



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 137 • NUMBER 202 • 1st SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, June 10, 2002
(Part A)

—
Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

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

Monday, June 10, 2002

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1105)

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should amend the Canada Transportation Act and the mandate of the Canadian Transportation Agency to give the Agency the additional responsibility of protecting public health by controlling noise, emissions and vibrations caused by rail cars being moved on the tracks and in the rail yards on interprovincial lines.

He said: Mr. Speaker, members of an opposition party are often told that they “are there only to criticize”. Well, as this motion shows once again, we often suggest to the government solutions that could change things.

In this case, the problem is a real one affecting citizens day and night. Since the CN has been privatized, approximately when this government came to power, the activities have intensified, traffic has grown and some rail yards have undergone some streamlining.

For example, the Taschereau station was closed and its activities were redirected to Montreal and Saint-Lambert so that, in my region near Quebec, there is more freight train traffic and more coupling activities every hour, day and night, at the Joffre station in the former municipality of Charny, which is now part of Lévis. Previously, the traffic was not so intense and the railroad employees could do most of their work during the day.

Since 1998, however, the people of Charny, who have always been aware of rail activities in their area—this being the main rail centre in Quebec, next to Montreal, being located in the middle of Quebec—have noted increased traffic and changes in methods. With privatization, staff has been cut and technology has improved.

For example, trains were made up by human beings, local people who were concerned with respecting the people of the community. They therefore made up the trains with as little commotion as possible.

Today, many mechanisms are more or less set off by remote control. The railway employee is often quite a distance from where

the train is being made up and has a tendency to couple more cars than necessary in order to be sure not to have to do it again. This can produce up to 75 decibels of noise, which hon. members will realize is an awful lot.

People started to complain back in 1998 and I got complaints in my riding office. I have always been, and still am, pro-railway. At first, I was a bit hesitant, and told people “It's normal to have noise when there is a marshalling yard”. There is a golf course a bit further on and the golfers do not seem to be particularly bothered. This is not, however, the case for those living nearby. Families with young children have them wakened up several times during the night, and this is becoming more and more frequent.

That is why people started complaining to the CN, but their complaints fell on deaf ears. The people at Transport's response was “There is a case before the courts in Oakville Ontario and CN appealed, because it contended that present jurisdiction did not allow the transportation agency to monitor and regulate this aspect of the problem”.

I will read a paragraph from the July 21, 2001 letter in which CN explains to the city that:

Departmental representatives are monitoring railway activities on an ongoing basis in order to ensure that they are operating safely.

Hon. members will see that safety is emphasized here. Certainly, the department and the transportation agency still have authority over safety. However, there are no regulations on pollution from trains and no federal power exists to deal with the noise and pollution resulting from railway activities.

• (1110)

For this reason, even though they had formed a citizens' committee—and the ruling for other cities confirms the fact that the Canadian Transportation Agency has no authority—, people had a noise study produced by an engineering firm by the name of Dessoprin Inc, in the hopes of influencing CN. The study demonstrated that the level of noise sometimes reached 75 decibels.

This is high. The World Health Organization says that no human should be exposed to sound levels greater than 60 decibels for extended periods of time, they even say 20 to 30 decibels.

This elevated sound level, given the frequency as demonstrated in the aforementioned study, was apparently not enough to convince CN of their case. The people therefore went to the Régie régionale de la santé et des services sociaux de Chaudière—Appalaches. A study was done to see if the noise was affecting people's health.

Private Members' Business

Obviously, I will not reveal the entire contents of the report, it would take too long. However, the representatives of the Régie said that the noise did indeed affect residents' health, because it occurs mostly at night and because it is continuous. People are forced to close their windows in the summer, and in addition to the discomfort, it is stressful, which in the longer term can affect the health of vulnerable people, such as children and seniors.

In fact, Maréchal-Joffre Street is located adjacent to the Joffre rail yards. The high level of activity in the yards—given that all of the routes are now being used—, means that trains are being moved and connected in close proximity to residents.

In the standing committee on health, there was a proposal to negotiate with CN—which did happen—to have a sound barrier built, as is done with freeways, as well as undertaking other measures to rectify the situation. I spoke publicly on this for the first time during the election campaign in order to meet with the citizen's committees following these studies.

I went to the citizens' committee and local authorities in Charny. This was before the municipal amalgamation, and negotiations with CN were underway, but behind closed doors. It was during the election campaign in the November 2000.

I told them they should rely on good faith and the negotiations, because passing legislation can take a long time. But the negotiations were so protracted that when I introduced this motion, a few weeks ago, and even now, they are still not concluded.

Patience is wearing thin, especially during the summer. Recently, people made representations to the municipal authorities and they were in touch with me. That is why I decided to introduce this motion. This is not a private member's bill, but simply a motion. I wish it were votable, but the committee decided otherwise. Everybody knows it is not all motions that are votable.

I think that this debate in the House will drive the message home and that the government will come up with and introduce a bill over the summer in order to amend the Department of Transport Act concerning railways. It could grant additional powers to the Canadian Transportation Agency, so that people who have this kind of problem can be heard by the agency.

•(1115)

In my opinion, this should exist in all cases. This is a neighbourhood—that is what originally led to the presentation of my motion and I think other members will speak about this today—the neighbourhood of Saint-Lambert in the Montreal region, where the residents complained to CN for the same reason, as they did in Oakville, Ontario, where authorities lost to CN in appeal. That region of Ontario also agrees, and I am convinced that other members have the same problem in their area.

Personally, I want to be clear. I am not trying to stop operations or to get the rail yards to close. I simply want to ensure that an organization called the Canadian Transportation Agency has the mandate to deal with complaints, and that, contrary to what one of its officials said, the Department of Transport has the power to control noise. If this were made clear to CN, the negotiation process would be different. CN would be more receptive to the public's representations.

Sure, we want CN to be a profitable venture and it is, which is fine. Sure, we want it to create jobs and I agree, because there are 400 jobs in the Charny area that depend on the railways. However, we do not want this to be achieved at the expense of people's quality of life. When we talk about people's health and the stress generated by this noise, I think CN should be more receptive.

Therefore, I invite members from all parties to support my motion. I realize that I filled in for another member at the very last minute. Normally, my motion should not have been on the order of the day, but the hon. member who was scheduled to present his motion today could not do so. Therefore, I was told on Friday that I could bring forward my motion. I am pleased to do so before the summer recess, although no one on this side of the House knows when this will come.

Therefore, I am very pleased to present it this morning. All the concerned citizens in my riding will also be pleased to see that this issue is debated. I will of course save five minutes to reply or urge my colleagues at the end.

Since this is a very important issue, I would ask, through the Chair, the unanimous consent of the House to make this motion a votable item.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is there unanimous consent of the House to make this motion votable?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

•(1120)

Mr. André Harvey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for his presentation of Motion No. 493. I think I have to recognize, even though we are from different parties, that my hon. colleague always try to speak about matters of concern to his immediate community.

I think it really is a member's first role to have an ongoing concern, every day and wherever we are working, not to forget that we are here to represent the constituents who sent us here. That is why the motion he is putting forward to the House must be treated with much respect.

Obviously, the government recognizes that urban sprawl has led to a spectacular growth of municipalities around railway lines. Linked with a sustained rail traffic, that growth is putting more and more pressure on the environment where people and railways are inevitably closer.

Nowadays, railway companies are competitive undertakings that strive to meet the market's requirements. In order to remain competitive, they always have to find means of improving the effectiveness of their operations. In other words, they have to maximize the use of their assets.

Private Members' Business

To this end, they must concentrate the traffic on main railway lines to increase its volume and reduce unit costs. This requirement can also increase daily traffic on some lines or transfer a portion of the traffic to different lines.

The movement of goods is different in many ways from the movement of travellers. While most people do not want to travel at night, the movement of goods is dictated by industry's needs, including just on time delivery and a continuing and stable service.

We can all understand the great contribution that railways bring to the growth of the Canadian economy, but this contribution significantly increases the concerns of people living near railways, which is the problem raised by the hon. member for Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière.

These problems include the noise made by the railway equipment, as well as vibration, intrusion and pollution problems.

The member may know that the responsibility for noise reduction belongs, in Canada, at all levels of government without exception. I know that my colleague is aware of this power sharing reality. As for municipalities, they fight against noise pollution through development and urbanism management plans, zoning bylaws, antinoise regulations, traffic plans and the building of antinoise structures.

Antinoise measures can be implemented by any level of government, but municipalities should preferably do it. Having already been a municipal representative, I know that it is a real and constant preoccupation at the municipal level.

The position adopted in the 1989 guidelines on exterior noise reduction is based on the conclusion that exterior noise problems are local problems that are difficult to solve without the involvement of the municipality. I am not saying that the municipality should be the only dealing with this problem, but the basic responsibility lies first with the municipality.

In this context, the member will understand that public and private sector co-operation is essential in any effort to, as he says in his motion, protect public health by controlling noise, emissions and vibrations caused by rail cars being moved on the tracks and in the rail yards on interprovincial lines.

The federal government recognizes the complexity of these matters and encourages communities and the railways to co-operate.

This last month, the Canadian railways made the commitment, through the Railway Association of Canada, to work closely with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to develop a framework that the railways and the communities will all be able to use to settle the disputes arising from local problems due to the proximity of the railways to residential neighbourhoods.

• (1125)

This joint initiative by the railways and the municipalities is a very constructive measure, which they have taken to address the matter of railway irritants in our cities.

It is based on a community/company dispute settlement process announced by the federation and Canadian Pacific at the federation's annual conference in 2001. The goals were twofold: to facilitate community participation in CP's infrastructure projects and major

operational changes; and to resolve issues raised by residents of a community or a municipality where CP operated.

These are some excellent examples of measures the railways are taking to improve their relations with the communities they serve.

The government understands, however, that there are circumstances in which it is not always possible to agree on solutions. In the past, railway irritants have been successfully resolved through co-operation and mediation, but this may not be enough for the future. It may be necessary to couple co-operation with legislative measures.

The member is asking that the government amend the Canada Transportation Act and the mandate of the Canadian Transportation Agency, and I quote:

[—] to give the Agency the additional responsibility of protecting public health by controlling noise, emissions and vibrations caused by rail cars being moved on the tracks and in the rail yards on interprovincial lines.

The member is perhaps aware that, in December 2000, the Federal Court of Appeal ruled that the Canadian Transportation Agency did not have jurisdiction over noise, vibrations and diesel emissions. The government therefore had to look at possible solutions to this pressing concern.

In July, the Minister of Transport tabled the final report of the committee to review the Canada Transportation Act, which addressed the Federal Court of Appeal ruling. The committee recommended that certain provisions of the act be reviewed and amended as needed in order to confirm and clarify the jurisdiction of the Canadian Transportation Agency.

The Minister of Transport is now drafting a policy framework for the federal government's transportation activities for the next decade and beyond. This document will address many recommendations made by the review committee. The minister has said he intends to publish the transportation policy framework in the fall with a view to consultations, after which he will introduce a bill to follow up on the review committee's recommendations.

In the meantime, the Canadian Transportation Agency continues to offer mediation services that have sometimes helped settle certain disputes concerning railway activities.

The agency provides these services to rail and maritime transportation since June 2000. These services help parties settle their disputes with a simple and efficient process that is fast, flexible and focused on co-operation rather than on litigation.

Mediation favours communication between the parties, particularly those who have a permanent relation. It also helps strike an appropriate balance between unequal parties. The mediator and the parties work together to find solutions that fit their situation. This co-operation brings about better understanding between the parties as well as agreements ensuring a high degree of mutual satisfaction and commitment.

Private Members' Business

We can use this service to settle different railway issues concerning prices, service obligations, railway crossings, the development of railways and railroad stations, the abandonment of lines and noise.

Clearly, the government recognizes the importance of the concerns of the member for Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière. The government has clearly demonstrated that it serious about examining solutions to the problems raised by the hon. member.

I thank the hon. member for his interest not only for his riding, but also for many places throughout the country that are experiencing problems as a result of the inconveniences inherent to rail transportation.

• (1130)

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, like my colleague the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, I too would like to congratulate my colleague from the Bloc Québécois. The Canadian Alliance does understand that the responsibility of every member of the House is to truly respect our fellow citizens and their concerns, not necessarily only the concerns we care about.

Just like my Bloc Québécois colleague, I am sure that all members who have trains going through their ridings have had calls from people angry about the noise coming from this means of transportation. It is very important that a voice be heard in the House regarding this problem.

I want to tell my Bloc colleague that the Canadian Alliance favours free votes on private members' bills. My views on the topic will not necessarily sway all my colleagues, when the time comes to vote on the motion.

[English]

The motion we are debating today from my colleague from Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière says:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should amend the Canada Transportation Act and the mandate of the Canadian Transportation Agency to give the Agency the additional responsibility of protecting public health by controlling noise, emissions and vibrations caused by rail cars being moved on the tracks and in the rail yards on interprovincial lines.

