri
 Vautour
 Wasylcyia-Leis
 Wilfert

McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 McWhinney
 Mercier
 Milliken
 Minna
 Muise
 Myers
 Nystrom
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Pagtakhan
 Parrish
 Perron
 Phinney
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Pratt
 Proctor
 Proulx
 Redman
 Richardson
 Robillard
 Rock
 Sauvageau
 Sekora
 Sgro
 St. Denis
 St-Julien
 Stewart (Brant)
 Stoffer
 Telegdi
 Torsney
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Volpe
 Whelan
 Wood—197

NAYS

Members

Adams
 Alcock
 Assad
 Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
 Baker
 Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
 Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Bevilacqua
 Blaikie
 Bonin
 Borotsik
 Brison
 Bryden
 Calder
 Cardin
 Casey
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
 Coderre
 Comuzzi
 Cotler
 Cullen
 Davies
 Desjarlais
 Dhaliwal
 Discepola
 Doyle
 Drouin
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Duhamel
 Earle
 Eggleton
 Fontana
 Gagliano
 Gallaway
 Girard-Bujold
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
 Goodale
 Gruending
 Guay
 Hardy
 Herron
 Ianno
 Jennings
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
 Knutson
 Laliberte
 Laurin
 Lee
 Lill
 Lincoln
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Manley
 Marchand
 Matthews

Alarie
 Anderson
 Asselin
 Bachand (Saint-Jean)
 Barnes
 Bélair
 Bellemare
 Bergeron
 Bertrand
 Bigras
 Blondin-Andrew
 Bonwick
 Boudria
 Brown
 Bulte
 Caplan
 Carroll
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
 Clouthier
 Collenette
 Copps
 Crête
 Dalphond-Guiral
 Debien
 De Villers
 Dion
 Dockrill
 Dromisky
 Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
 Duceppe
 Dumas
 Easter
 Finlay
 Fry
 Gagnon
 Gauthier
 Godfrey
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 Gray (Windsor West)
 Guarnieri
 Guimond
 Harvard
 Hubbard
 Jackson
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Keyes
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Kraft Sloan
 Lastewka
 Lebel
 Leung
 Limoges
 Longfield
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Malhi
 Mancini
 Marceau
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 McCormick

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre
 Nunziata

Normand
 Wappel

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

(Division No. 1311)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
 Anders
 Benoit
 Breikreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
 Casson
 Duncan
 Epp
 Goldring
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Hart
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Jaffer
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Lowther
 Meredith
 Penson
 Ritz
 Solberg
 Strahl
 White (North Vancouver)

Abлонczy
 Bailey
 Breikreuz (Yellowhead)
 Cadman
 Chatters
 Elley
 Forseth
 Gouk
 Harris
 Hill (Macleod)
 Hilstrom
 Johnston
 Konrad
 Mark
 Obhrai
 Reynolds
 Schmidt
 Stinson
 Thompson (Wild Rose)
 Williams—40

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Blaikie	Bonwick
Bonin	Boudria
Borotsik	Brown
Brisson	Bulte
Bryden	Caplan
Calder	Carroll
Cardin	Catterall
Casey	Chamberlain
Cauchon	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chan	Cloutier
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Collenette
Coderre	Copps
Comuzzi	Crête
Cotler	Dalphond-Guiral
Cullen	Debien
Davies	DeVillers
Desjarlais	Dion
Dhaliwal	Dockrill
Discepolo	Dromisky
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Drouin	Duceppe
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Dumas
Duhamel	Easter
Earle	Finlay
Eggleton	Fry
Fontana	Gagnon
Gagliano	Gauthier
Galloway	Godfrey
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Gray (Windsor West)
Goodale	Guarnieri
Gruending	Guimond
Guay	Harvard
Hardy	Hubbard
Herron	Jackson
Ianno	Jordan
Jennings	Karygiannis
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Keddy (South Shore)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kraft Sloan
Knutson	Lastewka
Laliberte	Lebel
Laurin	Leung
Lee	Limoges
Lill	Longfield
Lincoln	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
MacAulay	Malhi
Mahoney	Mancini
Maloney	Marceau
Manley	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Marchand	McCormick
Matthews	McGuire
McDonough	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McKay (Scarborough East)	McWhinney
McTeague	Mercier
Ménard	Milliken
Mifflin	Minna
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Muise
Mitchell	Myers
Murray	Nystrom
Nault	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Brien (Labrador)	

O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vancilief
Vautour	Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—197

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

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

(Division No. 1312)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Harris
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad
Lowther	Mark
Meredith	Obhrai
Penson	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Solberg	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—40

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Barnes

Government Orders

Beaumier	Bélaïr	Reed	Richardson
Bélangier	Bellemare	Riis	Robillard
Bennett	Bergeron	Robinson	Rock
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand	Saada	Sauvageau
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras	Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew	Serré	Sgro
Blaikie	Bonwick	Shepherd	St. Denis
Bonin	Boudria	St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Borotsik	Brown	Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Brison	Bulte	Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Bryden	Caplan	Szabo	Telegdi
Calder	Carroll	Thibeault	Torsney
Cardin	Catterall	Turp	Ur
Casey	Chamberlain	Valeri	Vanclicf
Cauchon	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Vautour	Volpe
Chan	Clouthier	Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Collenette	Wilfert	Wood—197
Coderre	Copps		
Comuzzi	Crête		
Cotler	Dalphondu-Guiral		
Cullen	Debien		
Davies	DeVillers		
Desjarlais	Dion	Lefebvre	Normand
Dhaliwal	Dockrill	Nunziata	Wappel
Discepolo	Dromisky		
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)		
Drouin	Duceppe		
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Dumas		
Duhamel	Easter		
Earle	Finlay		
Eggleton	Fry		
Fontana	Gagnon		
Fontana	Gauthier		
Gagliano	Godfrey		
Galloway	Godin (Châteauguay)		
Girard-Bujold	Gray (Windsor West)		
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Guarnieri		
Goodale	Guimond		
Gruending	Harvard		
Guay	Hubbard		
Hardy	Jackson		
Herron	Jordan		
Ianno	Karygiannis	Abbott	Ablonczy
Jennings	Keyes	Anders	Bailey
Karetak-Lindell	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Keddy (South Shore)	Kraft Sloan	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Lastewka	Casson	Chatters
Knutson	Lebel	Duncan	Elley
Laliberte	Leung	Epp	Forseth
Laurin	Limoges	Goldring	Gouk
Lee	Longfield	Grey (Edmonton North)	Harris
Lill	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Lincoln	Malhi	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
MacAulay	Mancini	Jaffer	Johnston
Mahoney	Marceau	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad
Maloney	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Lowther	Mark
Manley	McCormick	Meredith	Obhrai
Marchand	McGuire	Penson	Reynolds
Mathews	McLellan (Edmonton West)	Ritz	Schmidt
Matthews	McWhinney	Solberg	Stinson
McDonough	Mercier	Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
McKay (Scarborough East)	Milliken	White (North Vancouver)	Williams—40
McTeague	Minna		
Ménard	Muise		
Mifflin	Myers		
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Nystrom		
Mitchell	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)		
Murray	Pagtakhan		
Nault	Parrish		
O'Brien (Labrador)	Perron		
O'Reilly	Phinney		
Paradis	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)		
Peric	Pratt		
Peterson	Proctor		
Picard (Drummond)	Proulx		
Plamondon	Redman		
Price			
Proud			
Provenzano			

PAIRED MEMBERS

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

(Division No. 1313)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Harris
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad
Lowther	Mark
Meredith	Obhrai
Penson	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Solberg	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—40

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	

Government Orders

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Brison	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Calder	Caplan
Cardin	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Crête
Cullen	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	Debien
Desjarlais	De Villers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Gruending	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Hardy	Harvard
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
Laurin	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Julien

Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Vautour	Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—197

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

(The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1314)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Harris
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad
Lowther	Mark
Meredith	Obhrai
Penson	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Solberg	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—40

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Brison	Brown

Government Orders

Bryden
Calder
Cardin
Casey
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cullen
Davies
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Gruending
Guay
Hardy
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Laliberte
Laurin
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marchand
Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Ménard
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Robinson
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Shepherd
St-Hilaire
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Turp

Bulte
Caplan
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
Finlay
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lebel
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marceau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mercier
Milliken
Minna
Muisse
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Perron
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Sekora
Sgro
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Ur

Valeri
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

Vanclief
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—197

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre
Nunziata

Normand
Wappel

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

(Division No. 1315)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Casson
Duncan
Epp
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lowther
Meredith
Penson
Ritz
Solberg
Strahl
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy
Bailey
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman
Chatters
Elley
Forseth
Gouk
Harris
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Johnston
Konrad
Mark
Obhrai
Reynolds
Schmidt
Stinson
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Williams—40

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Assad
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Brisson
Bryden
Calder
Cardin
Casey
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cullen
Davies

Alarie
Anderson
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caplan
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien

Government Orders

Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Gruending	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Hardy	Harvard
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
Laurin	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Vautour	Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—197

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

The Speaker: I therefore declare Motions Nos. 2, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 3. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 17.