Moving rail cars in yards and shifting the rail cars makes a lot of noise. This is part of the cost of doing business and it is an unfortunate reality. It is impractical and unrealistic for railway companies to erect noise barriers around every action that they do in their rail yards.

To assist in avoiding future proximity problems associated with noise, the railway industry itself, outside of government mandate, has developed guidelines regarding and requiring vibration, noise and safety mitigation measures for new development along railways rights of way.

Since the mid-1980s, guidelines have been integrated into the development approval process in certain Canadian provinces. However beyond this there are no broadly accepted standards or guidelines through which parties may seek direction or resolution of emerging issues.

Consequently, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, which represents over 1,000 municipal governments across the country and the RAC, the Railway Association of Canada, which represents 55 freight and passenger railways operating in Canada, agreed at a meeting in Hamilton on May 31 of this year to "pursue a good neighbour approach to preventing and resolving disputes" according to the railway association's press release.

Instead of more rail regulation from the Canadian Transportation Agency, the Railway Association of Canada would prefer to work with municipalities to address "proximity issues and guidelines to be developed jointly on such matters as land use, noise levels and emissions", as stated by Federation of Canadian Municipalities CEO James Knight in a press release that he sent just following the meeting and the agreement.

Development of these guidelines will involve consultation with the railway industry, municipal governments, the property development community, transportation planners, acoustical consultants, related industrial concerns and other specialists and academics in the area of industrial proximity.

This is the exact sort of thing that the Canadian Alliance often champions. Here we have a situation where there are local concerns and local problems happening literally in people's backyards and local municipal governments responding directly with the industry without having the big iron boot of the federal government coming down on top of it and expanding the current leviathan state which takes away the powers from municipalities and citizens to react to local concerns with local measures that make local sense.

Rather than dumping more regulation on railways as Motion No. 493 recommends, the voluntary good neighbour approach between the railway companies and over a thousand municipal governments is already underway, including identification of the right and assessable contacts in municipal government, railways and open communication. A proactive approach beginning with municipal land use approvals based on sound planning principles is an effective tool for prevention of future disputes and complaints. Likewise, future railway operational planning would also seek to prevent future disputes and complaints.

Both the Railway Association of Canada and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities agreed on current options and best practices for mediation or dispute resolution, both at the local level and where necessary on a more formal level on a broader scale.

The Railway Association of Canada recognizes that the rail industry itself needs to be more sensitive to community and residential realities because Canada has become an increasingly urbanized country, which is common sense.

However the railway association also points out that Canada's economy is the most trade dependent on the planet. The Railway Association of Canada's vision for the future:

—is based on safe, secure, reliable rail corridors that carry both freight and passengers, reduce congestion and pollution. That will add to Canada's overall competitiveness, and Canadians' quality of life, because governments won't have to invest billions of dollars more in building new road systems, as they did in the past.

It is interesting that the motion we are debating on, and I understand will be voting on, proposes that railroad emissions be regulated. However Motion No. 493 was probably drafted without consideration of the fact that Canada's railways were on track to Kyoto compliance voluntarily. They produced 3.5% fewer greenhouse gas emissions in 2002 than they did in 1990, while hauling almost 30% more traffic than they did a decade ago.

I think it is important for my colleagues in the Bloc Québécois to consider this. The Bloc and the NDP are probably the most pro-Kyoto political parties in the House of Commons, although it is easy for them to be pro-Kyoto because of the water that they have their backyards. However overall the transportation sector remains the single largest energy user in Canada, with road vehicles accounting for more than 70% of sector emissions, passenger cars and light trucks accounting for 44.1% and commercial trucks 27.2%.

• (1135)

Rail generates only about 4% of transportation sector pollution in total. Rail carries slightly more than half of all freight ton miles moved in Canada, as well as 51 million commuters, intercity passengers and tourists. In fact the whole workload was handled with some 3,000 units in 2000.

A 100 car freight train, for example, carries the equivalent traffic load of 280 trucks and every commuter train takes hundreds of cars off the highway. This is the sort of thing that contributes to cleaning our skies, cleaning the pollution, getting more people moving faster, enhancing trade and doing the sort of thing that the Bloc Québécois says that this country needs to do, which is why it supports Kyoto.

[Translation]

I will conclude by addressing my Bloc Québécois colleague in French. Just like my colleague from Chicoutimi—Le Fjord said, we congratulate our colleague on his approach to respect his fellow citizens in his particular riding.

I too have introduced four or five private member bills aimed at dealing with problems that my fellow citizens had brought to my attention. We congratulate our colleague from Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière.

However, we believe that the kind of change that people in his riding and himself are seeking can be achieved without giving increased powers to a federal government that has proved so careless. It is not really a good idea to give it more powers as it has been getting worst and worst.

I congratulate my colleague on his motion and we do appreciate the spirit in which it was drafted. However, the Canadian Alliance will not support the motion.

[English]

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to congratulate the member for Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière. This is a very important motion and what the member has outlined in speaking to his motion is exactly the same problem I face in my riding in east Vancouver.

To go back into the historical record, the previous member of parliament to my predecessor, Margaret Mitchell, who was elected in 1979 and whom I am sure some members remember as being a very

Private Members' Business

outstanding member of parliament, took up this issue way back in 1979 and into the 1980s in terms of constituents in east Vancouver who were severely impacted by the incredible noise from rail yards along the waterfront on the port of Vancouver lands.

The issue the member has raised is something that has been ignored for a very long time. As the member of parliament since 1997 in east Vancouver, I have written countless letters to the Minister of Transport, to the Canadian transportation authority and I have sent copies to the committee. I have raised this issue again and again to try to get some relief for residents who cannot sleep at 1 a. m., 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. as a result of the switching yards and train shunting in east Vancouver.

After hearing the member from the Canadian Alliance, this is not an issue where somehow we are against rail transportation. I would agree that rail transportation is a very exceptional mode of transportation, particularly in an age where we have to be very concerned about emissions into the environment. The people in east Vancouver who have historically lived next door to an industrial port and have had trains going by their houses for decades, do not deny the right and the opportunity for those rail operations to be operated in a way that is efficient, businesslike and so forth. However the reality is that for rail yards, which are adjacent to residential neighbourhoods, there have to be particular precautions put into place to ensure that the daily and nightly lives of local residents do not become completely disrupted. That is why I support this motion.

In my riding people like Shane Simpson, Barbara Fousek and Jim Campbell have spent thousands of hours dealing, in this case, with the CPR trying to get it to understand and be sensitive to resident concerns about noise. I will quote from one of the many e-mails that I have received from Mr. Campbell, a local resident. He said:

Shunting 100+ car lengths at a slow speed means residents endure 10-20 minutes of screeching, grinding and then diesels howling to move the sheer weight of the load.

Imagine that taking place every night. Imagine coming home from work after a long day and going to bed. All people want is to go to sleep but they awake every hour or so, perhaps several times a night or a week. When that happens people end up suffering from sleep deprivation. It begins to affect not only the health of individual families but also of the whole community.

In the case of east Vancouver there have been several local committees such as the Wall Street and Burrard View Residents' Association, for example, that have banded together to take up this issue. They have put forward numerous submissions to the Canadian transportation authority only to find that the CTA now claims it has no responsibility in this area, and I find that very shocking.

We followed very closely the situation in Oakville. I even spoke to the government member of parliament for that area. I was very interested to see that the residents of Oakville, which is a very affluent community, had hired some pretty hot shot lawyers to take on the CN company in that case. They won and then, as we know, the appeal was thrown out.

Private Members' Business

●(1140)

It was interesting to hear the parliamentary secretary speak behalf of the government today and leave the impression that everything is A-OK, that there are joint initiatives and a dispute settlement mechanism and that mediation services have been offered. If that is the case I can tell the House that they are not working, because obviously there are communities across this country that are still suffering very badly as a result of excessive noise from diesel engines, from shunting and switching and from engines being turned on and off and so on.

If the parliamentary secretary is correct that the minister is prepared to come forward with some amendments to the Canadian Transportation Agency and that there may be some legislation, this is something that is long, long overdue, because the current processes in terms of dispute resolution simply are not working. In my opinion, when there is a flurry of complaints the rail companies, in our case the CPR, may respond to them and may provide some temporary relief, but the fact is that over the long term the situation does not change.

I would also like to address the fact that the parliamentary secretary has kind of sloughed this off and has said that it really is a local problem. I am sure he knows that where these rail tracks and the switching and shunting that is taking place are in a port area or in an area of federal jurisdiction, it is very difficult for the municipality to apply the noise bylaw. We have gone this route in Vancouver. The residents went before Vancouver city council to try to get the noise bylaw enforced. The parliamentary secretary says this is a local problem and that is where complaints should be taken, but I can tell him that the residents have received no relief there.

I want to reiterate my support for the motion. I actually went out on the train tracks with local residents, with the CPR, and we actually drove in a car along the tracks to look at the situation firsthand. I was really quite disturbed by the lack of any sort of process or any sort of facilitation that would resolve the problems these residents are facing.

I too wish that the motion were votable. It would have been a very good motion to have as a votable motion. Based on what we have heard today in the debate and based on the experience across the country, I implore the government to listen seriously to these complaints and to understand that the lives of local residents and communities are being severely disrupted.

We are not talking about a low level background noise like a freeway. We are talking about, in the case of east Vancouver, noise levels that are up to 100 decibels. It seems to me that this is completely unacceptable in an urban environment. We have regulations about airports. No one would expect people to live right next to a runway and hear the decibel levels of airplanes, but when it comes to a rail line or a shunting yard where this kind of activity, which is as noisy, is taking place, somehow all of a sudden there is an absence of any federal regulations that can deal with it.

In regard to the responsibility of the CTA, it is a glaring omission to somehow slough this off. Again I want to implore the government and the minister to take their responsibilities seriously and ensure that amendments are brought forward if the motion is not voted on

today. We want these amendments brought forward as quickly as possible so that the CTA will have authority to unequivocally deal with these rail companies. Maybe these companies are busy doing other things and do not think the complaints of local residents are important, but I want to say this: They have a responsibility to act in a neighbourly way. They have a responsibility to act in a way that is sensitive to the needs of local communities, just as local communities are very sensitive to the fact that they have business to do. This can be a win-win situation if only the Liberal government would bring in these amendments and make it clear that the CTA must act on these complaints and must take responsibility and provide relief to the people of east Vancouver and other affected communities.

●(1145)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, obviously, I am pleased to add my contribution to the debate on the motion moved by my colleague, the member for Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière. First, I would like to congratulate him for this motion. The member, and all of the Bloc Québécois are terrific when it comes to defending the interests of the citizens they represent. For this, I congratulate the member for Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière.

Clearly, the Liberal government is trying to outdo itself and surprise me every day. I listened to the speech made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord. He sarcastically congratulated my colleague for defending the interests of his constituents, the citizens of Quebec, with some clever explanation as to why the Liberal government could yet again not support my colleague's good intentions.

This was the Liberal government's response, through the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport. Basically, he said "We are aware of the problem, but we will not do anything about it right away. The minister will introduce an overview of Canadian transportation policy in the fall. A plan will be developed in the next ten years". In the end, there will be no amendments to the legislation and the government will not support my colleague's motion. This is the reality of the situation at the end of the day.

This is hard to accept, particularly since we are told that the local authorities can deal with the problem. Municipalities do not have jurisdiction over federal lands. People may not be aware, but the federal government does not pay any municipal taxes, unlike all other citizens and corporate citizens, on any lands where rail lines and rail yards are located. The federal government decides on its own how much it will give to municipalities on federal lands.

That is the way it is. These lands have never been considered to be jurisdictions over which municipal or provincial governments have any authority. Rail lines and rail yards are under federal jurisdiction, and it is the federal government that passes legislation on these lands. It is not for nothing that in Oakville, proceedings were taken.

Private Members' Business

In fact, they wanted to take the federal government to court. There was an appeal. Canadian National won, and the ruling is clear. The federal government has no responsibility, because Transport Canada and the Canadian Transportation Agency do not have any jurisdiction over noise. Clearly, given the fact that the lines and yards are on federal land, there is no legislation affecting these private companies.

Again, those who are listening to us must understand that the Liberal government has privatized rail transportation. It is now operated by profit making corporations. That is essentially what my colleague from Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière was saying.

Since privatization has occurred, there is no respect for neighbours anymore. The use of remote controls to connect cars is more common. The noise level is increasing simply because Canadian National and Canadian Pacific, which are private companies, are no longer required to show respect for the community.

Of course, every three months, they have to pay dividends to their shareholders. That is what they have to do. They do not care about the neighbourhood. That is why my colleague is asking the government to take action.

However, I can understand that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport would be reluctant to criticize Canadian National today, since that company was the fifth largest contributor to the Liberal Party of Canada's election fund in 2000. It contributed \$93,148 to that party's election fund in 2000. That is a fact.

Again, they cannot criticize their friends. They say "Let us not worry about it. Local governments can take care of that. We will try to have mediators". Mediation is the solution. That is pretty much the message that we heard from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, in telling us "We could go and see what is going on, but there is a mediation process".