[Translation]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[English]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will be opposed to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, needless to say, the members of the Bloc Québécois support this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP present are opposed to this motion.

[English]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, members of the Conservative Party will be voting no to this motion.

(The House divided on the Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1297)

YEAS

Members	
Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Cardin
Bigras	Crête
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Debien
Dalphon-Duval	Duceppe
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Gagnon
Dumas	Girard-Bujold
Gauthier	Guay
Godin (Châteauguay)	Laurin
Guimond	Marceau
Lebel	Ménard
Marchand	Perron
Mercier	Plamondon
Picard (Drummond)	St-Hilaire
Sauvageau	
Turp—32	

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Anders
Assad
Bailey
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison
Bryden
Cadman
Caplan
Casey
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chatters
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
Cullen
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Epp
Fontana
Fry
Galloway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Gruending
Hardy
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Jackson
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Phinney
Pratt
Proctor
Proulx

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anderson
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carroll
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Easter
Elley
Finlay
Forseth
Gagliano
Godfrey
Goldring
Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri
Harris
Harvard
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Laliberte
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Mark
Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Minna
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Obhrai
Paradis
Penson
Peterson
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proud
Provenzano

Government Orders

Redman
Reynolds
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Schmidt
Sekora
Sgro
Solberg
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Ur
Vancielief
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—205

Reed
Richardson
Ritz
Robinson
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Shepherd
St. Denis
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Valeri
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)
Williams

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre
Nunziata

Normand
Wappel

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 lost. I therefore declare Motion No. 17 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 9.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe there would be unanimous consent to apply the result of the last vote to Motion No. 9.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1309*)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Gauthier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Lebel
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
Turp—32

Asselin
Bergeron
Cardin
Crête
Debien
Duceppe
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Laurin
Marceau
Ménard
Perron
Plamondon
St-Hilaire

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Anders
Assad
Bailey
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison
Bryden
Cadman
Caplan
Casey
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chatters
Clouthier
Collette
Copp
Cullen
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Epp
Fontana
Fry
Gallaway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Gruending
Hardy
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Jackson
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Miffin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anderson
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carroll
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Easter
Elley
Finlay
Forseth
Gagliano
Godfrey
Goldring
Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri
Harris
Harvard
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Laliberte
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Mark
Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Minna
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Obhrai

Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Phinney
Pratt
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Reynolds
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Schmidt
Sekora
Sgro
Solberg
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—205

Paradis
Penson
Peterson
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Richardson
Ritz
Robinson
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Shepherd
St. Denis
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Valeri
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)
Williams

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre
Nunziata

Normand
Wappel

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 9 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 22.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening will be voting in favour of this motion.

[Translation]

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

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP vote no to this motion.

[English]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party will be voting yes to this motion.

Government Orders

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

(Division No. 1298)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brisson	Cadman
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duncan
Elley	Epp
Forsyth	Goldring
Gouk	Grey (Edmonton North)
Harris	Hart
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Jaffer	Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad	Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mark
Meredith	Muise
Obhrai	Penson
Price	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Solberg	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vautour	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—53	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Calder	Caplan
Cardin	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Crête	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
Debien	Desjarlais
De Villers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dockrill	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Gallaway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold

Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)	Gruending
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Hardy
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lastewka	Laurin
Lebel	Lee
Leung	Lill
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Mathews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Peric
Perron	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Plamondon
Pratt	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—184	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 22 lost.

We are now going on to Group No. 2. The question is on Motion No. 4. A vote on this motion will also apply to Motion No. 5.

• (1805)

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

Government Orders

(Division No. 1299)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman	Calder
Cardin	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Comuzzi	Crête
Dalphond-Guiral	Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Guimond	Harris
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Jaffer	Johnston
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad
Laurin	Lebel
Lowther	Marceau
Marchand	Mark
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Obhrai
Penson	Peric
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Reynolds
Ritz	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solberg
St-Hilaire	Steckle
Stinson	Strahl
Telegdi	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp	Ur
Volpe	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—80	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Baker
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Brisson	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Godfrey

Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)	Gruending
Guarnieri	Harvard
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lee
Leung	Lill
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Moise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt	Price
Proud	Proulx
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	St. Denis
St-Julien	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Thibeault
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—144

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 lost. I therefore declare Motion No. 5 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 6.

• (1810)

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will be voting yea to this motion.

[*Translation*]

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

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, NDP members will be voting in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 1300*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Cadman
Brison	Casey
Cardin	Chatters
Casson	Crête
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Debien
Dalphond-Guiral	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Doyle	Duceppe
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duncan
Dumas	Elley
Earle	Forseth
Epp	Gauthier
Gagnon	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Girard-Bujold	Goldring
Godin (Châteauguay)	Grey (Edmonton North)
Gouk	Guay
Gruending	Harris
Guimond	Herron
Hart	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (Macleod)	Jaffer
Hilstrom	Keddy (South Shore)
Johnston	Konrad
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laurin
Laliberte	Lill
Lebel	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Lowther	Marceau
Mancini	Mark
Marchand	Ménard
McDonough	Meredith
Mercier	
Muise	

Nystrom
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Ritz
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vautour
White (North Vancouver)

Government Orders

Obhrai
Perron
Plamondon
Reynolds
Sauvageau
Solberg
Stinson
Strahl
Turp
Wasylcia-Leis
Williams —96

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Baker	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Miliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Peric	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt	Proud
Proulx	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
St. Denis	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—128

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

Government Orders

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 6 lost.

[*English*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following motions: Motions Nos. 7, 8, 20 and 21.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 1301*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Cadman
Brison	Casey
Cardin	Chatters
Casson	Crête
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Debien
Dalphond-Guiral	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Doyle	Duceppe
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duncan
Dumas	Elley
Earle	Forseth
Epp	Gauthier
Gagnon	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Girard-Bujold	Goldring
Godin (Châteauguay)	Grey (Edmonton North)
Gouk	Guay
Gruending	Harris
Guimond	Herron
Hart	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (Macleod)	Jaffer
Hilstrom	Keddy (South Shore)
Johnston	Konrad
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laurin
Laliberte	Lill
Lebel	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Lowther	Marceau
Mancini	Mark
Marchand	Ménard
McDonough	Meredith
Mercier	Nystrom
Muise	Penson
Obhrai	Picard (Drummond)
Perron	Price
Plamondon	Ritz
Reynolds	Schmidt
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Solberg	Stoffer
Stinson	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Strahl	Vautour
Turp	White (North Vancouver)
Wasylcia-Leis	
Williams —96	

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anderson

Alcock
Assad

Baker	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Peric	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt	Proud
Proulx	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
St. Denis	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—128

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

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

(*Division No. 1302*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Alarie

Ablonczy
Anders

Government Orders

Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Karygiannis	Keyes
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Benoit	Bergeron	Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras	Lee	Leung
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik	Limoges	Lincoln
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Longfield	MacAulay
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Cadman	Mahoney	Malhi
Brison	Casey	Maloney	Manley
Cardin	Chatters	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
Casson	Crête	McCormick	McGuire
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Debien	McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
Dalphond-Guiral	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	McTeague	McWhinney
Doyle	Duceppe	Mifflin	Milliken
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duncan	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Dumas	Elley	Mitchell	Murray
Earle	Forseth	Myers	Nault
Epp	Gauthier	O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Gagnon	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Girard-Bujold	Goldring	Paradis	Parrish
Godin (Châteauguay)	Grey (Edmonton North)	Peric	Peterson
Gouk	Guay	Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Gruending	Harris	Pratt	Proud
Guimond	Herron	Proulx	Redman
Hart	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Reed	Richardson
Hill (Macleod)	Jaffer	Robillard	Rock
Hilstrom	Keddy (South Shore)	Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Johnston	Konrad	Sekora	Serré
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laurin	Sgro	Shepherd
Laliberte	Lill	St. Denis	St-Julien
Lebel	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Lowther	Marceau	Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Mancini	Mark	Telegdi	Thibeault
Marchand	Ménard	Torsney	Ur
McDonough	Meredith	Valeri	Vanclief
Mercier	Nystrom	Volpe	Whelan
Muise	Penson	Wilfert	Wood—128
Obhrai	Picard (Drummond)		
Perron	Price		
Plamondon	Ritz		
Reynolds	Schmidt		
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire		
Solberg	Stoffer		
Stinson	Thompson (Wild Rose)	Lefebvre	Normand
Strahl	Vautour	Nunziata	Wappel
Turp	White (North Vancouver)		
Wasylcia-Leis			
Williams —96			

PAIRED MEMBERS

(The House divided on Motion No. 20, which was negated on the following division:)

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Baker	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell

(Division No. 1307)

YEAS

Members

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

Government Orders

Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)	Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Goldring	Gouk	Pratt	Proud
Grey (Edmonton North)	Gruending	Proulx	Redman
Guay	Guimond	Reed	Richardson
Harris	Hart	Robillard	Rock
Herron	Hill (Macleod)	Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom	Sekora	Serré
Jaffer	Johnston	Sgro	Shepherd
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	St. Denis	St-Julien
Konrad	Laliberte	Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Laurin	Lebel	Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Lill	Lowther	Telegdi	Thibeault
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini	Torsney	Ur
Marceau	Marchand	Valeri	Vanclief
Mark	McDonough	Volpe	Whelan
Ménard	Mercier	Wilfert	Wood—128
Meredith	Muise		
Nystrom	Obhrai		
Penson	Perron		
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon		
Price	Reynolds		
Ritz	Sauvageau	Lefebvre	Normand
Schmidt	Solberg	Nunziata	Wappel
St-Hilaire	Stinson		
Stoffer	Strahl		
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Turp		
Vautour	Wasylcia-Leis		
White (North Vancouver)	Williams —96		

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

(The House divided on Motion No. 21, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1308)

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Baker	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	De Villers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gallaway	Godfrey
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Peric	Peterson

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Cadman
Brisson	Casey
Cardin	Chatters
Casson	Crête
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Debien
Dalphond-Guiral	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Doyle	Duceppe
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duncan
Dumas	Elley
Earle	Forseth
Epp	Gauthier
Gagnon	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Girard-Bujold	Goldring
Godin (Châteauguay)	Grey (Edmonton North)
Gouk	Guay
Gruending	Harris
Guimond	Herron
Hart	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (Macleod)	Jaffer
Hilstrom	Keddy (South Shore)
Johnston	Konrad
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laurin
Laliberte	Lill
Lebel	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Lowther	Marceau
Mancini	Mark
Marchand	Ménard
McDonough	Meredith
Mercier	Nystrom
Muise	Penson
Obhrai	Picard (Drummond)
Perron	Price
Plamondon	Ritz
Reynolds	Schmidt
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Solberg	Stoffer
Stinson	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Strahl	Vautour
Turp	White (North Vancouver)
Wasylcia-Leis	
Williams —96	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Baker	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Peric	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt	Proud
Proulx	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
St. Denis	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—128

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

The Speaker: I therefore declare Motions Nos. 7, 8, 20 and 21 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 15.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find unanimous consent to have members who voted on the preceding motion recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening are in favour of this motion as well.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are in agreement with the motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present will be voting against the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, Conservative Progressive Party members vote yes to this motion.

• (1815)

(The House divided on Motion No. 15, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1303*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brisson
Cadman	Cardin
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Debien	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Guimond	Harris
Hart	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Jaffer
Johnston	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad
Laurin	Lebel
Lowther	

Government Orders

MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Marceau
Marchand	Mark
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Muise
Obhrai	Penson
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Price
Reynolds	Ritz
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Solberg	St-Hilaire
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Turp
Vautour	White (North Vancouver)
Williams —85	

Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—139

Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Baker	Beaumier
Bélaire	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)	Gruending
Guarnieri	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lee
Leung	Lill
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Peric
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pratt
Proud	Proulx
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	St. Denis
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer	Szabo

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 15 lost.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I think there would be consent to apply the result of the last vote to Motions Nos. 16, 18 and 19.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1304*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablozczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brisson
Cadman	Cardin
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Debien	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Guimond	Harris
Hart	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Jaffer
Johnston	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Konrad
Laurin	Lebel
Lowther	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Muise	Obhrai
Penson	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Price	Reynolds
Ritz	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solberg

Government Orders

(The House divided on Motion No. 18, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1305)

St-Hilaire
Strahl
Turp
White (North Vancouver)

Stinson
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vautour
Williams —85

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Baker
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Boudria
Bryden
Calder
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Finlay
Fry
Galloway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Hubbard
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Laliberte
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peterson
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Shepherd
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—139

Alcock
Assad
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Brown
Bulte
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Drouin
Earle
Eggleton
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Goodale
Gruending
Harvard
Ianno
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
MacAulay
Malhi
Mancini
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Peric
Phinney
Pratt
Proulx
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Sgro
St. Denis
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre
Nunziata

Normand
Wappel

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borosik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman
Casey
Chatters
Crête
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laurin
Lowther
Marceau
Mark
Mercier
Muisse
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Ritz
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Turp
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Bergeron
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison
Cardin
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Elley
Forseth
Gauthier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guay
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Konrad
Lebel
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marchand
Ménard
Meredith
Obhrai
Perron
Plamondon
Reynolds
Sauvageau
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vautour
Williams —85

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Baker
Bélair
Bellemare
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Brown
Bulte
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi

Government Orders

Copps	Cullen	Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
DeVillers	Dhaliwal	Benoit	Bergeron
Dion	Discepola	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Dromisky	Drouin	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Duhamel	Earle	Borotsik	Brison
Easter	Eggleton	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cardin
Finlay	Fontana	Cadman	Casson
Fry	Gagliano	Casey	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Gallaway	Godfrey	Chatters	Dalphond-Guiral
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goodale	Crête	Doyle
Gray (Windsor West)	Gruending	Debien	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Guarnieri	Harvard	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dumas
Hubbard	Ianno	Duceppe	Elley
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell	Duncan	Forseth
Karygiannis	Keyes	Epp	Gauthier
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Gagnon	Godin (Châteauguay)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan	Girard-Bujold	Gouk
Laliberte	Lee	Goldring	Guay
Leung	Lill	Grey (Edmonton North)	Harris
Limoges	Lincoln	Guimond	Herron
Longfield	MacAulay	Hart	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Mahoney	Malhi	Hill (Macleod)	Jaffer
Maloney	Mancini	Hilstrom	Keddy (South Shore)
Manley	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Johnston	Konrad
Matthews	McCormick	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lebel
McDonough	McGuire	Laurin	MacKay (Picou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)	Lowther	Marchand
McTeague	McWhinney	Marceau	Ménard
Mifflin	Milliken	Mark	Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna	Mercier	Obhrai
Mitchell	Murray	Muise	Perron
Myers	Nault	Penson	Plamondon
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)	Picard (Drummond)	Reynolds
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly	Price	Sauvageau
Pagtakhan	Paradis	Ritz	Solberg
Parrish	Peric	Schmidt	Stinson
Peterson	Phinney	St-Hilaire	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pratt	Strahl	Vautour
Proud	Proulx	Turp	Williams —85
Redman	Reed	White (North Vancouver)	
Richardson	Robillard		
Rock	Saada		
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora		
Serré	Sgro		
Shepherd	St. Denis		
St-Julien	Steckle		
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)		
Stoffer	Szabo		
Telegdi	Thibeault		
Torsney	Ur		
Valeri	Vanclief		
Volpe	Wasylcia-Leis		
Whelan	Wilfert		
Wood—139			

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

(The House divided on Motion No. 19, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 1306)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Baker	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gallaway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)	Gruending
Guarnieri	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lee

Government Orders

Leung
Limoges
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peterson
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Shepherd
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—139

Lill
Lincoln
MacAulay
Malhi
Mancini
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Peric
Phinney
Pratt
Proulx
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Sgro
St. Denis
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre
Nunziata

Normand
Wappel

The Speaker: I therefore declare Motions Nos. 16, 18 and 19 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 23.

• (1825)

(The House divided on Motion No. 23, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1310)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Bailey
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Calder
Elley
Harris
Jaffer
Karygiannis
Lincoln
O'Reilly
Penson
Provenzano
Ritz
Serré
Steckle
Volpe—31

Adams
Benoit
Bryden
Chatters
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hill (Macleod)
Johnston
Konrad
McTeague
Ohrai
Peric
Reynolds
Schmidt
Shepherd
Thompson (Wild Rose)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alcock
Anderson
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Bélair
Bellemare
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown
Cadman
Carroll
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cullen
Davies
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Finlay
Forseth
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Gruending
Guay
Hart
Herron
Hilstrom
Jackson
Jordan
Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Laurin
Leung
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marchand
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Ménard
Meredith
Milliken
Minna
Muisse
Myers
Nystrom
Paradis
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon
Price
Proud
Redman

Alarie
Anders
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes
Bélangier
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonwick
Boudria
Brisson
Bulte
Caplan
Casey
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Copp
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Duncan
Easter
Epp
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Goldring
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Limoges
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marceau
Mark
Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Mercier
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proctor
Proulx
Reed

Government Orders

Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Sgro
Solberg	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Stoffer
Strahl	Szabo
Thibeault	Torsney
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
White (North Vancouver)	Wilfert
Williams	Wood—189

Ms. Wendy Lill: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion, please.

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

(Division No. 1316)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 23 lost.

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the House would agree, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening are opposed to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will oppose this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the New Democratic Party present will vote in favour of this motion.