People who live in an area like Lévis, that is criss-crossed by railroad tracks, have had the benefit of several studies on this issue. The Chaudière—Appalaches regional health and social services board has conducted a qualitative study on noise. It explains very clearly the public health risk.

● (1150)

So, there was an assessment of the risk, and the international standards of the World Health Organization have been explained. In residential areas, noise is a serious nuisance during the day and at night, at levels above 56 decibels. In residential areas, the nuisance is considered moderate if the noise level is 50 decibels and more. Inside the bedrooms, sleep is disturbed if the noise level is over 60 decibels.

I am summing up here the learned study by the regional board on the residential neighborhood near the Joffre switching yard. Train traffic has increased the noise level over 60 decibels, with occasional peaks of 69 and 74.9 decibels. The use of truck backing-up alarm in the switching yard has been associated with a reading of 71.9 decibels.

This has an impact on public health, and that is what my colleague from Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière has been arguing. We should make it clear that while we in the Bloc Québécois are in favour of

rail transportation, and the Canadian Alliance member is right, private companies, CN in this case, must protect the health of people living near switching yards.

All we are asking the CN and the other railway companies is to respect public health. As I said, there are internationally recognized standards set by the World Health Organization: the maximum is 50 decibels during the day and 60 decibels during the night. Those are the standards to abide by. When the noise reaches peaks of 74.9 decibels, it is harmful to the health of the people living in the vicinity.

The situation is not limited to the Joffre yard, it is the same in all rail yards. Our colleague from the New Democratic Party told us that she experiences the same situation. It is the same thing for people all over Canada. Why? Because the Liberal government has decided to deregulate and privatize transport. Now the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific are private corporations. All they want is to make the service profitable; they are not interested in protecting the health of the people living in the area.

Therefore, my colleague's motion is well founded. The purpose is to say that the federal government should change the law in its own jurisdiction. I repeat that tracks, railroad lines and rails yards are on federal land, and the provincial and municipal governments have no jurisdiction on that land. As we saw in the Oakville decision, the federal government and the Canadian Transportation Agency have no jurisdiction on noise. It is not mentioned in the Canada Transportation Act. My colleague is asking that we change that act. Let me read the motion once again:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should amend the Canada Transportation Act and the mandate of the Canadian Transportation Agency to give the Agency the additional responsibility of protecting public health by controlling noise, emissions and vibrations caused by rail cars being moved on the tracks and in the rail yards on interprovincial lines.

Of course, these lines are under federal jurisdiction. Once again, I call upon the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport to review all his notes and to tell the knowledgeable public servants who wrote them—I do not blame him because we are not always aware of what may be brewing in this parliament—that railway lines and rail yards are under federal jurisdiction.

These companies do not pay municipal taxes like other companies. For everything that is under federal jurisdiction, the federal government decides itself to provide the contributions to municipalities. If they do not pay their taxes like any other corporate citizen, it is simply because municipalities have no jurisdiction whatsoever on these areas.

Consequently, it is important for the House to take the matter under advisement. Once again, it is unfortunate that the Liberal Party does not want this motion to be votable. Quebec and Canadian citizens have health problems because private railway companies throughout Canada do not respect international standards on noise pollution.

My colleague from Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière simply wanted to raise the awareness of members to ensure that we pass legislation that would guarantee citizens who live close to railway tracks and rail yards that the companies' operations comply with community health rules.

Government Orders

•(1155)

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank the four colleagues who spoke for their respective parties, with the exception of the Conservative Party. I had been notified in advance that they were in agreement with the motion and I thank them.

As they have said, I believe that the first duty of an MP is to reflect the concerns of the people in his or her riding. That is what I wanted to do. I know that other colleagues have experienced similar problems or have been told of them. My NDP colleague has referred to similar problems in Vancouver. This is not, therefore, the concern of a single member, or a single riding. It concerns marshalling yards in particular, where trains are shunted onto sidings, where trains are made up and so on.

I would like to give a quick reply to the parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, who has shared his concerns with us, but at the same time I would side with what my colleague from Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel said about jurisdictions.

As far as noise is concerned, he is right in saying that municipalities have a certain power over this, which he explained very well, but the land belongs to the federal government. Sound travels, so a municipality might decide to erect a wall outside the federal property, but when residential areas are already established this requires expropriations. This, in my opinion, is contrary to the polluter-pay principle. Who caused the noise? The CN, with its railway activities.

In a situation where each party had equal responsibility, there would be mediation and each would propose remedies to its part of the problem. The CN does not care in the least. It says that the others need to adapt to its presence. The usefulness of CN is acknowledged, and of course we want to see it prosper.

The parliamentary secretary's response is "Yes, but we have carried out studies and have presented a report. In the coming decade we will have a plan to address such situations". This makes no sense.

What makes even less sense is that my colleague from the Alliance seems friendly but talks about Kyoto in his speech. The railway noise issue has nothing to do with the Kyoto protocol. He must have lacked substance or time to think about the position to say that.

The NDP has supported my motion. I congratulate and thank them for that. However, I would like to correct one misconception. When they say that citizens were right in Oakville, this is not the case. They were indeed right in the first round, but CN appealed the decision and won.

It is therefore a really important matter and, as everybody knows, the parliamentary secretary considers it important too.

If I were to ask unanimous consent of the House to make this issue votable, I know that the government House leader is usually listening—he has been criticized for some things—but as far as listening to the citizens, I think that he should accept my motion and instruct his party so that this motion be can be made votable.

If the Alliance members are opposed, they can vote against it. But those who support private members' motions should be allowed to vote freely in the House. This motion is intended to guide the government and not to force it to do one thing or another. It only asks for legislation that would amend the Canada Transportation Act and the mandate of the Canadian Transportation Agency. That is it. We are not trying to tell the government exactly what to do.

•(1200)

The Deputy Speaker: Was the hon. member for Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière asking for unanimous consent?

Mr. Antoine Dubé: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière have the unanimous consent of the House to move his motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired. Since the motion was not deemed votable, the item is dropped from the order paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SPECIES AT RISK ACT

BILL C-5—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

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

That in relation to Bill C-5, an act respecting the protection of wildlife species at risk in Canada, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage of the bill and one sitting day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill and, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the day allotted to the consideration of the report stage and on the day allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

•(1205)

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30 minute question period.

In order to facilitate everyone's work over the next 30 minutes we will govern ourselves in such a way to allow as many members as possible to participate with questions and replies being no longer than approximately one minute.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, what we have just seen is truly a disgrace. It is the 77th time that closure has been used. The rat pack used to oppose that an awful lot.

Government Orders

The Canadian Alliance has always supported the goal of this legislation which is to save species at risk. However it is unfair to expect some Canadians to absorb the total cost. Landowners and resource users deserve better than this from the government. Some will lose their livelihood or their land or their land value to save species without fair market value compensation.

The minister is playing a shell game by promising that it would be in the regulations. If there were no regulations drawn up there would be no compensation. This "trust us" attitude is not acceptable. No money has been budgeted for this compensation. The legislation will not work on the ground. Will the minister come clean and drop his shell game and say there is no compensation and tell Canadians the truth?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the first point made by the hon. member was that the time allocation motion should not be put.

I point out to him when we combine Bill C-5 with the two preceding pieces of legislation, Bills C-33 and C-65, we have had a total of 93 days of debate in the House discussing endangered species legislation. That totals 246 hours in the House and committee.

The time has come for us to recognize that we are running out of time before the summer and we must get on with this because this piece of legislation has had more exhaustive debate than any other legislation that comes to my mind at the present time.

On the second point with respect to compensation, as the member well knows we attempted to draw compensation regulations initially but we found this to be quite new and experimental in some respects. We were unable to do so without risking denying compensation to people on the land who might conceivably deserve it under conditions which we have not yet envisaged.

We decided to have a period of experimentation. I can assure the hon. member that we fully expect to have compensation provisions and to use the compensation provisions in the act.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as my Canadian Alliance colleague just mentioned, once again, there is a gag order on a bill on which there is no consensus within the government.

My question concerns the authority to make regulations under this bill. The department's backgrounder says that this authority encompasses not only crown land, but any land and water in Canada.

Can the minister assure the House today that the regulations that are yet to come will only apply to crown and federal lands and that he will concern himself with areas under his jurisdiction, such as wildlife reserves throughout Canada, and not land under provincial jurisdiction?

Hon. David Anderson: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot make the commitment the hon. member is asking for. The legislation applies to all of Canada, every province and every territory. It does not apply only to land under federal legislative control, meaning Indian reserves or, for instance, military reserves or national parks. It goes much further than that.

However, should the member examine the legislation, he will see that if a province does an adequate job of protecting species at risk, the federal government will let it continue doing what it does to protect these species and will not override it.

If we have good agreements in place with the provinces and they know what to do, we will provide scientific advice and maybe also money occasionally. We will help them protect species at risk. However, there is no way this legislation will only apply to federal lands.

● (1210)

[*English*]

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, the minister mentioned the 93 days and we know that is not accurate. There are only snippets of those days in the House and in committee. It has taken the government nine years to bring forward substantive environmental protection legislation.

The Conservative Party, along with many stakeholders, sought to ensure a proper balance. Why has the environment minister chosen to ignore the unprecedented consensus that was achieved by the coalition of major environmental and industrial groups known as the species at risk working group? Why has he gone around that with this legislation? Why does he continue to be completely unspecific on the issue of compensation?

Hon. David Anderson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should realize that it has taken us a long time to get this legislation out because the previous Conservative government did nothing about this issue. It was in our red book when we first came forward. We beat the Conservatives to the point where they were reduced to two seats because they were doing nothing on this issue.

Since then it has taken a lot of time. He is quite right. However when he says that we have not attempted anything for nine years, has he forgotten Bill C-33, or indeed the previous bill, Bill C-65? Has he forgotten how long it has taken with this particular bill?

We have been working on this continuously. When he is so critical of parts of days being used I hope he will remember, as he cozies up to the Alliance as he is so keen on doing, that the staff of the hon. Leader of the Opposition actually bragged about the way it was filibustering this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Andy Burton (Skeena, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government should be ashamed of itself. How dare it rule the country with such an iron fist?

The species at risk act is a major piece of legislation which the government has been trying to push down the throats of Canadians since its first term in office. This is the third attempt and it still does not have it right. The government just invoked time allocation which would seriously restrict debate. It does not care to listen to the concerns of Canadians any longer. How shameful.

Government Orders

The Minister of the Environment has heard from the farmers, ranchers, guide outfitters, fishermen, landowners and others who have identified serious concerns with the impact of the bill. We have demanded that socioeconomic concerns be included in the purpose statement of the bill so that decisions made under the legislation would take into account the impact that it would have. Instead the government has argued against such an amendment. Canadians deserve better.

Can the minister explain why he does not care about the impact that the bill will have on rural Canadians and landowners?

Hon. David Anderson: Mr. Speaker, as I waded through that lengthy statement I am having difficulty in finding the question.

The hon. member says we have not consulted with people who work on the land. We have. The hon. member is concerned about individuals who work on the land where these endangered species are found. I agree with him that these are the people who are most important in this legislation: farmers, ranchers, trappers, people who fish or people who work in the woods. These are the frontline people when it comes to protecting endangered species.

We have consistently sought the support of and worked with such people, and that is why in this legislation members will find that the approach we have adopted is user friendly. We stress that we will have programs in place that are protective rather than, as the opposition would suggest so frequently, coercive.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Mr. Speaker, the minister surely knows that Quebec has had its own species at risk legislation since 1991, which is even one year before the earth summit was held.

Given the fact that, in 1996, Quebec and the provinces signed the Accord for the Protection of Species at Risk in Canada, in which co-operation was deemed to be a fundamental principle by the federal government, and given the fact the Quebec has had its own legislation for more than ten years and has ratified the accord that I just mentioned, can the minister assure us that Bill C-5 will not apply to Quebec as he has already promised?

• (1215)

Hon. David Anderson: Mr. Speaker, that is not correct. As I just said in my answer to the member's first question, this legislation will apply to Canada as a whole, that is to all the provinces and territories. As the member indicated, in cases where a province already has species at risk legislation, the federal government will play second fiddle to the province. If the provinces need scientific or financial assistance, we will be able to provide that. We will work with the provinces and territories to ensure that all species at risk across Canada benefit from the best protection possible.

[*English*]

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister claims that the people who advised him were the ones on the ground and who knew what type of legislation we should have.

Would that not be even more so for the people on the environment committee who spent 12 to 15 months of regular work on trying to redraft the bill because it was so weak. Do they not get any credit for their expertise? All political parties, including your own, Mr. Minister, sitting on the committee made substantial amendments.

The Deputy Speaker: Just to differentiate between committee work maybe and the House, members should make sure that all interventions are made through the Chair and not directly across the floor.

Mr. Joe Comartin: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for that. It is a proper admonition for my part.

The reality is that the committee did spend a lot of time. They were experts and knowledgeable people and also representative of the country in terms of what type of legislation we need. Do they not get any credit? Do we shovel these government amendments through or do we allow the committee work to stand as being a much more accurate representation of where the country is at?