[English]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members are voting in favour of the motion.

Mr. Rick Laliberte: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting in favour of the motion.

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Barnes
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Brison	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Casey
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dockrill	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Gruending	Guarnieri
Harvard	Herron
Hubbard	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Peric	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis

Government Orders

Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Shepherd
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

Robinson
Saada
Sekora
Sgro
St. Denis
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood —156

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman
Chatters
Crête
Debien
Duceppe
Elley
Forseth
Gauthier
Goldring
Guay
Harris
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Johnston
Konrad
Lowther
Marchand
Ménard
Meredith
Penson
Plamondon
Ritz
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Turp
Williams—66

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffier
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laurin
Marceau
Mark
Mercier
Obhrai
Picard (Drummond)
Reynolds
Sauvageau
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson (Wild Rose)
White (North Vancouver)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre
Nunziata

Normand
Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from May 11 consideration of the motion that Bill C-18, an act to amend the Criminal Code (impaired driving causing death and other matters), be read the second time and referred to a committee, and on the motion that the question be now put.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Thursday, May 11, 2000, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the previous question at the second reading stage of Bill C-18.

The question is on the motion that the question be now put.

[Translation]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, you will find unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion, with the exception of the member for Ottawa—Vanier, who had to withdraw, to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with the Liberal members voting yes.

[English]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague from Prince George—Bulkley Valley, I would like to indicate that Canadian Alliance members present this evening are very much in favour of this motion.

• (1830)

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois categorically oppose this motion.

[English]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP present are voting yes to this motion.

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative members are voting in favour of this motion.

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

(Division No. 1317)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Belair
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anderson
Bailey
Barnes
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonwick

Government Orders

Borotsik	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bryson	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Cadman	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chatters	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel	Duncan
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Elley
Epp	Finlay
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Edmonton North)	Gruending
Guarnieri	Harris
Hart	Harvard
Herron	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hubbard	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Lowther	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Mark	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Reilly
Obhrai	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Reynolds
Richardson	Riis
Ritz	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solberg
St. Denis	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Stoffer	Strahl
Szabo	Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan

White (North Vancouver)
Williams

Wilfert
Wood—194

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Bigras	Dalphond-Guiral
Crête	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Debien	Gagnon
Duceppe	Girard-Bujold
Gauthier	Guimond
Guay	Marceau
Laurin	Ménard
Marchand	Picard (Drummond)
Mercier	Sauvageau
Plamondon	Turp—27
St-Hilaire	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

The next question is on the main motion.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion, again with the exception of the member for Ottawa—Vanier and also the members for Kingston and the Islands and Brossard—La Prairie, be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening are very much in favour of this motion as well.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are also equally categorically opposed to this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the New Democratic Party present will vote in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party are voting in favour of this motion.

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

(Division No. 1318)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bailey
Baker	Barnes
Bélaïr	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brisson	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Cadman	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chatters	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Davies
Desjarlais	De Villiers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel	Duncan
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Elley
Epp	Finlay
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Edmonton North)	Gruending
Guarnieri	Harris
Hart	Harvard
Herron	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hubbard	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottetown)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Lowther	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Mark	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Penson
Peric	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud

Private Members' Business

Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Reynolds	Richardson
Riis	Ritz
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solberg
St. Denis	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Stoffer	Strahl
Szabo	Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanciel	Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
White (North Vancouver)	Wilfert
Williams	Wood—192

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Bigras	Dalphond-Guiral
Crête	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Debien	Gagnon
Duceppe	Girard-Bujold
Gauthier	Guimond
Guay	Marceau
Laurin	Ménard
Marchand	Picard (Drummond)
Mercier	Sauvageau
Plamondon	Turp—27
St-Hilaire	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Lefebvre	Normand
Nunziata	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): It being 6.35 p.m., the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

COMPETITION ACT

The House resumed from April 5 consideration of Bill C-276, an act to amend the Competition Act, 1998 (negative option market-

Private Members' Business

ing), as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and on Motion No. 1.

• (1835)

Mr. Bob Kilger: Madam Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House for a moment on a point of order. Earlier today the House unanimously adopted a deferral of the private member's bill, of course with the approval of the member for Lambton—Kent—Middlesex.

With the day having run slightly longer than anticipated, I have not had time, respectfully to all my colleagues on both sides of the House, to do the normal negotiations. I submit, in the spirit of co-operation, especially since it is Private Members' Business, I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House that the vote be deemed requested and deferred, so that members who have other obligations will have the ability to do so with the agreement of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is there unanimous agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dennis Gruending (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise at report stage and speak to Bill C-276. This is the latest incarnation of the member for Sarnia—Lambton's longstanding effort to severely curtail the practice of negative option marketing in areas of federal jurisdiction.

Negative option billing happens when companies we are already buying a service from unilaterally change the terms of our agreement with them. In effect, they start to sell us something more or something different on the assumption that if we did not want it, we would have told them so.

The cable companies learned the hard way a few years back that Canadians do not appreciate this. Most people are busy and have better things to do with their time than to pour over the fine print of every piece of junk mail that comes through the slot. We in the NDP believe they should not have to pour over that fine print. The NDP government in British Columbia moved to curb this practice after that cable fiasco in 1995. I note that the Government of Quebec has put similar legislation into effect.

We are talking today about a proposed amendment by the Bloc Québécois which would carve out Quebec from the applications of the current bill. The Bloc believes that the regulation of commerce is an exclusive provincial jurisdiction and that businesses falling

under federal jurisdiction in Quebec currently observe and comply with the Quebec law on this matter.

We have two issues here, one factual and one political, although they run together. First, let us talk about the factual.

Evidence presented by the Quebec consumer groups at the committee hearings suggested that this was not an exclusively provincial jurisdiction. In fact, the Action Réseau Consommateur reiterated just yesterday in an e-mail sent to all members of parliament just how necessary it believes this bill to be in the province of Quebec.

The other issue is political and it is one on which I am afraid we in the NDP cannot agree with our colleagues in the Bloc. The federal government does have the right to regulate industries falling within its areas of jurisdiction. Once it does, the same rules must apply all across the country.

The bill before us today moves farther than the member's first attempt to respond to negative option billing by the cable companies back in 1995. At that time he sought to amend the Broadcasting Act to prevent cable distributors from repeating such business practices in the future.

While that bill enjoyed the support of the House in all three stages, it then moved on to the Senate where it got bogged down in a series of complex legal and cultural arguments. It died on the order paper when the election was called in 1997.

The current version of this bill extends its application to other industries under federal jurisdiction. I am talking here notably about the banks and telephone companies, as well as the holders of so-called broadcast distribution undertakings, that is to say the cable companies. The member broadens this definition by amending the Competition Act instead of the Broadcasting Act.

The member for Sarnia—Lambton presented numerous examples at committee of how the banks and telephone companies have used negative option marketing. They have done so in much the same way that the cable companies did back in 1995 when they started charging everyone for cable channels if they were not cancelled within 30 days.

• (1840)

I remember when this happened to me. I called the cable company to tell it that I did not want the service. It told me that I would obviously keep the service because I needed it. As I recall, I was treated as if I were unintelligent because I was not going to take all of the television channels. I assured the company that I had enough television channels and that I could not understand why it was pursuing this negative option plan. I felt it was unfair to me and to other consumers.

As we know, there was a great deal of outrage among consumers at the time about the negative option being practised by the cable companies. That was the reason the hon. member brought forward his bill at that time.

The banks, the telephone companies and the cable companies, which we are now talking about, are among the largest companies in Canada. Although they have recently been opened up to competition in varying ways, they have all had a substantial head start over their competitors, thanks to an assured place in the market in the past.

Historically in Canada, because we needed to provide telephone service, banking and entertainment in a diverse country, we chose the route of giving a few large Canadian companies the right to develop and sell services without foreign competition. This was a social contract. In return, they promised to be fair to consumers and accountable to government regulators.

Although there was clearly some difference in how this principle was translated into the different methods of regulating the three industries under discussion today, I believe that it fairly characterizes the philosophical approach that was adopted.

Today technology is changing our economy and our society in many ways. These changes should offer the promise of allowing consumers more choice and more control over the services they buy from banks, telephone companies and cable companies. These technological changes make the provision of legislation such as this even more necessary, just as it makes it more possible for the companies to provide us with more choice.

Companies will no longer be able to argue that it is too expensive to write three letters to every consumer or to obtain consent prior to every transaction. In fact, they are going to find that they may lose business unless they accord us this respect.

What is important for legislators to keep in focus and in balance during these changing times are three principles. First, we must ensure that services and infrastructure are available to all our citizens in this large and geographically diverse country.

Second, we must promote Canadian providers of these services wherever possible.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we must put the interests of consumers, both their short term and long term interests, at the centre of our efforts.

I believe the hon. member's bill takes an important step in these directions and follows these principles. I am pleased to support his bill for that reason.

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the hon. member for Sarnia—

Private Members' Business

Lambton's private member's bill, Bill C-276, which seeks to amend the Competition Act to ensure that Canadian consumers are not unwillingly participants of negative option billing.

Negative option marketing is the practice of offering products or services while placing the onus on the customer to expressly decline or opt out of whatever is offered. If the consumer does not do that or does not know about it, then the consumer is on the hook to pay for the product or service even though he or she has not consented to the purchase.

The members of the House and many Canadians know the work that the member for Sarnia—Lambton has done with respect to negative option marketing. I wish to acknowledge his good work to protect senior citizens, those on fixed incomes and others, and all consumers who may not be aware of the consequences of negative option marketing until it affects them. We thank him for his efforts to date.

• (1845)

Bill C-272 is designed to prohibit the practice by federally regulated businesses such as banks, cable and telephone companies of implied consent billing. It would require the consumers' explicit consent before they could be billed for a product or service, thus putting an end to the practice of negative option billing.

Consumers across Canada demonstrated their intense frustration when cable providers attempted to automatically charge for new programs unless the service was expressly rejected. It is clear that in a monopoly market such as telephone and cable services consumers cannot easily switch to a service provider who does not engage in this sneaky marketing tactic. That is why the people of Quebec should not be denied the benefits of this legislative proposal.

The amendment we are discussing today is from the Bloc which is insisting that Quebec be exempt. I believe that Quebecers deserve to be protected by the laws of Canada and an exemption for federally regulated industries in Quebec is unworkable and unfair to the Quebec consumer. Personally I like the principle that businesses should obtain consumer consent before charging for new services.

However, the inclusion of the banks in Bill C-272 makes me wonder if the consent requirement is practical for all industries. For example, the banks tell us that only about 30% of their customers currently receive bank statements. The financial review group of the Department of Finance told the industry committee that the complaints they receive tend to be general complaints about the cost of bank service charges rather than changes to service charge packages. This reflects my experience with my constituents. I received hardly any complaints regarding negative option billing

Private Members' Business

with respect to the banks. More important, there is competition in the banking industry and choices are available to the consumer.

The provincially regulated credit unions and others will not have the same obligation so there would not be a level playing field. Perhaps this issue would be better examined during a review of the Bank Act planned for this summer.

Competition laws and regulation can profoundly restrict economic freedom and market efficiency. A general move toward strengthening these laws should be approached with caution. The federal government must strive to ensure that our competition laws do not become overly intrusive and generate a muddled business environment. Competition law must balance the rights of the consumer and the aspirations of companies striving to expand their market share. We must act vigilantly to create competition through deregulation in the interest of every Canadian consumer.

Negative option billing is a practice common to federally regulated industries that enjoy market protection inasmuch as they can restrict or limit a customer's ability to seek out alternative providers of a product or service. Therefore, the deregulation of federally regulated industries would be the first step to eliminate negative option billing and other practices that do not properly serve consumers.

I would much rather have an initiative that worked to limit government regulation and increase competition. The Canadian Alliance supports limited government but recognizes the important role of government in creating an economic environment with fair and transparent rules which protect both consumers and businesses.

We differ from the Liberals in that we believe that markets serve consumers well as long as competition is permitted. This bill in a sense is a band-aid solution made necessary by the Liberals who maintain protectionist policies and regional monopolies in federally regulated industries such as cable and telecommunications, despite the fact that these policies hurt consumers. The drive for profits in a competitive and deregulated industry will give more power to the consumer to seek the most favourable terms for them. It is the invisible hand of capitalism or the market at work.

To conclude, it is clear that the Liberal mismanagement of federally regulated industries has created an economic environment in which consumers suffer the ill effects of limited competition.

● (1850)

I give our qualified support until such time as these industries can be further deregulated. After this deregulation, competition will ferret out those businesses that conduct their affairs in a manner inconsistent with consumer interest.

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Madam Speaker, it is with pleasure today that I rise to speak to Bill C-276, the legislation that addresses the issue of negative option billing.

It is important when we are developing solutions to complex problems that we do not use solutions which are overly simplistic and may not in fact address the actual complexities of the problem. H. L. Menkin, the American humorist, once said that for every complex problem there is a neat, plausible solution that is wrong.

I have some concerns as a member about the legislation. That being the case, I recognize the position of the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton in bringing forward the legislation and support the ends he is trying to achieve. I am just questioning whether or not this may be the most effective means to achieve those ends.

Every industry that may use negative option billing is different and operates within different parameters. For instance, cable companies are clearly different from industries within the financial services sector or the banks. In an effort to reduce negative option billing or to address the issue of negative option billing, we have to be careful that we do not create an onerous level of regulation in one industry where it is more prevalent and impose the same level of regulation on another industry that in fact is not utilizing negative option billing as much.

This may lead to greater costs for consumers with a complicated process where effectively participants in that given industry, for instance the financial services sector, may find that it creates a competitiveness disadvantage relative to industries in other areas.

One issue that needs to be addressed is the fact that in mailings from banks or financial institutions to customers there is only a 5% return rate currently. As such, it would create an immense amount of administration within a financial services institution or a bank to actually try to eliminate completely any level of negative option billing.

If negative option billing is being used, for instance to bundle or to package services in ways where a customer may in fact benefit in some way or that would actually reduce the costs to the customer, there is no negative to the customer. That is the case for some of our financial institutions.

It is also important to realize that we heard from the Minister of Finance last June with a response to the MacKay task force of the Government of Canada. Those measures have not yet been implemented. I believe they should have been implemented earlier.

The government is in fact stalling on implementing its response to the report on the financial services sector. The legislative enabling of that response should have taken place by now but it has not. When the Senate looks at the legislation it should ensure that it somehow fits within this private member's bill and that any

Private Members' Business

recommendation would fit within the parameters of the government's white paper response to the MacKay task force.

The issue of the competitiveness of our banks and our financial institutions is paramount right now.

• (1855)

Currently we are seeing around the world immense changes in the financial services sector relative to information technology. Effectively the forces of technology and globalization are transforming the financial services sector.

We have to be very careful in Canada. For instance, this type of legislation does not exist in the U.S. There is nothing like it relative to negative option billing in the U.S. As we increase levels of competition or access to Canadian markets by foreign banks, there is a risk that if we handcuff Canadian financial institutions with this type of legislation we in fact may be imperilling Canadian banks and creating a deleterious impact on them and their shareholders, which in fact include 7.5 million Canadians who actually own bank shares in Canada.

We have to ensure that legislation that is designed on one hand to help Canadian consumers does not on the other hand hurt the 7.5 million Canadians who directly or indirectly depend on their investments in our chartered banks for part of their retirement income or in many cases in most portfolios a significant part of their retirement.

The issue of addressing the differences between industries is paramount. If we create some type of regulatory body or vehicle and focus on protecting people from one industry which affects a broad range of industries, clearly it may have a lot of unforeseen and unintended consequences. We have to be awfully careful of that.

We are supportive of the ends of this legislation, in that negative option billing may be something that is more common in Canada and have a more negative impact on Canada than members of the House are aware. We are studying and discussing as a caucus our position on this matter currently.

When we are crafting public policy in the House we have to be sure that we are crafting it around realities as opposed to perceptions. It is very easy sometimes to develop public policy around perceptions in the current environment of poll driven policy as opposed to policies that reflect the realities of what is going on in Canada.

I would prefer to see a greater level of competition in all these sectors, including the financial services sector. I would like to see the government truly address issues of competitiveness, including greater opportunities for smaller financial institutions to compete fully with the banks in Canada, and thus enable both on the consumer side and on the lending side Canadians to have a greater

range of services from a greater variety of financial institutions in Canada.

It is important that we address the basic fundamental issues of competition and do not treat these issues with a less holistic approach. It is important to recognize that effectively we should try to ensure that our regulatory burden in Canada is not grossly different from that which exists in countries with which our Canadian companies need to compete.

Clearly the issue the hon. member from Sarnia raises is a very important one. We have to ensure that the means by which he is proposing we address it are the most appropriate means.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on Bill C-276 sponsored by the member for Sarnia—Lambton who has been quite active on the whole question of negative option billing or marketing.

• (1900)

Canadians will recall the national event involving a cable company which tried to introduce additional services. These services were going to be charged automatically unless the customer let it be known that they did not want the services. This is the whole concept of negative option billing. As members will recall, the consequence was the uprising of consumers who said that this was unfair, this was not right. The cable company withdrew its proposal and the consumer won.

This bill is about consumer protection. There is a very good reason why it should be characterized as that and why it should be before the House. In my experience in business, as a member of parliament and as an observant consumer, it is my view that consumers need help.

How many times have we seen people go to an automatic teller machine to withdraw \$20? How many times have we seen someone go to McDonald's and use a debit card to buy a Big Mac? People do not realize the cost of a transaction. It is pervasive.