Hon. David Anderson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member came in perhaps a trifle late. As you explained, the debate is on the issue of time allocation.

Certainly, if I am permitted to depart from that strict issue, I would give the greatest credit to the committee members, including the hon. member who just spoke. They did an immense amount of work, not just on the current bill, Bill C-5, but also on the preceding bills, Bill C-33 and Bill C-65 in previous parliaments.

However, and I hope he understands this, the fact that I point out that the critical people who will be protecting endangered species are those who are out on the land, namely farmers, ranchers, trappers, fishermen and people who work in the woods, I hope does not suggest to him that somehow we are denigrating the work of the committee. No, these are the people who are particularly important.

With due respect to the hon. member, he comes from an urban riding. He spends a lot of time in the House. He is not always out there on the land. Perhaps he should give a little credit too, to those people on whom the bill will depend for its success and whose co-operation is so important in getting this bill.

I hope that does not denigrate the committee.

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I think one of the points we are trying to make here is that he is not consulting with the right people.

Last week the government introduced an amendment to the legislation that would make protection of critical habitat on federal lands mandatory after 180 days. The amendment has serious implications for all people in rural communities and who work in the natural resources sector.

The mandatory protection would be given to the critical habitat identified in a recovery strategy or an action plan. However a recovery strategy is not based on consultation with stakeholders and does not take into account the socioeconomic interests of Canadians, whereas an action plan does.

Government Orders

Will the government ensure that the communities are not destroyed by strong-handed government actions to protect critical habitat, and will the government change the amendment so that protection of critical habitat on federal lands is mandatory only after consultations have taken place in developing an action plan for species?

Hon. David Anderson: Mr. Speaker, we have no intention at this point, which I believe is understandable to all members of the House after these many years and many hours, of having further amendments. That was ended last Friday when we had House agreement on the amendments that are currently before us.

However I can assure him that we have absolutely no intention of adopting the irrational proposal that he has suggested. We are not here to destroy rural communities. We are here to make sure that rural people, who are just as keen on protecting endangered wildlife as anyone else in Canada and who have already, in many instances, worked assiduously to protect endangered species, are given the advantage of the legislation to assist them in that work.

I can assure him that when he talks about strong-handed and destroying, those words should be out of the lexicon. We are not in that situation. We are here in a facilitative mode trying to make sure we assist people in the countryside whose instincts and wishes are to protect endangered species.

● (1220)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras: “Mr. Speaker, on October 2, 1996, when the Accord for the Protection of Species at Risk in Canada was signed, the Quebec Minister of the Environment said in Charlotte-town, and I quote:

We cannot remain indifferent to the fact that this agreement opens the door to overlap between the future federal legislation and the act that has been in force since 1989.

He was referring of course to Bill C-5. He also indicated the following:

We risk creating more red tape instead of dedicating ourselves to what really matters to us: the fate of endangered species.

Does the minister not recognize that he is going against the Quebec model, a model which has existed for 11 or 12 years, which has proven itself and which works well? The minister is trying to derail the way endangered species are managed in Quebec. Does he not recognize that he is only creating a cumbersome administration that is totally unacceptable for the provinces?

Hon. David Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I must say that, as the hon. member explained, the province of Quebec implemented legislation with which I fully agree.

However, the federal bill will complement provincial and territorial legislative measures. It will not compete with them. We respect the other governments' jurisdictions, but we also expect them to protect species at risk and their habitat.

Under Bill C-5, the Government of Canada will have the power to act alone, if necessary, on the whole Canadian territory.

[*English*]

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, if we look out on the street we will see vehicles

designed for different purposes: boats, aircraft. This bill is designed for confrontation, not co-operation. Those words are important. The key players, the cabinet, cannot even agree among themselves.

Bill C-5 would give the federal government the power to impose its laws on provincial lands. Will the minister guarantee to the House, to his department and to other departments that co-operation will be the key between the provinces and the property owners rather than creating an atmosphere that is built into the bill of distrust and uncertainty that would deter Canadians from ensuring species at risk receive the protection that is needed?

Hon. David Anderson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can certainly give the hon. member the assurance that co-operation is the hallmark of what we are attempting to do. We do intend to work with rural people and rural communities.

I can assure him that the suspicion, fear and the concerns that he is talking about have, unfortunately, been engendered by his party. It is a great mistake that it has done that. If he chose to read the legislation he would see that it is based upon a co-operative approach with other agencies including, as I mentioned on two or three occasions in response to a question from the Bloc, with provincial governments.

Mr. Joe Comartin: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister again. My friend from the Bloc has raised this in a peripheral way. I want to go at it directly.

Does the Department of the Environment have a legal opinion or a confirmation that Bill C-5 will meet the international commitments that we have made with regard to protecting endangered species, protecting the environment and specifically enhancing biodiversity? There are a number of opinions out there that the bill does not in fact do that.

● (1225)

Hon. David Anderson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the views and legal opinions conveyed to me on the bill with respect to our international obligations are that it fully meets our international commitments. It provides the authority to prohibit the destruction of critical habitat of listed endangered or threatened species anywhere in Canada.

Along with other legislation, the Canada Wildlife Act, the Migratory Birds Convention Act, the Fisheries Act and the National Parks Act as well as, as the hon. member from the Bloc has stressed, the provincial and territorial legislation, we believe we have the tools to protect endangered species and fully meet our international obligations.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about co-operation, consultation, the frontline soldiers and how much he wants to listen to them. Yet the government uses closure, which is what we are debating right now. It includes things like due diligence in the legislation where people would be guilty even if they did not know it was an endangered habitat or an endangered species.

Government Orders

Why would the minister not have considered mens rea where people would have to show intent that they wanted to destroy habitat or that they wanted to destroy an endangered species. We would agree then that the book should be thrown at people who did that. However the minister has chosen not to do that and instead has chosen to use due diligence where the government will again go after farmers, ranchers and the guy on the ground, the little people.

Hon. David Anderson: Mr. Speaker, the reason for that is that a piece of legislation such as this cannot be considered in isolation from other provincial, territorial and federal legislation, the vast majority of which is inconsistent with this one. In other words, to establish different standards here would destabilize the approach taken.

We believe that this approach is appropriate. There is of course the defence of due diligence available. We think this is the one that people are familiar with from other legislation and therefore the one that should proceed in this.

We have many new features in this legislation. However this is not one of them. The reason for that is of course we want to ensure that people continue to work with what they are comfortable.

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, just a moment ago the minister gave credit to the committee for the work done, and rightly so, because the committee opened the eyes of the minister and the government in relation to many changes to be made and contemplated in the act. He said the real people who will ensure this is a success are the people on the ground. It is unfortunate that all these people, according to the correspondence we received, unanimously are not in agreement with the act either. Therefore, what is the rush?

As we get closer to a piece of legislation that satisfies everyone, what is the rush? Why can we not take our time and do it right? We are not trying to drag it, we are looking for that balance that was contemplated when the former government signed the biological diversity act back in 1992. If we take our time on this one, we can also have a good piece of legislation, but not if it is rushed.

Hon. David Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I point out to the hon. member it has taken eight or nine years. It is not a question of rushing it through. I gave the number of hours spent on it in committee and in the House, which was 246 hours. I believe the number for days was 93 days. Of course we have also been faced with filibuster, which was admitted and bragged about in the *Hill Times* by the assistants to the then leader of the opposition.

How much time does the member want to spend on going over the same things again and again? We believe the legislation should be based on the support of people out there. If the hon. member has only received negative comments from those people, why does he not look at the *Hill Times* where an ad has been taken out by among others the Forest Products Association of Canada and the Mining Association of Canada telling us to proceed with this very bill?

• (1230)

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister has referred to fear. I do not want to get into where all this fear comes from, but the folks in Saskatchewan who I have talked to are very fearful that if their habitat is adversely

affected by this legislation they will not receive fair compensation for that.

In a legal sense this matter could be dealt with very simple language in the legislation, not in regulations or assurances from the government. Someone who is adversely affected should receive fair market value as compensation. That is a clearly defined term.

Why could the minister not alleviate a lot of the fears in the legislation, make that minor amendment and assure landowners they will receive fair market compensation for adversely affected land?

Hon. David Anderson: Mr. Speaker, the reason for having the words fair and reasonable in the legislation rather than fair market value as suggested by the hon. member is that the legislation is not based on expropriation, the standard language he is using with respect to fair market value.

In other words, it would be possible to have stewardship programs. If in some instances there were some use of the land being infringed, it would not be fair market value because not all the land would be taken over. One may take over a particular part of it, ask that a width of hedgerow be increased for the loggerhead shrike, or ask that a certain crop not be planted in a certain area and that a different one be planted instead. It is not a question of expropriation of land for road purposes which the hon. member seems to have in mind.

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Mr. Speaker, the minister told us earlier that his bill was complementary to the legislation already existing in Quebec. I would like to believe him.

But in reality this is not the case. I spoke to him about the *Loi sur les espèces menacées* passed in 1989. I will also speak to him about the *Loi sur la conservation de la faune*, which we passed in Quebec.

In Quebec, we have wildlife enforcement officers who cover the land under Quebec's jurisdiction. What the minister wants to create are federal officers who would not only be on federal lands but could also operate on Quebec's territory.

With this system, which means we have a government that is not co-operating with respect to the protection of endangered species, as it did in 1986, but rather a policing body, how does it intend to introduce this new officer in Quebec's jurisdiction?

Hon. David Anderson: Mr. Speaker, for the third or fourth time, the hon. member has spoken about the system in the Province of Quebec, and I respect him. I say hats off to the authorities in the Province of Quebec, who have created a good system, but not all provinces have the same system. Not all provinces have systems as effective as that of the Province of Quebec.

This federal legislation will be for all Canada's provinces and territories. We will take action only if the province in which the species at risk is located does not. If a province needs the assistance of the federal government, we will be ready to provide it. It is not a question of trying to oppose a province, or beat it to the draw. It is more a matter of providing support.

[English]

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, most Canadians, urban or rural, want to save species at risk. However most Canadians including those in downtown Toronto understand that using heavy handed tactics will not get the co-operation of the people on the ground, the so-called frontline soldiers the minister talks about.

Let us look at some examples: The government is invoking closure today; it is not addressing the due diligence issue; it would say guilty until proven innocent by not putting in mens rea; and it would impose \$250,000 fines. This is not how to get co-operation from the frontline soldiers.

How does the minister think the bill has any hope of working on the ground?

Hon. David Anderson: Mr. Speaker, the Alliance should get off the idea that time allocation is being used today without any background or because we simply dreamed it up.

Let us look at what the Alliance has done. On April 17 the Leader of the Opposition made a two and a half hour speech to table a defence committee report. He took up the entire time allocated to government orders which was Bill C-5. On April 18 the Canadian Alliance member for Yellowhead used the same trick to drag out the tabling of a committee report until the government called a vote to bring the House to government orders. As these people appear to have forgotten what they did in April and many other months I will cite a quote from the *Hill Times* in which the assistant to the Alliance Party's then leader said:

We gathered as much information...and we basically culled them together in one document so that [the hon. member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast] can fill the two hours and then try to ad lib as much as possible in between the various different things that we've written for him.

That is what Alliance members are saying about their own filibuster. Now they are blaming us for putting in time allocation.

•(1235)

The Deputy Speaker: This concludes the 30 minute question time.

The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

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

Government Orders

(Division No. 306)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Cannis	Carignan
Carroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Coderre	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Fry
Galloway	Goodale
Graham	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Jackson
Jennings	Karetak-Lindell
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Macklin	Mahoney
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Nault	O'Reilly
Pacetti	Paradis
Patry	Peschisolido
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Redman	Reed (Halton)
Regan	Richardson
Robillard	Saada
Savoy	Scherrer
Scott	Sgro
Shepherd	Simard
Speller	St-Jacques
St. Denis	Stewart
Szabo	Thibault (West Nova)
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)	Tirabassi
Tonks	Torsney
Valeri	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood — 114

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Asselin
Bailey	Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bergeron	Bigras
Bourgeois	Breitkreuz
Burton	Cadman
Cardin	Casson
Comartin	Crête
Cummins	Davies
Dubé	Duceppe
Epp	Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Québec)	Gagnon (Champlain)
Gallant	Gauthier
Godin	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Guay

Government Orders

Guimond	Hanger
Harper	Hearn
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laframboise	Lebel
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark	Masse
Mayfield	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Moore	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pallister
Paquette	Penson
Perron	Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Reynolds	Ritz
Roy	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Toews
Wasylcia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Yelich — 77	

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrar	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne — 26

- (1315)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
(Motion agreed to)

The Deputy Speaker: I also wish to inform the House that because of the proceedings on the time allocation motion, government orders will be extended by 30 minutes.

- (1320)

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from May 8 consideration of Bill C-5, an act respecting the protection of wildlife species at risk in Canada, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 4.

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on Bill C-5 and the Group No. 4 amendments to the proposed species at risk legislation.