How many times have people received in the mail a credit card that was unsolicited? How many times have we seen someone at the till look at the onion sheets of bad credit cards? Why would all of these unsolicited cards be given if there was not, as there is in gambling, a winner? Considering the number of cards that are now issued in the credit card industry, this business is very profitable, despite the fact that many accounts go bad and losses are incurred.

The fact is that consumers need protection because they are not alert. Consumers are distracted by life, by their own interests, and they have been conditioned to assume that everything will take care of itself. Many people do not pay their full Visa balance or Mastercard balance and they are charged interest. It is only a few dollars. It is not a big deal. But with millions of consumers all

Private Members' Business

having the same lazy consumer habits, the sponsors of the credit cards receive a tremendous profit, even though there are losses.

If an individual does not have a special arrangement with their bank, they could be paying anywhere from 30 cents to 75 cents every time they use their debit card. People think that the debit card is convenient because they do not require cash in their pocket. The card is pushed into a machine, a number is keyed in and the machine pays exactly the amount owing. Individuals do not have to worry about cash. Consumers think that is convenient.

A cashier at a large grocery store told me that the smallest purchase made at the store by a customer using a debit card was the purchase of a newspaper. It was 50 cents for the newspaper, but there was a 75 cent charge for the use of the debit card. It makes absolutely no sense.

Consumers need to be educated. They have to be educated about the tied value of money. They have to be educated about the fact that there is a transactional cost no matter what we do, whether we are using debit card machines, green machines or any other electronic device. The costs have to be recovered somehow. We know what a computer costs. We could imagine what this equipment would cost.

This bill really is a proxy for all the frustrations felt by consumers. Consumers need protection, not because they are incapable of working this out for themselves, but because they are busy people. It is not that they are lazy; they have families and jobs and they assume things.

Every now and then the cable company, the telephone company, a bank, almost anyone will do something and it is very subtle. We do not think it is a great deal even if we see something, although there is an additional five cents or three cents charged on an additional withdrawal in this account.

• (1905)

It is not enough for one individual to get excited about, but when that additional increase is spread over millions and millions of transactions, then we are talking about a significant amount of money taken out of the consumers' pockets on the basis of marketing strategies.

Who came up with the concept of negative option billing? Was it consumers? Did they say that business should do this because it is going to help them? Of course not. Negative option billing or marketing is a concept of business. It is a concept of consumer transactions within which the consumer perhaps might not win, but they surely can lose in certain circumstances.

If we go back to the credit card analogy, everyone knows that we get a period of 20 days or so between when the bill is received and when it is due. There is a grace period between when the money was spent or the purchase was made and when the cash has to be

disbursed. In a perfect world, if we took that cash we would have otherwise used to pay for the purchase and put it in a bank account, and always left in the bank account all the moneys that we charged, at the end of a certain period, if it was an interest bearing account, we would accumulate a fair bit of money. We could accumulate a fair bit of money over a period of several years and still meet all of our obligations with regard to the banks.

Why do people not do that? The reason is quite simple. It takes time. We have to keep track of things. If we miss just once, all the work done over a couple of weeks could be gone by missing one transaction or one day. People are not in the business of trying to make nickels and dimes on odd amounts.

I liked this bill conceptually when we went through the first round in the last parliament. Now we are into an amendment to the Competition Act. Quite frankly, negative option billing or marketing has been described as a deceptive marketing practice. That is a harsh description or characterization, but it is accurate and I would like to make that clear. The reason it is deceptive is because if we do not do something, then something is going to happen to us. What if I am busy or away? What if I do not quite understand or have misread something? What if I am an elderly person and cannot read very well any more? What if I am just so tired that I cannot do it? What if someone misses because they just happen to be a human being? Chances are they will lose.

This is a high risk area for those who are maybe less able or less capable than some to protect their own interests. That is why, generally, all consumers should say that in principle we do have to protect the consumer population because within our group there are some who really are vulnerable. The stories we hear about abuse of the elderly, as a simple example, is certainly one reason alone that we just cannot be soft on high pressure, scientifically proven, financially viable marketing strategies that have been very successful. With the velocity of transactions that are taking place through Internet banking, et cetera, things are happening very quickly, Madam Speaker, so please do not blink, as you might miss part of my speech.

I wanted to make the point that the velocity of information is changing. The options are there. There are so many things that we can do. Quite frankly, we are in transition as a society.

People have to have a comfort level that they are going to be protected, especially when others want to change the nature of the environment in which they are going to do their consumer transactions.

I want to congratulate the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton. He has been a champion for the consumer in this place. I believe that all hon. members respect him for his hard work. I hear that he has again reached report stage of a very important bill, and I know he is very much looking forward to having this accepted by the House so that he can go back to entertain his friends, the senators.

Private Members' Business

• (1910)

Mr. Reg Alcock (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to speak to this bill.

I am here partly at the request of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, as well as the Minister of Industry, who want to add their support to the very hard work that has been done by the member for Sarnia—Lambton.

This is the House of Commons. This is the place in Canada where we who represent people from all parts of this country give voice to their concerns, and through that I think establish a body of rights for them. They do not have lots of lobbyists running around the Hill trying to influence various bits of legislation. They do not have people who are paid to come in and watch what is going on here all the time and try to influence things on their behalf. They have us, the members. It is our job.

What this hon. member has done is picked up on an issue that offended a very large number of Canadians. He has worked hard to get it past all of the resistance, to get it past all of those people who did not want to see their ability to impose things upon citizens affected in any way. He has done that.

I shall not go through all of the problems the hon. member has had along the way to this point, but he has never given up. He fought the bill through the House and he earned the respect and the support of members of the House. He fought the bill in the other place and he has brought it back to the House with the support of the departments.

I want to share with the House some of the things that other people are saying about the member. This is a quote from an article which appeared on December 17 in the *National Post*:

Bank mergers were squelched last summer because of concerns over how the super-banks would treat customers. So why would Ottawa want to make it easier for the banks to sell Canadians services they don't want? Mr. Gallaway's bill should pass as is.

The competition commissioner stated:

I don't see how negative optioning could ever be pro-competitive. The basic, underlying concept of a competitive market is that consumers have a choice and exercise that choice, and they exercise it knowingly. If you have a negative option, you don't even know this has happened. You never get a choice.

That is taken from testimony before the Standing Committee on Industry in November and it comes from Konrad von Finckenstein, the Commissioner of the Competition Bureau of Canada. The

commissioner is recognizing on behalf of Canadians the problem that exists, the problem that the member is trying to solve.

Let us continue with the testimony before the committee:

The Bureau feels that negative option marketing cannot be seen as a competitive technique that would be good for consumers. The Bureau believes that consumers should have the opportunity to make an informed choice when buying new services. We have never had and we do not yet have any objection to Mr. Gallaway's bill, which would apply to banks, the cable industry and broadcasting.

That statement was made by Johanne D'Auray, the Deputy Commissioner of the Competition Bureau of Canada, in testimony before the Standing Committee on Industry on February 17 of this year.

What does the consumers' association have to say? In testimony in December 1999 the Consumers' Association of Canada said that it believed support for Bill C-276 is a vote to restore to Canadian consumers the right to choose. That came from Mrs. Gail Lacombe, the president and chief executive officer of the Consumers' Association of Canada.

It is that right, the right to choose the services that we want, the right to choose the things that we will purchase, that is embodied in the bill. It is sad in a way that we even have to have this sort of legislation. It is sad that we would ever question a person's right to make an informed choice about the kind of purchases they will make and their right to know what kind of charges will be imposed upon them before they agree to it. It is astounding in a way.

It is interesting, but I do not think that some of the negative option marketing has been a stunning success. Representatives of Rogers Cable indicated that before the committee. In their testimony they indicated that they would never again do it because they have had such a negative reaction from consumers.

• (1915)

It is astounding to me that in the past we have never had protection to prevent companies, particularly companies that had monthly billing practices, from altering the amount of money we were being charged without our ever knowing what it was for unless we took the time to look at it. They did not ask us as to whether we wanted to purchase those new services or not.

This bill represents the kind of work all of us like to see done in the House. It started with a member having a concern brought to his attention by people who lived in his riding. He came back and met with other members from all sides of the House. This bill has had support from all sides because they shared the concern. He worked diligently to produce a piece of legislation that would provide the protection that consumers were requesting.

Madam Speaker, perhaps you could give me a bit of advice. I understand there is a desire for the mover of the bill to have the right of reply.

Adjournment Debate

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): There is no right of reply tonight. About two minutes are left in debate.

Mr. Reg Alcock: Madam Speaker, there has been a lot said on this bill, on the need for it and what it will do for consumers. I will spend the last bit of time reflecting on the responsibilities all of us have in the House to protect and work on behalf of the people we represent.

The member has acted in the finest traditions of the House to bring forward a grievance that a great many Canadians have. He has not just raised the question, he has gone beyond that and devised a solution to the problem, a solution that all members of the House can support. It is a great credit to the member and it is a great credit to the members of this institution that we were able to take a stand together on behalf of the consumers.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Pursuant to the order made earlier today, all questions necessary to dispose of this motion are deemed to have been put, and a recorded division is deemed to have been requested and deferred until Wednesday, May 17, 2000, at the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Dennis Gruending (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Madam Speaker, last month Canadians were outraged when they learned that 90,000 tonnes of toxic waste from an American military base in Japan was bound for Canada.

A shipment of PCBs, toxins that have been linked to birth defects and illnesses including Parkinson's disease and cancer, were on a boat bound for the port of Vancouver. From there this toxic waste was going to be shipped all the way across the country to northern Ontario where it was going to be concentrated and then shipped back across the country once again to Alberta where it was destined to be burned. That is right. Toxic waste was going to be shipped from one end of the country and back again, toxic waste that was not even produced in Canada.

As we might expect, Canadians were shocked to learn that their health was going to be put at risk to do the U.S. military a favour, while making a fast buck for an American company that had set up shop in northern Ontario to get around U.S. environmental laws. Imagine an American company setting up shop in Canada to get around environmental laws. Americans used to be afraid of losing jobs to Mexico because of the combination of low environmental standards and people's dire need for work.

Members of the House and many Canadians will remember one of the great fears people had during the NAFTA negotiations. It was that Mexico's so-called trade advantage vis-à-vis employment, health and environmental standards would result in a race to the bottom in our country. We would have to do that in order to prevent job losses to Mexico. Well, things have switched. It now appears that Canada and not Mexico is the environmental patsy in North America.

• (1920)

We are looking at a law for example to protect endangered species. If it is passed without amendment it is going to be the weakest on the continent.

On another matter, officials from our own environment ministry are leading the charge to muzzle the Centre for Environmental Cooperation. That is the NAFTA watchdog that holds our governments accountable when they fail to enforce environmental laws.

Yesterday in the House I urged the environment minister to instruct his officials to stop undermining the work of the centre. He said at the time that I was talking rubbish. But last night Robert F. Kennedy Jr., who is an environmental lawyer in the United States, spoke to a public meeting here in Ottawa. He made exactly the same charge, that is that Canada is leading a movement to undermine the Centre for Environmental Cooperation.

These are serious matters. We have a damning report as well, I might add, from the auditor general leaked only today which says that Canada is incapable of protecting its citizens from the illegal traffic, the improper storage and the wrongful disposal of hazardous waste.

While the Americans have banned the import of PCBs into their country, Canada is prepared to take them. There are tonnes and tonnes of domestically produced PCBs sitting in storage sites in this country waiting to be dealt with and technologies which could dispose of them safely. We do not have to ship them back and forth across the country and burn them.

The promises made by the Liberals during the last two election campaigns and as recently as the throne speech last fall are looking more and more like empty rhetoric. Under them we have slipped to the point where Mexico has stronger laws in place to protect the environment than we do. When it comes to protecting the health of Canadians, the government is failing all of us.

Adjournment Debate

In closing I urge the government to put the health of Canadians before all else when it comes to environmental issues which we confront.

Mr. Roy Cullen (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to report that the shipment of waste containing PCBs from U.S. military bases was not off-loaded in Vancouver and is on its way back to Japan.

We are pleased that the U.S. government has taken responsibility to dispose of this cargo outside Canada. Throughout we have maintained that the cargo and its disposal were the responsibility of the U.S. Department of Defense and Trans-Cycle Industries.

As a result of this incident we have asked the U.S. Department of Defense to inform us in advance of any shipments of PCB contaminated waste intended for Canada no matter what the PCB concentrations.

We would ensure that our obligations under the Basel convention and all federal and provincial regulations are complied with before any decision on allowing such a shipment is rendered. Under our regulations Canada ensures that hazardous waste imports and exports are handled in a manner that protects the environment and human health.

The new Canadian Environmental Protection Act provides enhanced authority to control imports and exports of hazardous waste. We will introduce new regulations to implement specific criteria to assess the environmental soundness of proposed imports and will refuse any import if these criteria are not met.

An outright ban on the import of all hazardous waste is neither required nor appropriate. A ban would neither be consistent with Canada's international obligations nor with the policy of sharing facilities with either side of the Canada-U.S. border which under the proximity principle allows both countries to use the nearest approved facilities thereby reducing transportation distances.

Canada intends to continue to honour all of its international obligations and will take steps to continuously improve the standards for hazardous waste whether these wastes are domestic or international in origin.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to stand tonight and speak about the future of CBC regional programming. It seems like a never ending story. On April 6 I asked the Minister of Canadian Heritage whether she would commit to intervene with cash to save regional TV news programs if the corporation decided to kill supper hour shows.

• (1925)

That was on April 6. Today coincidentally the president of the CBC came before the heritage committee to talk to us on that very subject. The heritage committee had expressed a great deal of concern about rumours about impending cuts to regional programming. We asked if he would come before the committee to discuss it.

What we heard today from the president of CBC was a confirmation that due to 16 years of Liberal and Conservative cuts, 17 local supper hour shows are to be reduced, quite possibly to one per time zone, each one co-hosted from Toronto. The president made a very glossy presentation, a video of what these new shows would look like. Peter Mansbridge would co-host with a host from each region. The news would be recycled through Toronto, Peter Mansbridge being the mainstay of the program.

I do not think there was much appetite in the room for that kind of treatment of local and regional programming. I think it would be quite fair to say that the committee en masse, both sides of the House, every party, had passionate statements about the importance of regional programming and local programming to Canadian culture, to the survival of people's political knowledge of their area so that they would be able to understand the actual governance of their own region.

The member for Fredericton talked about the fact that there was no other programming that was available other than the CBC. The member from Windsor talked about the fact that Windsor is a tiny little enclave surrounded by American production and was very concerned. The leader of the New Democratic Party came to the heritage committee specifically to talk about the importance of regional programming to the Atlantic region.

We have four local supper hour news shows in Atlantic Canada and all of them have excellent ratings. For example, the percentage audience share for the May 10, 2000 ratings compare the supper hour shows with *Hockey Night in Canada*, *Royal Canadian Air Farce* and *The National*.

The proposed changes which were alluded to by Mr. Rabinovitch and by Mr. Redekopp last Friday while speaking to the regional staff talked about beaming one supper hour show through Toronto with various inserts. This is not something that people in Atlantic Canada want. We want to see our own talent. We want to hear our own stories. We do not need it recycled through Toronto. In every market the supper hour news is more popular than *The National*. In three out of four markets the 6 p.m. news beats hockey during the height of the playoffs.

Where the New Democratic Party is coming from as always over the years is that it is important to maintain stable and secure funding for the CBC. At this point in time, this quite historic day when the president finally acknowledged the fact that the CBC is

Adjournment Debate

underfunded, we ask the Prime Minister to reinvest in our national broadcaster.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to say that I too participated in the meeting to which the member for Dartmouth referred.

It is true that the members who attended took advantage of the opportunity to pass on to the president of the CBC the concerns raised by their constituents.

[*English*]

We had a golden opportunity as members of parliament to convey to the president of the CBC concerns that have been expressed to us about the importance of the regional aspect in CBC Radio Canada's mandate. That has been done. Today the president of CBC committed to the members of that committee to report directly to the board of CBC Radio Canada the concerns that have been voiced by a number of people but also the concerns that were voiced today by members of parliament who were reflecting comments received from constituents from all across the country.

That also points out that a decision has not been made. One can hope that the concerns expressed indeed will be reflected in whatever decision is finally made.

We cannot ignore that CBC gets some of what my hon. colleagues have called stable funding. The funding has been stabilized. This is the third year of a five year stable funding program. It was marginally increased to reflect some cost of living adjustments. It was also increased to absorb one time costs related to the Y2K concerns and so forth.

Proof that some things were working was presented to us today by the president of CBC in that radio is fine and in that French television is fine. Let us not forget Radio Canada International which has also received secure and stable funding.