As the member of parliament for Nanaimo—Alberni, I think most residents of and visitors to my riding would agree that it is truly one of the most beautiful places in Canada. I have travelled a lot internationally and it is no exaggeration to say Vancouver Island is one of the most picturesque places in the world.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. James Lunney: I note that some hon. members agree.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, colleagues. I wonder if we might have the co-operation of the House so we can pursue the debate on Bill C-5. If there are discussions, I wonder if they might take place in

the respective lobbies so that we can continue the business of the House with some decorum.

The hon. member for Nanaimo—Alberni.

Mr. James Lunney: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I believe that Nanaimo—Alberni has the distinction of being the only riding with two UNESCO biospheres. UNESCO is the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. We have Clayoquot Sound on the west coast of Vancouver Island, which includes Tofino and the beautiful Pacific Rim National Park, and the Mount Arrowsmith Biosphere Reserve, recently proclaimed, right where I live, from the summit of Mount Arrowsmith right down to the 300 foot depths of the Strait of Georgia.

Respect for the environment and wildlife is very much a part of the social consciousness of my constituents. Not only are ecotourism, sustaining a healthy environment and protection of species at risk important to our local economy, they are a few of the kaleidoscope of factors that make Vancouver Island such a desirable place to live and to vacation.

It is a reality that the human presence in paradise does affect the environment profoundly. I am aware of and also concerned about the impact man has on our neighbours, large and small, the flora and fauna, the organisms we share this planet with.

My background is in the biological sciences. My personal pursuit of knowledge at the undergraduate level led me to a major in zoology and a minor in chemistry. I continued my education by studying these fabulous human bodies that we have each been given. The more we know about life, the more amazing the trip through life can be. If we have eyes to seek it, there is an amazing array of activity around us. We should check it out: under a rock, under a log, in the tide pool and along the riparian zone that straddles our streams. We can break the surface of our coastal waters and enter a whole new universe of activity.

That is what this subject, species at risk, is all about, but what about Bill C-5? Will it deliver what we hope to achieve? What about the Group No. 4 amendments? What are we hoping to achieve here?

Residents in my riding and indeed the majority of Canadians share my concern and believe in protecting and enhancing the health of our ecosystems. However, what is quite startling is that the proposed legislation was developed in virtual isolation. There was no consultation initiated by government with the various vested interests and stakeholders.

An hon. member: And now they are shutting down debate.

Mr. James Lunney: As well, I should mention that while I respect the spirit and the tenor of the government's objectives with regard to protecting species at risk, I cannot support the methods it proposes to achieve its goals, as demonstrated today, in fact, when it is even closing down debate on this important subject.

Government Orders

As for the Group No. 4 amendments to Bill C-5, Motion No. 127 specifically, which is supported by my party, demands that the government liaise with Canadians to gather feedback before invoking such sweeping legislation. Policy conceived by one party or catering to one set of interests is counterproductive and risks alienating Canadians. This risks failure by denying the necessary flexibility to deal with unanticipated economic and social changes. The government should know better. It should understand that consultation with all parties is an important part of the policy process. On this, Bill C-5 has failed. That is why this amendment is so fundamentally necessary.

In 1996 the federal government released its findings on modern comptrollership, a report entitled "Strengthening Our Policy Capacity". The task force charged with the report identified six mandatory prerequisites for policy engineering. The theme that was repeated throughout these recommendations was collaboration, not just among bureaucrats and across departments but, most important, with the citizens and non-governmental organizations most affected. The silos of government and administrative effectiveness may be continually thwarted by narrow organizational and policy self-interest. Catering solely to one opinion or failing to consult with all parties is almost certain to cause more harm than good.

Within the Group No. 4 amendments to Bill C-5 we have identified several areas where legislation does not respect the principles of horizontality, collaboration, transparency and accountability.

Issues concerning public consultation and discussion are important, as I touched on a moment ago. The government, according to its own treasury board guidelines, pledged to pursue an open and transparent approach to service that incorporates a multitude of policy partners across a spectrum of interests. At least that is what was written in treasury board's "Results for Canadians". However, given the opportunity to apply these concepts in Bill C-5, the government has failed to heed its own advice. There is a fundamental importance, even an obligation, to make consultations as wide as possible, thereby ensuring that consultations have a legitimate impact on the administration of the species at risk legislation.

• (1325)

Sound policy, effective consultation and responsible governance need to have built in mechanisms for review. Initially the bill called for parliamentary review of Bill C-5 after a period of five years. The standing committee contributed to this theme by stating that subsequent reviews would occur at five year intervals. It should be noted that mandatory reviews of legislation are not as rigid as sunset clauses, but they are, nevertheless, identifiable junctures and opportunities to examine how well the bill is functioning. They allow for a review of the questions that must be asked and are an important part of the policy process.

Periodic reviews ask implicit and vital questions. What was the intent of the legislation? What were its goals and objectives? Furthermore, a review demands to know if the implementation strategy of the legislation is achieving its mandated goals. Finally, is it achieving these goals within the allocated budgetary resources? Periodic reviews of legislation ensure that legislation remains evergreen and robust. Unanticipated events and unforeseen changes

in the future can profoundly affect legislation and render it impotent or, worse, damaging.

I want to illustrate the consequences that can occur when there are no tools for reviewing legislation that is ill-conceived. I am sure that many of my colleagues in the House recall that failure to anticipate events played a key role in inflicting massive damage to the oil and gas sector in western Canada.

An hon. member: I remember that.

Mr. James Lunney: Of course I refer to the national energy policy of the 1980s. I hear some hon. members saying they remember.

The national energy policy, which, I will add, was supported by the Prime Minister, was disastrous. It failed to consider the possibility for capital flight or a drop in the world petroleum price index. It failed to anticipate American responses to the nationalization of the petroleum industry or a unilaterally imposed federal restriction of oil exports. It also failed to consider the profoundly negative impact the NEP had on federalism in Canada, nor did it foresee the consequent feelings of alienation and resentment that still abound and are harboured by some and linger in the west as a result of such poor policy.

No piece of legislation is perfect. Therefore, the power to periodically review legislation is a significant responsibility. Reviews and evaluations are not just a good idea: They should be a fundamental principle of governing. However, Motion No. 130 from the government will remove the standing committee amendment calling for mandatory reviews.

Apparently, despite the lessons learned, the government is not practising any degree of due diligence. The government feels that reviewing legislation for Bill C-5 is unnecessary. Perhaps it feels that the democratic spirit of reviews are nuisance clauses and are consequently easily dismissed, or perhaps it feels that Bill C-5 possesses perfect design and requires no mandatory review. Such is surely not the case.

During earlier debates of Bill C-5 we identified several gaps in the proposed legislation which may indeed have some profound and unanticipated impacts on Canadians. Two that immediately come to memory are criminal liability without intent and lack of compensation for financial losses. I will go into detail only briefly since we have already had these discussions at length.

First, the act will not work without guaranteeing fair and reasonable compensation for property owners and resource users who suffer losses. Farmers, ranchers and other property owners want to protect endangered species, but should not be forced to do it at the expense of their livelihoods.

Second, criminal liability must require intent. The act will make criminals out of people who may inadvertently or unknowingly harm endangered species or their habitat. This is unnecessarily confrontational and makes endangered species a threat to property owners.

Government Orders

These are very serious and in fact, I would say, negligent omissions. It therefore becomes all the more necessary to ensure that periodic reviews of Bill C-5 are drafted into the legislation. I am hopeful that common sense will prevail and the government will accept the amendments that will make Bill C-5 workable. The power to review must be present, the necessity to consult should be evident, and the importance of adequate compensation is paramount to successful legislation.

• (1330)

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

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 6. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 6 stands deferred.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 16 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 17. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 17 stands deferred.

The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 20. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment carried.
(Amendment agreed to)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 20. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the Motion No. 20, as amended, carried.

(Motion No. 20, as amended, agreed to.)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 24. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the Motion No. 24 carried.
(Motion No. 24 agreed to)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 25. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment carried.
(Amendment agreed to)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 25. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the Motion No. 25, as amended, carried.

(Motion No. 25, as amended, agreed to)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The division on Motion No. 29 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 72. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 72 stands deferred.

•(1335)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The division on Motion No. 76 stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 114. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 114 stands deferred.

•(1340)

The question is on Motion No. 126. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 126 stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 127. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 127 stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 130. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 130 stands deferred.

The Deputy Speaker: We will now proceed to the motions in Group No. 5.

Hon. Robert Nault (for Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-5, in Clause 8, be amended by replacing lines 14 and 15 on page 9 with the following:

“two ministers, delegate to any minister of the Crown in right of Canada or of a province or to any person who is employed by the Government of Canada, the government of a province or any other government in Canada any of that Minister’s powers or”

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Carleton, Canadian Alliance) moved:

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-5, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing lines 39 to 45 on page 9 and lines 1 to 3 on page 10 with the following:

“10. (1) A competent minister may, after consultation with every other competent minister, enter into an agreement in respect of the administration of this Act with

- (a) any other minister of the Crown;
- (b) any provincial, territorial, municipal or aboriginal government;
- (c) a wildlife management board, in respect of any lands specified in a land claims agreement in respect of which the board has authorization to perform the functions specified in the land claims agreement;
- (d) any landowner or authorized resource user, or any other person considered by the competent minister to be directly affected by the administration of the Act; or
- (e) any other person if the competent minister considers that it is appropriate for the administration of this Act to enter into an agreement with that person.

(2) Before entering into an agreement referred to in subsection (1), the competent minister shall

- (a) publish the proposed agreement in the public registry for a period of thirty days; and
- (b) after the expiry of that period, consult with all persons who it is reasonable to believe may be affected by the agreement.”

Mr. Andy Burton (Skeena, Canadian Alliance) moved:

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-5, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing lines 39 to 43 on page 9 with the following:

“10. (1) The competent minister may, after consultation with every other competent minister, enter into an agreement with

- (a) any other federal government Minister;
- (b) a provincial, territorial, municipal or aboriginal government;
- (c) a wildlife management board, for any lands specified in a land claims agreement for which the wildlife management board has authorization to perform functions as specified in the agreement;
- (d) a landowner, authorized resource user or other person whom the competent minister considers to be directly affected by the administration of this Act; or
- (e) any other person or organization that the competent minister considers to be appropriate for the administration of this Act.

(2) Any agreement that the competent minister may enter into under subsection (1) shall be with respect to the administration”

Motion No. 26

That Bill C-5, in Clause 11, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 9 on page 11 with the following:

“11. (1) A competent minister may, after consultation with every other competent minister, enter into an agreement to provide for the conservation of a species at risk with

- (a) any other minister of the Crown;
- (b) any provincial, territorial, municipal or aboriginal government;

(c) a wildlife management board, in respect of any lands specified in a land claims agreement in respect of which the board has authorization to perform the functions specified in the land claims agreement;

(d) any landowner or authorized resource user, or any other person considered by the competent minister to be directly affected by the administration of the Act; or

(e) any other person if the competent minister considers that it is appropriate for the administration of this Act to enter into an agreement with that person.”

Hon. Robert Nault (for Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 27

That Bill C-5, in Clause 11, be amended by

- (b) replacing, in the English version, line 10 on page 11 with the following:
- (c) deleting lines 24 to 29 on page 11.

“to do so, enter into a conservation agreement with any government in Canada, organization or person to benefit a species at risk or enhance its survival in the wild.”

“(2) The agreement must provide for the”

Mr. Andy Burton (Skeena, Canadian Alliance) moved:

Motion No. 31

That Bill C-5, in Clause 15, be amended by deleting lines 6 to 9 on page 14.

Hon. Robert Nault (for Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 33

That Bill C-5, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing lines 27 to 30 on page 15 with the following:

“20. The Minister must provide COSEWIC with any professional, technical, secretarial, clerical and other assistance, and any facilities and supplies, that, in his or her opinion, are necessary to carry out its”

Motion No. 37

That Bill C-5, in Clause 29, be amended by replacing lines 6 to 8 on page 19 with the following:

“apply to any order that is made under subsection 27(1) on the basis of that recommendation, and the order is exempt from”

Motion No. 38

That Bill C-5, in Clause 30, be amended by replacing lines 11 to 25 on page 19 with the following:

“30. (1) As soon as possible after an order is made on the basis of a recommendation referred to in subsection 29(1), COSEWIC must have a status report on the wildlife species prepared and, within one year after the making of the order, COSEWIC must, in a report in writing to the Minister,

- (a) confirm the classification of the species;
 - (b) recommend to the Minister that the species be reclassified; or
 - (c) recommend to the Minister that the species be removed from the List.
- (2) Within 30 days after the report is received by the Minister, a copy of the report must be included in the public registry.”

Motion No. 43

That Bill C-5, in Clause 32, be amended by replacing lines 33 to 36 on page 19 with the following:

“an endangered species or a threatened species.”

Motion No. 75

That Bill C-5, in Clause 49, be amended by

- (b) replacing lines 36 and 37 on page 28 with the following:
- (c) replacing lines 3 to 5 on page 29 with the following:

“(b) a statement of the measures that are proposed to be”

“protected;”

“be derived from its implementation; and”

Motion No. 85

That Bill C-5, in Clause 59, be amended by replacing lines 8 to 40 on page 33 and lines 1 to 8 on page 34 with the following:

“59. (1) The Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the competent minister after consultation with every other competent minister, make regulations to protect critical habitat on federal lands.

Government Orders

(2) The competent minister must make the recommendation if the recovery strategy or an action plan identifies a portion of the critical habitat as being unprotected and the competent minister is of the opinion that the portion requires protection.

(3) The regulations may include provisions requiring the doing of things that protect the critical habitat and provisions prohibiting activities that may adversely affect the critical habitat.

(4) If the competent minister is of the opinion that a regulation would affect land in a territory that is not under the authority of the Minister or the Parks Canada Agency, he or she must consult the territorial minister before recommending the making of the regulation.

(5) If the competent minister is of the opinion that a regulation would affect a reserve or any other lands that are set apart for the use and benefit of a band under the Indian Act, he or she must consult the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the band before recommending the making of the regulation.

(6) If the competent minister is of the opinion that a regulation would affect an area in respect of which a wildlife management board is authorized by a land claims agreement to perform functions in respect of wildlife species, he or she must consult the wildlife management board before recommending the making of the regulation."

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair has been informed that Motion No. 109 will not be proceeded with.

Hon. Robert Nault (for Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 116

That Bill C-5, in Clause 74, be amended by

(b) deleting lines 30 to 36 on page 40.

(c) replacing lines 3 to 6 on page 41 with the following:

"74. (1) The competent minister may enter into an agreement with a person, or issue a permit to a person, authorizing the person to engage in an activity affecting a listed wildlife species, any part of its critical habitat"

"have been considered and the best solution has been adopted;"

Motion No. 117

That Bill C-5, in Clause 75, be amended by replacing lines 14 to 31 on page 42 with the following:

"75. An agreement, permit, licence, order or other similar document authorizing a person or organization to engage in an activity affecting a listed wildlife species, any part of its critical habitat or the residences of its individuals that is entered into, issued or made by the competent minister under another Act of Parliament has the same effect as an agreement or permit under subsection 74(1) if

(a) before it is entered into, issued or made, the competent minister is of the opinion that the requirements of subsections 74(2) to (6) and (9) are met; and

(b) after it is entered into, issued or made, the competent minister complies with the requirements of subsection 74(7)."

Motion No. 118

That Bill C-5 be amended by adding after line 18 on page 43 the following new clause:

"77.1 (1) Despite any other Act of Parliament, any person or body, other than a competent minister, authorized under any Act of Parliament, other than this Act, to issue or approve a licence, a permit or any other authorization that authorizes an activity that may result in the destruction of any part of the critical habitat of a listed wildlife species may enter into, issue, approve or make the authorization only if the person or body has consulted with the competent minister, has considered the impact on the species' critical habitat and is of the opinion that

(a) all reasonable alternatives to the activity that would reduce the impact on the species' critical habitat have been considered and the best solution has been adopted; and

(b) all feasible measures will be taken to minimize the impact of the activity on the species' critical habitat.

(2) For greater certainty, section 58 applies even though a licence, a permit or any other authorization has been issued in accordance with subsection (1)."

• (1345)

The Deputy Speaker: Further to my revised ruling, Motion No. 120 is now in Group No. 5. This motion was already moved and seconded when it was in Group No. 3.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance) moved:

Motion No. 129

That Bill C-5 be amended by deleting Clause 125.

Hon. Robert Nault (for Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 131

That Bill C-5, in Clause 135, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 5 on page 73 with the following:

"4.2 (1) The Minister may delegate to any minister of the Crown in right of Canada any power conferred on the Minister under this Act. The other minister may then exercise the power subject to any terms and conditions that the Minister specifies.

(2) The other minister may delegate any power delegated under subsection (1) to any person employed in any department for which that other minister is responsible."

Motion No. 132

That Bill C-5, in Clause 138, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 30 on page 74 with the following:

"minister of the Crown in right of Canada or of a province or to any person who is employed by the Government of Canada, the government of a province or any other government in Canada any power conferred on the Minister under this Act relating to its enforcement or the issuance, renewal, revocation and suspension of permits. The minister or other person to whom the power is delegated"

Motion No. 133

That Bill C-5, in Clause 139, be amended by replacing lines 2 to 4 on page 75 with the following:

"minister of the Crown in right of Canada or of a province or to any person who is employed by the Government of Canada, the government of a province or any other government in Canada any power conferred on the Minister under this section relating to permits. The minister or other person to whom the power is delegated"

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day that we are standing to speak to the last group of motions. The government has chosen to use closure to shut down consultation with the grassroots people and frontline soldiers the minister talks about: the farmers, ranchers, people in the forest industry and all those who pay taxes to allow the country to exist. On this dark day I will speak briefly to the motions in Group No. 5.

It is interesting that the government has totally withdrawn clause 109 which may have someday put compensation into the regulations. I defy any rural member across the floor here to go home and say "Guess what, guys? Now you will not get any compensation for sure". I dare them to stand on the election platform and justify that one. I wonder how they would handle it.

We see what the Liberal government is really about. It brought its rural caucus onside by saying it would change the word may to will. It has now cancelled the whole thing. That is pretty shocking. It is shocking to find out about it in the House in the 11th hour. Under the current bill there would not be compensation or fair market value. It does not even contain the term fair and reasonable which is what the committee finally agreed on. Real estate people and lawyers who were consulted said it had to be fair market value because fair and reasonable could mean anything. Now the bill contains nothing, not even fair and reasonable. That is pretty shocking.

We talked earlier about the issue of mens rea. This means if farmers who plow the fields, ranchers who put cattle into the pastures or miners who exercise property rights do not do environmental impact studies to find out if an endangered species or habitat is present they would be guilty before even entering a courtroom. What kind of justice system is that?

Government Orders

Why would the government not want to consider the socio-economic issues? The possibility of losing 10,000 jobs, 20,000 jobs or whatever should be a factor in considering whether to save habitat or species like the wart toad, liverwort or whatever. It seems only reasonable that the government consider these things.

The process of consultation and co-operation is a farce. It is a lie. It is nowhere in the legislation. Landowners need to be involved in the consultation process, yet they would not be. Bill C-5 would be exactly what the American legislation is. American experts who have been looking at this type of legislation for close to 30 years have said the Endangered Species Act in the United States has yet to save a single species although it has been in effect 27 years. They have predicted SARA would be equally ineffective in Canada.

The money would be used for litigation. It would be a great time for lawyers but not for landowners and those who care about species. Bill C-5 would endanger the species it is trying to save. We hope it will endanger the party across the way in the next election when the Canadian people find out what it really means.

I have spoken to a number of environmental groups which say if we do not compensate people on the ground they will not co-operate. That should be common sense. However the government does not realize that. The withdrawal of motion 109 further emphasizes how bad the legislation would be.

● (1350)

Co-operation is what it takes. I will tell the House a story about a time a long time ago when I worked for the Canadian Wildlife Service. I had some money and my job was to go out and protect habitat. We would go to farmers and say they had marsh land we wanted to protect. The farmers might say they had planned to drain it or do something else with it. However when we offered compensation for the land there was not one person who did not sign the agreement. That is what co-operation is all about. That is how to protect habitat.

Farmers and ranchers across the country are already preserving habitat and species. Bill C-5 would do nothing but antagonize them and make them stop doing what has been normal practice for them up to this point.

What does the government not understand about getting the co-operation of landowners? How does it hope to work with the provinces when it is putting in a safety net proposal that says federal legislation would rule? If the federal government deemed that provincial governments were not doing an adequate job it would come down on them with overriding legislation. That would mean court action and more court action. It would mean lawyers and more lawyers. It would put more money in the pockets of lawyers and less in the hands of the front line workers the minister talks about.

I could go on about all the amendments put forward and the hard work of the committee to try to make the legislation better. For the first time since I have been in the House we had co-operation among all members on the environment committee. We really cared.

Today we voted for some motions put forward by an hon. member regarding aboriginal issues. We co-operated because we knew the members would co-operate on some of our big concerns. We worked hard on it. What did the government do? It came in and reversed all

the things we fixed in the legislation. It did not listen to members from all parties. Five parties worked together to make the legislation better. The government then had the nerve to come in at report stage with all these amendments and reverse everything we did. It makes one wonder why we bother to get involved in committees or do any work. We worked hard on the legislation for 9 or 10 months to try to make it work.

It is a sad day. The government has used closure. Under the bill there would be no compensation. It would make landowners and users guilty until proven innocent. We are slapping the provinces in the face. Bill C-5 would do nothing to save species at risk. We should be disgusted with this piece of legislation and what we have seen today. The government should pay a big price for using closure to pass Bill C-5 and ram it down people's throats.

● (1355)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak again on Bill C-5, which we are addressing again today.

We have got to the fifth group of motions of this major bill, which has stirred up opposition, not just on this side of the floor but also some considerable opposition leading to a crisis on the government side. This bill runs counter to what the protection of Canada's endangered species is all about.

A bit of a historical review will remind us that Quebec and some other provinces decided as early as 1996 to sign the national accord for the protection of species at risk in Canada. This was a commitment by the provinces to protect the species and habitat within their territory in order to provide greater protection to our ecosystems and to the habitat, which is where the endangered species are to be found.

At that time, the accord represented an important federal initiative. It set out a number of principles relating to co-operation and collaboration with the provinces. As far back as 1996, Quebec had presented the federal government with a number of initiatives and legislation that had already been enacted by the Bourassa government.

I have a very clear recollection of this endangered species legislation. It took effect in Quebec in 1989. It was adopted and sponsored by members on the other side of the national assembly, even Quebec Liberal MLAs voted in favour of this legislation which protected endangered species on Quebec territory.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am going to interrupt the hon. member for Rosemont—Petite-Patrie. He will have more than seven minutes left should he wish to continue speaking after oral question period.

Now, we will proceed to statements by members.

S. O. 31

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

NATIONAL SPINA BIFIDA AND HYDROCEPHALUS AWARENESS MONTH

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House and all Canadians that June is National Spina Bifida and Hydrocephalus Awareness Month in Canada.

The effects of spina bifida range from severe physical disabilities and developmental delay to problems that can be corrected by surgery. The most common effects are limited use of the lower limbs and bowel and bladder limitations. Since its inception in 1981 the Spina Bifida and Hydrocephalus Association of Canada has been providing information and support for affected families, promoting public awareness and supporting research on spina bifida.

In March, 2002 Health Canada launched a campaign to help prevent spina bifida and other neural tube birth defects. The campaign promotes awareness among Canadian women of child-bearing years and their health care providers of the importance of taking folic acid before conception and in the early weeks of pregnancy to reduce the risk of spina bifida and other neural tube birth defects.

Let us all support that campaign.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, since 1994 the Liberal government has denied Canada's military the helicopters it needs to carry out dangerous missions. The Canadian Press has obtained a defence department report detailing the effects of this political foot dragging.

Our pilots asked for warning equipment that would alert them when enemy radar locked onto their Sea Kings. They were denied. Our pilots asked for flares and chaff that would throw missiles off their Sea Kings. They were denied. They asked for a device that would alert pilots if their Sea Kings were targeted by enemy lasers. They were denied.

Instead of buying our troops this defensive equipment to protect them in battle the government bought \$100 million in luxury jets for the Prime Minister and his cabinet, not because they were needed but because they were nicer.

It is no wonder 69% of Canadians think this government is incompetent. The Prime Minister and his Cabinet should be ashamed. Canadians deserve better, a lot better.

* * *

● (1400)

[*Translation*]

CHARLES DAUDELIN

Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Shefford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the great honour of unveiling the postage stamp commemorating

“Embâcle”, the work of the great Canadian sculptor, Charles Daudelin, from Granby located in my riding.

Charles Daudelin had exceptional talent, unparalleled vision and unflagging creativity. This man who hailed from my region had a phenomenal career as an artist both here and abroad.

He was ahead of his time and contributed more than anyone else in giving new impetus to sculpture in Quebec by creating grandiose, even gigantic sculptures for public areas, which blended in marvelously with the urban landscape.

I am extremely happy that Canada Post is paying tribute to the work of this unique pioneer. This stamp provides us with another opportunity to appreciate the talent of this artist who left his permanent mark not only on the wonderful world of sculpture, but also on all of the arts community in Quebec and Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

GIRL GUIDES

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate a resident of Hamilton Mountain, Amanda Charlebois, on receiving the prestigious Lady Baden-Powell Award for achievement in the girl guides.

The Girl Guides of Canada was founded in 1910 to help young women become responsible citizens, able to give leadership and service in the community, whether local, national or global. The girl guides work to inspire an ethic of co-operation while encouraging leadership potential, giving girls opportunities to experiment with various roles, allowing them to develop diverse skills and a sense of pride and confidence that will stay with them throughout their lives.

Amanda personifies this ethic, having earned 72 community badges through participation in volunteer work and camp. She has experienced activities from snowshoeing to photography, to aviation and first aid.