All told, the focus was on English television. Despite funding problems there were things that the president wanted to do which he might do even if he got more money.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): A motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:30 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 16, 2000

Report of Privacy Commissioner		Mr. Strahl	6878
The Speaker	6853	Miss Grey	6878
		Mr. Strahl	6878
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Miss Grey	6878
Government Response to Petitions		Mr. Strahl	6879
Mr. Lee	6853	Miss Grey	6879
Order in Council Appointments		Mr. Strahl	6880
Mr. Lee	6853	Miss Grey	6880
Committees of the House		Mr. Coderre	6881
Environment and Sustainable Development		Miss Grey	6881
Mr. Caccia	6853	Mr. Strahl	6883
Finance		Miss Grey	6883
Mr. Bevilacqua	6853	Mr. Clouthier	6883
Bank Act		Miss Grey	6883
Bill C-478. Introduction and first reading	6853	Mr. Kilgour	6883
Mr. Ménard	6853	Miss Grey	6883
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	6854	Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	6884
Committees of the House		Miss Grey	6884
Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities		Mr. Assadourian	6884
Motion for concurrence	6854	Mr. Strahl	6885
Miss Grey	6854	Mr. Assadourian	6885
Mr. Lee	6854	Mr. Strahl	6885
Miss Grey	6855	Miss Grey	6885
Mr. Coderre	6856	Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	6885
Miss Grey	6856	Miss Grey	6885
Mr. Coderre	6858	Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	6885
Miss Grey	6858	Miss Grey	6885
Mr. Clouthier	6858	Mr. Coderre	6885
Miss Grey	6858	Miss Grey	6886
Mr. Strahl	6859	Mr. Knutson	6886
Miss Grey	6859	Miss Grey	6886
Miss Grey	6862	Mr. Catterall	6886
Mr. McCormick	6863	Miss Grey	6886
Miss Grey	6863	Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	6887
Ms. Catterall	6864	Miss Grey	6887
Miss Grey	6864	Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	6887
Mr. Benoit	6865	Miss Grey	6887
Miss Grey	6865	Mr. Adams	6889
Miss Grey	6870	Miss Grey	6889
Mr. Strahl	6870	Miss Grey	6890
Miss Grey	6870		
Mr. Strahl	6871	STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS	
Miss Grey	6871	Vancouver Symphony Orchestra	
Mr. Strahl	6872	Mr. Sekora	6890
Miss Grey	6872		
Mr. Strahl	6873	Yorkton Regional High School Marching 100	
Miss Grey	6873	Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	6890
Mr. Strahl	6874		
Miss Grey	6874	International Development Research Centre	
Miss Grey	6875	Ms. Beaumier	6891
Mr. Clouthier	6876		
Miss Grey	6876	The Family	
Mr. Kilgour	6877	Ms. Bakopanos	6891
Miss Grey	6877		
		General Motors of Canada	
		Ms. Whelan	6891

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	
Mr. Mark	6891
Kurdish Refugees	
Mr. O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	6892
Alternative School Liberté-Jeunesse	
Mr. Perron	6892
Niagara-on-the-Lake	
Mr. Pillitteri	6892
Taxation	
Mr. Lowther	6892
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	
Ms. Lill	6892
Former Parliamentarians	
Mr. Lee	6893
St. John's West Byelection	
Mr. Doyle	6893
Young Offenders Act	
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral	6893
Lori's Room Walkathon	
Ms. Bulte	6893
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	6894

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Government of Canada	
Miss Grey	6894
Mr. Boudria	6894
Miss Grey	6894
Mr. Boudria	6894
Miss Grey	6894
Mr. Boudria	6894
Airline Industry	
Ms. Meredith	6895
Mr. Collenette	6895
Ms. Meredith	6895
Mr. Collenette	6895
Young Offenders Act	
Mr. Duceppe	6895
Ms. McLellan	6895
Mr. Duceppe	6895
Ms. McLellan	6895
Mr. Bellehumeur	6896
Ms. McLellan	6896
Mr. Bellehumeur	6896
Ms. McLellan	6896
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	
Ms. McDonough	6896
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	6896
Ms. McDonough	6896
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	6896
Justice	
Mr. MacKay	6896
Ms. McLellan	6896
Mr. MacKay	6897
Mr. MacAulay	6897

Human Resources Development	
Mrs. Ablonczy	6897
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	6897
Mrs. Ablonczy	6897
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	6897
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	6897
Human Resources Development	
Mr. Crête	6897
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	6897
Mr. Crête	6897
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	6898
Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Lowther	6898
Ms. Copps	6898
Mr. Lowther	6898
Ms. Copps	6898
Ms. Copps	6898
Banking System	
Mr. Loubier	6898
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	6898
Mr. Loubier	6898
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	6898
Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Solberg	6899
Ms. Copps	6899
Mr. Solberg	6899
Mr. Solberg	6899
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	6899
National Defence	
Mr. Laurin	6899
Mr. Eggleton	6899
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Gallaway	6899
Mr. Axworthy	6899
The Environment	
Mr. Jaffer	6900
Mr. Rock	6900
Mr. Jaffer	6900
Mr. Rock	6900
Mr. Gruending	6900
Mr. Rock	6900
Mr. Mancini	6900
Mr. Anderson	6900
National Defence	
Mr. Borotsik	6901
Mr. Eggleton	6901
Mr. Borotsik	6901
Mr. Eggleton	6901
Sierra Leone	
Mr. Pratt	6901
Mr. Eggleton	6901
Correctional Service Canada	
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	6901
Mr. MacAulay	6901
Health	
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean)	6901
Mr. Rock	6901
CBC	
Ms. Lill	6902

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	6902
Fisheries and Oceans	
Mr. Keddy	6902
Mr. Dhaliwal	6902
Sierra Leone	
Mrs. Barnes	6902
Mr. Axworthy	6902
Correctional Service Canada	
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	6902
Mr. MacAulay	6902
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	6902
Privilege	
Bill C-25	
Mr. Strahl	6903
The Speaker	6903
Correctional Service Canada	
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	6903
The Speaker	6904
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	6904
The Speaker	6904
Points of Order	
Question Period	
Mr. Abbott	6904
Time Allocation	
Mr. Strahl	6904
Mr. Strahl	6905
The Speaker	6906
Mr. Blaikie	6906
Mr. MacKay	6907
Mr. Gauthier	6908
The Speaker	6908
Mr. Boudria	6908

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Income Tax Amendments Act, 1999	
Bill C-25—Time Allocation Motion	
Mr. Boudria	6909
Motion agreed to	6910
Business of the House	
Mr. Kilger	6910
Income Tax Amendments Act, 1999	
Bill C-25. Second reading	6910
Ms. Blondin-Andrew	6910
Mr. Cullen	6912
Mr. Solberg	6912
Mr. Solberg	6913
Ms. Catterall	6913
Mr. Solberg	6914
Mr. Jaffer	6915
Ms. Catterall	6915
Mr. Jaffer	6915

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House	
Environment	
Mr. Jaffer	6915

Ms. Catterall	6915
Mr. Jaffer	6915

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Income Tax Amendments Act, 1999	
Bill C-25. Second reading	6915
Amendment to the amendment negated	6917
Mr. Kilger	6917
Amendment negated	6918
Mrs. Ablonczy	6918
Mr. Kilger	6918
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6918
Mr. Bergeron	6918
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	6918
Mr. Doyle	6918
Motion agreed to	6919
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	6919
Citizenship of Canada Act	
Bill C-16. Report stage	6919
Mr. Kilger	6919
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6919
Mr. Bergeron	6919
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	6919
Mr. Doyle	6919
Motion No. 1 negated	6920
Mr. Kilger	6920
Motions Nos. 2, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 negated	6926
Mr. Kilger	6926
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6926
Mr. Bergeron	6926
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	6926
Mr. Doyle	6926
Motion No. 3 negated	6927
Mr. Kilger	6927
Motion No. 9 negated	6928
Mr. Kilger	6928
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6928
Mr. Bergeron	6928
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	6928
Mr. Doyle	6928
Motion No. 22 negated.	6929
Motion No. 4 negated	6930
Mr. Kilger	6930
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6931
Mr. Bergeron	6931
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	6931
Mr. Doyle	6931
Motion No. 6 negated	6932
Mr. Kilger	6932
Motions Nos. 7, 8, 20 and 21 negated	6935
Mr. Kilger	6935
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6935
Mr. Bergeron	6935
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	6935
Mr. Doyle	6935
Motion No. 15 negated	6936
Mr. Kilger	6936
Motion No. 16 negated	6939
Motion No. 18 negated	6939
Motion No. 19 negated	6939
Motion No. 23 negated	6940

Motion for concurrence	6940
Ms. Caplan	6940
Mr. Kilger	6940
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6940
Mr. Bergeron	6940
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	6940
Mr. Doyle	6940
Mr. Laliberte	6940
Ms. Lill	6940
Motion agreed to	6941

Criminal Code

Bill C-18. Second reading	6941
Mr. Kilger	6941
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6941
Mr. Bergeron	6941
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	6941
Mr. Doyle	6941
Motion agreed to	6942
Mr. Kilger	6942
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6942
Mr. Bergeron	6942
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	6942
Mr. Doyle	6942

Motion agreed to	6943
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ...	6943

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Competition Act

Bill C-276. Report stage	6943
Mr. Kilger	6944
Mr. Gruending	6944
Mr. Lowther	6945
Mr. Brison	6946
Mr. Szabo	6947
Mr. Alcock	6949
Mr. Alcock	6950
(Division deemed requested and deferred)	6950

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Environment

Mr. Gruending	6950
Mr. Cullen	6951

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

Ms. Lill	6951
Mr. Bélanger	6952

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