I wish to congratulate both Amanda on her achievement and the Girl Guides of Canada for their good work in organizing and encouraging young girls and women like Amanda to develop their potential.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MILLENNIUM SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of my riding, I am very happy to congratulate the five winners of excellence awards.

They are: Geneviève Carrier, of the Collège de l'Outaouais; Vicki Da Silva-Casimiro, of Collège Saint-Joseph in Hull; Maïté Garcia Gonthier, of the MultiCollège de l'Ouest du Québec; Pamela R. Ledoux, of Heritage College; and Maude Schneider, of the Petit Séminaire de Québec.

The excellence awards recognize, support and encourage students who have set themselves apart by their academic results, leadership and community involvement.

S. O. 31

The Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation was created by the Liberal government by an act of parliament by which all Canadians invest and express their confidence in the future leaders of this country.

I congratulate to the winners from my riding and wish them much luck with their studies.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Mr. Larry Spencer (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, at this moment we have thousands of Canadians on surgery waiting lists. One of my own constituents has been waiting for surgery for a year and has been told to expect to wait another six months. This is on the priority list.

There are burdensome costs to these patients on waiting lists. Many continue to endure much pain and suffering, bear the financial burden of more prescription drugs, endure decreased physical ability and suffer the loss of income because of additional sick days off work. This is unacceptable.

We are not living in a third world country. We live in one of the most progressive countries in the world and yet we do not provide adequate health care for our own people. This is one more issue the Liberal government has failed to address. Liberals are caught up in the defence of their own corruption and are bogged down with endless studies.

Canadians are left with a government incapable of responsible action. How can it defend its virtual inaction in dealing with the health care crisis when it is costing our constituents on a daily basis?

* * *

[Translation]

MILLENNIUM SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. Serge Marcil (Beauharnois—Salaberry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Jean-Michel Leduc, who attends the École secondaire des Patriotes-de-Beauharnois and lives in the riding of Beauharnois—Salaberry, on winning an award of excellence from the Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation.

The Beauharnois—Salaberry area is privileged to have among its students a young man whose excellence is being recognized in this way. This scholarship will make it possible for him to learn, to develop personally, and to contribute to the betterment of his community.

On behalf of all my fellow citizens, I wish him every success in the attainment of his academic goals.

* * *

• (1405)

LISE WATERS

Ms. Diane Bourgeois (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Pierre Jury in *Le Droit* caught my attention. It was about an exceptional resident of the Outaouais, Lise

Waters, a retired teacher and a volunteer for over 30 years with youth in sport.

As Pierre Jury wrote, Lise Waters is a woman who works for absolutely nothing, for the pleasure of giving, for the pleasure of staying young at heart.

President for the past 12 years of the Unité régionale de loisir et de sport de l'Outaouais, each election finds her hoping that she will be able to make way for someone younger. Unfortunately, but fortunately for the clientele, when no candidates step forward, the sexagenarian generously takes on the job, anxious not to leave a gap.

The Bloc Québécois joins with me in paying tribute to Lise Waters and wishes her many more years of success among the young people of whom she is so fond.

* * *

[English]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week the Greater Halifax Partnership released a report on the economic future of the Halifax region and indeed Nova Scotia in general.

As many members will know, the oil and gas sector of Nova Scotia is booming. While it would be wrong to hang our hopes on a single industry, our offshore resources have the potential to give the people of Nova Scotia what they really want, sustainable, long term economic growth. The numbers look good: a possible GDP growth of 72%, 52,000 new jobs and growth in the housing and service sectors by 2020. The end result of all this is clear. More young Nova Scotians will be able to stay in their home province.

Like all Atlantic Canadians, Nova Scotians want to become contributors to equalization, not recipients.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mrs. Betty Hinton (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, on August 12, 1944, Lieutenant Colonel Al Trotter was shot out of the sky on his 44th mission over enemy territory. He was captured, tortured and interned for more than 300 days.

Due to communication errors with veterans affairs, the prisoner of war was unaware for 14 years that he was entitled to compensation for his pain and suffering. Now, after 10 years of appeals, the government still refuses to honour the retroactivity of this distinguished veteran. The government has unlimited funds for the Prime Minister's Challenger jets and is embroiled in controversy over contracts paid in full for services not rendered.

This distinguished veteran did honour his contract, but Canada does not recognize his service and POW status due to bureaucratic red tape and miscommunication. Lieutenant Colonel Trotter does not mince words. He asked me to wear his medals today but I cannot. He instructed me in very unparliamentary language as to where I should place them should the government continue to be unresponsive.

Surely there is a more dignified resolution.

PORTUGAL DAY

Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today many of my constituents and others across Canada will be celebrating Portugal Day.

The Portuguese presence in Canada extends back 500 years when they braved the Atlantic to reach our shores. Portuguese sailors fishing off the Grand Banks helped lay the foundations of the cod fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador.

The Waterloo region has the highest percentage of Portuguese in Canada, with my riding of Cambridge being home to over 20,000 Portuguese Canadians. Portuguese Canadians have helped to build our great nation. Today they are contributing to every occupation and profession. Their contributions to Canada and my riding of Cambridge are immense.

As they reflect with pride on their heritage and their accomplishments, I wish to extend a happy Portugal Day to all Portuguese Canadians. I wish to say Viva Portugal, especially after it won 4-0 against Poland.

* * *

PHILIPPINE HERITAGE WEEK

Ms. Judy Wasylcia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today marks the beginning of Philippine Heritage Week in Manitoba. It is a time for all Canadians to reflect on the richness of our multicultural mosaic and to take pride in being the most spectacularly diverse country in the world. Nowhere is this fact more celebrated than in Winnipeg.

This week we commemorate the proud achievements of our Filipino community who number more than 40,000 and contribute in outstanding ways to Manitoba's social, economic and political life. The festivities held in conjunction with the 104th anniversary of Philippine independence convey a message of universal significance that transcends cultural and linguistic barriers.

This week the Filipino community in Manitoba will celebrate and share with the whole community expressions of joy for the freedom and independence of Filipino people everywhere. It is a time for all of us to pay tribute to the nation building efforts of Filipino Canadians and to rededicate ourselves to the priorities of intercultural understanding, mutual respect and universal acceptance of Canada's cultural diversity.

* * *

● (1410)

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the year 2002, the Bloc Québécois has uncovered a whole series of facts that raise doubts about the integrity of certain Liberal ministers.

The departure of Alfonso Gagliano for Denmark was just the tip of the iceberg, which is becoming unbelievably huge.

The Prime Minister and his government set up a sponsorship program with the stated objective of counteracting sovereignists in

S. O. 31

Quebec. In their despicable mission, they turned to advertising agencies whose close connections with the Liberal Party are a well known fact. Millions of dollars in taxpayers' money were diverted for purely partisan reasons.

The Prime Minister may claim that, by seeing the Canadian flag, Quebecers have become more federalist, but we have our doubts about this. In fact, his comments are just a clumsy attempt to make people forget that friends of the Liberal Party unfairly benefited from public funds.

* * *

[English]

SNOWBOARDING

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week the International Ski Federation awarded the prestigious World Snowboard Championships to Whistler, B.C. to be held from January 22 to January 30, 2005. This event has never been held outside of Europe and is a real coup for B.C.

The ski federation is a charter member of the Olympics. This recognition of Whistler as a worldclass site may bode well for our 2010 Olympic bid. The slopes used for the snowboard championships are the same ones proposed for the Alpine events in the Olympics. Snowboarding is a sport of youth and continues to increase in popularity. Whistler has long been the number one choice for worldclass snowboarders.

I wish to congratulate the Canadian Snowboard Federation and the Whistler organizing committee. Here is hoping for 2010.

* * *

VIA RAIL

Mr. Rex Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls, PC): Mr. Speaker, the silence of VIA Rail with regard to the spending of public money is deafening. Once again \$1 million of the public purse has been spent on advertising and sponsorship, but no one wants to give the public the answers it deserves.

It is time for the crown corporation to be accountable to the public. At issue is what kind of work was performed and why the sponsorship money was funnelled through VIA Rail. Something smells and it is not the pollution in the air. I will be recommending that the chairman of the VIA Rail board and the president and chief executive officer come before the transport committee and answer questions concerning the company's advertising and sponsorship programs.

VIA Rail is owned by the taxpayers of this country and they have a right to know how the money is being spent.

* * *

BURLINGTON

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, seven outstanding residents were recently honoured with civic recognition awards by the mayor of Burlington, Robert MacIsaac.

Oral Questions

A founding member of the Burlington Art Centre, Elizabeth Pudsey was named Arts Person of the Year. Athletes of the Year were award-winning rower and equestrian, Roslyn MacLeod, and Samantha Magalas, a member of Team Canada's women's baseball team and Assumption High School's 2001 student of the year and female athlete of the year. Sportsperson of the Year was Jennifer Cheyne O'Brien, coach of Burlington's Ice Image synchronized skating teams.

Community service awards went to Ross Cotton and Lee Fiamelli. Mr. Cotton is an active volunteer with the Burlington Committee for the Physically Challenged while Mr. Fiamelli has volunteered at Brantwood Lifecare Centre for 40 years. Our Junior Citizen of the Year was Jayde Duncombe who is involved in many activities at Nelson High School and in our community.

I wish to congratulate Elizabeth, Roslyn, Samantha, Jennifer, Ross, Lee and Jayde. Their work enriches our community and our country. I wish to say, way to go Team Burlington.

* * *

MILLENNIUM SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. Rob Merrifield (Yellowhead, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute today to four winners of the millennium scholarship from the beautiful riding of Yellowhead.

The recipients for the 2002-2003 academic year are: Tomas Rochford from St. Joseph School, Whitecourt; Myka Jones from Hilltop High School, Whitecourt; Laura McPherson from Grande Cache Community High School, Grande Cache; and Sheena Ptokipchuk from Mayerthorpe High School, Mayerthorpe.

Their hard work, curiosity and dedication to their studies has led them to these honours. I wish to congratulate them for their academic achievements and wish them much success as they continue their studies. I also wish to congratulate the dedicated teachers and supportive parents who have made their own contributions to these achievements.

Tomas, Myka, Laura and Sheena, we wish them all the best as they begin their university studies and look forward to hearing from them in the future as they contribute to a better Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ): Mr. Speaker, while friends of the Liberals are making a killing under a system that allows them to get contracts before calls for tenders are even issued and that provides a double billing mechanism, the Liberal government is incapable of ensuring day to day administration.

It is dragging its feet regarding the announcement of investments for highway 185. It is letting Les Escoumins pier go into disrepair, even though it owns it, thus jeopardizing the ferry season, the jobs of 26 workers and the whole tourism industry in the area. Moreover, the government is abandoning the provinces, which are the victims of a fiscal imbalance that is choking them.

It is high time that the federal government set up an independent public inquiry to shed light on the whole system that led to the sponsorship scandal, and started to take its responsibilities again.

The Prime Minister must put an end to the shenanigans, even though he initiated them.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

● (1415)

[English]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Stephen Harper (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we have more questions on these contract scandals. We now know that the Prime Minister was aware of the sponsorship scams in September 2000.

This is what the Prime Minister did. He had his most senior officials huddle for a damage control session. Then the internal audit was sanitized and published without the names of the offending companies. Since that time tax dollars have kept flowing to these Liberal firms.

How does the Prime Minister justify this behaviour?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in fact the internal audit was posted on the Internet on October 11, 2000. The only changes that were made were those required by the Access to Information Act and the privacy legislation. Otherwise there were no material differences whatsoever.

Media reports began to appear the very next day, October 12, 2000, as evidenced on page 3 of the *Globe and Mail*. Obviously this was not a secret operation.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Of course, Mr. Speaker, absolutely nothing changed for two years.

[Translation]

Even before the meeting in the Prime Minister's office, government authorities summoned officials from the five large firms to attend a meeting: Boulay, Brault, Coffin, Gosselin and so on.

The financial audit was released without names and, since then, millions of dollars in contracts have been paid, with taxpayers' money, to these Liberal companies. Is this how the government thinks Canadians' money should be used?

Oral Questions

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, indeed immediately upon the completion of the internal audit, which again I would say the auditor general has described as excellent, courageous and a critical piece of work, an action plan was developed in order to correct what the audit had revealed. That action plan was implemented over the course of the following 12 to 15 months. There was a review conducted in the spring of this year to verify that in fact the corrective action had been taken.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it was an action plan that led to nothing other than the companies getting more money.

Here is a specific example of what I am talking about. First, last week the Minister of Public Works and Government Services claimed it was natural justice for the government to continue to do business with Groupaction. Then after pressure he told us he would essentially not approve any more business. Today what do we learn? We now learn that there have already been back channels set up for more contracts with Groupaction through other departments.

How far is the government going to go to keep taxpayer money flowing to its friends?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear about the action that was taken last week.

Where my department is the contracting agent on behalf of either itself or any other department or agency of government, new advertising business to Groupaction will not be entertained. Whenever there is business caught in process by this decision, it will be reviewed on a case by case basis. My department is contacting every other agency of the Government of Canada to draw this position to their attention.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the one thing in that answer you will notice is that between 2000 and now, nothing happened, zero.

The Prime Minister sent his personal advisors to this meeting. They knew what was happening and they had a choice. They could have chosen to clean it up or cover it up. Why did the Prime Minister and the Liberal government choose to cover up the sleaze in public works?

● (1420)

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since the internal audit was posted on the Internet on October 11, 2000 it is hardly a cover-up. The matter in fact was public in the *Globe and Mail* on page 3 the very next day, Thursday, October 12. This was obviously not a covert operation.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the real question is what did the government do when it was made

public? Absolutely nothing. The money flowed. The money continues to flow even today.

The government had an opportunity. It could clean up or cover up. My question stands. Why did the government choose to cover up the sleaze in public works?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister and officials at the time undertook an action plan that was intended to address the deficiencies that had been found in the internal audit. The action plan was prepared and the implementation began in the early part of 2001. Through the following 12 to 15 months the action plan was implemented. There was a further review by the internal auditor this spring to confirm that the necessary corrective action had in fact been taken.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister knew as early as September 2000 that the sponsorship program had been used for a gross abuse of tax dollars. However, because he was in a hurry to call a general election, the Prime Minister preferred to keep quiet about the whole thing.

The most influential members of his cabinet even prepared a comprehensive communications strategy, in case the Prime Minister would be asked about this most damning scandal for the government.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister admit that the strategy devised on September 28, 2000 by the Prime Minister's closest advisors has all the makings of a cover-up operation prepared on the very eve of an election campaign?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how it could be a camouflage operation when the internal audit was posted on the Internet, when it appeared in newspapers the very next day and when every ATIP request since has been responded to.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this cover-up operation included, among other measures, having the ethics counsellor testify, since he was a mere puppet of the Prime Minister during the election campaign.

In the fall of 2000, the Deputy Prime Minister not only decided to hide the scope of the irregularities condemned in the public works report, he even gave his blessing to the continuation of an operation which he knew was quite improper.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister recognize that because of his determination to protect his government on the eve of the election, to this day the sponsorship program continues to lead to the worst possible abuse, so much so that the minister of public works says that it is indefensible?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, as the Prime Minister has indicated and as the Deputy Prime Minister has indicated, the errors and mistakes of the past cannot be condoned. We do not condone them. We make no effort to defend the indefensible. We think mistakes were made. We are determined to correct those mistakes in future, including finding an alternate delivery mechanism that does not use external agencies.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was fully informed about the numerous irregularities in the Public Works Canada sponsorship program. Instead of putting an end to it, his strategy was to acquire a communications plan for damage control in case this got out, and as a result, millions of dollars worth of contracts were awarded subsequently without the government doing anything to stop it.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Is there not something basically immoral about withdrawing a question of such seriousness from public debate just before a general election?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, it was hardly withdrawn from public debate. It was posted on the Internet. It was published in the *Globe and Mail*. ATIP responses have been made to the requests that have followed. I have a mandate from the Prime Minister to find out where the errors happened, to correct them, and to make sure they never happen again.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in his attempt to defend the indefensible, the minister of public works is using an argument that does not hold water. Putting the report on the Internet, with the names obliterated along with half the information, is of no importance. The fact is, the situation continued despite the PM's knowledge of it.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister admit that the PM's strategy, after he learned about the situation in 2000, was not to settle the problem but to conceal things and protect his buddies? This is what he is being faulted for.

• (1425)

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the changes that were made in terms of the deletion of information that appeared on the Internet were those changes that are in fact required by the laws of this House having to do with access to information and the privacy legislation. Otherwise there was no material change. Publishing on the Internet is hardly keeping it secret.

POVERTY

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I know the Prime Minister has been busy these days fighting off mutinies and scandals, but it is about time he paid attention to issues of daily survival not of himself but of Canadians facing poverty.

Today the Canadian Association of Food Banks released a scathing report showing that twice as many people need food banks today compared to in 1989. How does the Prime Minister reconcile his support for ending world hunger at the Rome summit while here at home three million Canadians are victims of his government's legislated poverty?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, certainly the incidence of poverty in Canada is something that all of us deplore and against which we need to continue to make efforts.

It is also important to recognize that the number of Canadians with low incomes continues to decline. It has declined from 14% in 1996 to 11.8% in 1999. The number of jobs has increased. Over the first five months of this year 237,000 jobs have been created. That is going to make a major contribution to reducing the number of people living in poverty.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we have heard the same mantra before. If these figures are correct, why is it that child poverty has doubled in this country since the resolution was passed by the House in 1989? Why has food bank usage gone up so much?

The same report from the food bank association specifically exposes government policies like EI cuts that have driven families into poverty.

I ask again, where is the evidence that the government's actions have reduced poverty rather than increased it?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to deny the progress that has been made, to fail to recognize the important contribution that has occurred to alleviate poverty in Canada through the child tax credit, other directed tax measures, support for housing, support for homelessness and the fact that we have made real progress in creating employment in this country, why put Canadians against a plan to try to alleviate poverty elsewhere in the world? This is a project which all of us need to identify with.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, clearly when prominent Liberals are awarded millions in contracts, who benefits is the Liberal Party, not Canadian taxpayers.

Oral Questions

On Friday I asked the auditor general to investigate a \$17 million sweetheart deal awarded to Tim Banks, the solicitor general's close friend and fundraiser. No one questions the project's merits or island investment, but one does question the partisan process and the dodging of detail.

Will the government simply table all the documents, including the list of bidders, and will it support a call for a full forensic audit on the Greenwich deal?

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Marzil (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I simply want to inform our colleague that these grants were given to the organization in accordance with the standard rules and with our programs.

[English]

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary should inform himself.

The public works minister said he would not defend the indefensible yet more RCMP investigations and the suspending of business with some Liberal ad firms will not suffice.

These are not administrative errors. These are not coincidences that Liberals are consistently the beneficiaries of rich Liberal contracts. This is part of a deliberate plan by the Liberal Party to preserve power. The equation is simple: Liberal contacts equal Liberal contracts. Greenwich development is a prime example.

Will the government suspend the payment of this rich rental reward program until a full forensic audit is complete?

• (1430)

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Marzil (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is important to understand one thing. First, the interpretive centre's construction was entirely funded by the APM through public-private partnership. Then, the lease was signed with Parks Canada.

Therefore, there is a big difference between the facts and the hon. member's fanciful imagination.

[English]

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, thanks to a diligent *Globe and Mail* reporter and not the questionable internal audits at public works, we learned that the government shelled out \$330,000 for a fish and game show that never took place and it never demanded the money back. It is still sitting there.

It is becoming clear that the entire Liberal cabinet sat by while taxpayers are on the hook for another outrageous abuse of their money. If, as the minister says, he is truly serious about accountability and transparency, will he stand up today and tell us which of his cabinet colleagues on his committee signed off on dirty deals like this?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the media have reported, this file causes me deep concern. I have asked my officials to review it very

carefully. That process is ongoing and I would confirm that they have referred it to the appropriate police authorities.

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Another referral is great, Mr. Speaker, but where is the money? Why is the government not demanding the money back if it did not buy the services that were offered?

Canadians can no longer trust the government to help clean up this mess. We need a full blown public inquiry. When will the minister announce one?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the issue of recovery of the money, I would confirm that I commenced those proceedings this morning.

[Translation]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government's reaction to the sponsorship programs scandal really confirmed that it was aware of these scandalous affairs and directly involved in them.

How can the Prime Minister explain that, instead of getting Canadians' money back, his government's first response was to meet with the firms involved that benefited from the system to warn them all to be careful in the future?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, immediately upon the conclusion of the internal audit corrective measures began to be taken. Those measures were implemented throughout the course of 2001 and continued to the spring of this year. In the spring of this year my predecessor sent the internal auditors back in to verify that in fact the appropriate action had been taken, of which they were able to do in the spring of this year.

[Translation]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that these measures have not yet been very successful. New scandals come to light everyday.

The second cover-up attempt by the government was to implement a communications strategy to keep the affair out of the public eye.

Will the Prime Minister or the Deputy Prime Minister admit that by acting in such a manner, the government put the interests of the Liberal Party of Canada ahead of the public interest, and that this is unacceptable? This man, the Prime Minister, violated his oath of office.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the evidence shows that the internal audit was published on the Internet on October 11, 2000. The following day media reports appeared, including on page 3 of the *Globe and Mail*.

ATIP requests were responded to. This was obviously not a secret endeavour. It was an endeavour where issues were found in a program that needed to be corrected and the government began the process of correction.

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, could it be just a coincidence that the treasury board, the justice department, the defence department, the fisheries department, Canada customs and the independent supposedly revenue agency, the office of the privacy commissioner, the CRTC and the fisheries department all just happened to have independently chosen Groupaction to do their work?

When will the government tell all government department that there is no more business for Groupaction or any of their related companies?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in respect of that type of business that would be contracted through the Department of Public Works and Government Services, which would be the largest portion of it, the action has already been taken.

My deputy minister and I are also drawing this matter to the attention of every other official in the Government of Canada who may have contracting responsibility apart from public works. We will ensure that they know full well the position of our department.

•(1435)

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, really this cover up sounds more like Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Colson and Dean, and the government should remember what happened to Richard Nixon.

I will quote the public works minister who said: "You can't defend the indefensible. You can't deny the undeniable". The government cannot deny nor can it defend the obvious corruption, cronyism, incompetence and cover up.

When will it give Canadians what they are demanding, a full public inquiry?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I previously outlined the inquiries undertaken by my department, treasury board, the auditor general, the police, the public accounts committee and so on.

All dimensions of this matter are being very thoroughly investigated. I would say that it would be politically convenient on the floor of the House if I could respond to the hon. gentleman with a

broadside political blunderbuss, but I would prefer to take this step by step, meticulously along the way to ensure that every step is sound and secure and we get to the ultimate destination, and that is cleaning up this problem.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government's third step was to produce a report full of deletions, a censored report, on the Public Works and Government Services Canada web site so as to cover up the reality. It was a real crossword puzzle.

How can the Prime Minister claim to have tried to find a solution when, with the November 2000 election behind him, he again appointed the same minister, Alfonso Gagliano, so that the good old schemes could continue?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I made inquiries with my officials to examine this issue with respect to what appeared on the Internet. I am advised that aside from the severances of third party proprietary information, as required by the Access to Information Act and privacy legislation, there are no differences between the audit reports posted on the Internet and the final audit that was approved by my department.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, is not the mere fact that the Prime Minister decided in March 2002 to implement the communications plan that his personal advisers had already concocted in September 2000 proof that the Prime Minister is still trying to cover up the sponsorship scandal so that everything can go on as before?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, in asking me to take on this responsibility, asked me to find out where the problems were and to correct them. His instructions were very clear. There are problems that need to be addressed. They must be addressed in a sound and solid way so that we can have transparency, accountability and full value for taxpayer dollars.

That is the mandate I have and that is the mandate on which I intend to deliver.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have a straightforward question for the government. Could the public works minister tell us how many different matters he has referred to the RCMP since he took over the portfolio 15 days ago?

Oral Questions

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have thus far declined to get into the numbers game with respect to police references. If I am asked a direct question about a direct file, I will give a direct answer. However I will avoid speculation and being drawn into hypothetical supplementaries because if I allow myself to fall into that trap then sooner or later somebody will interfere with the police investigation and I do not want that to happen.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we know that the government is moving slowly and unsurely. However we are not after details here that may affect any police investigation.

Would someone over there please tell the taxpayers of Canada how many matters relating to the government's advertising, sponsorship and communications contracting are currently under investigation by the RCMP?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again the hon. gentleman is inviting speculation. Quite frankly, if we engage in that game sooner or later we will be tripping over something that fouls up a police investigation and I will not do that. It is extremely important in this matter that we take it step by step and that we are meticulous and careful to ensure that the police are able to do their job.

* * *

• (1440)

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Massimo Pacetti (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is a world leader in the field of biotechnology. In 2001 Canada was home to the second largest number of biotechnology companies in the world, with over 400 biotechnology firms. This burgeoning sector of the economy has obvious benefits for our knowledge based economy.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry tell the House what the government is doing to encourage the growth of this innovative biotechnology sector?

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Marcil (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to inform the House that when the Minister of Industry addressed the delegates to BioConference 2002 in Toronto today, he announced that the Business Development Bank of Canada would target \$200 million of venture capital investments in the biotechnology sector over the next five years.

This investment is an important step in Canada's innovation strategy, which aims to double the amount invested in Canadian research and development by 2010.

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Canada-U.S. softwood lumber agreement expired on March 31, 2001. More than one year later the government has had no success in negotiations having to desperately rely upon challenges of the WTO and NAFTA. These remedies could take to mid-2003 to reach a decision.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Finance, so forth and so forth. On Friday the minister told the media that we would have to deal with the impact of softwood tariffs somehow. Aside from the marketing contracts that will benefit U.S. firms or Liberal fundraisers through media campaigns, will the minister invest in Canadian communities and families devastated by the government's inability to handle this trade dispute?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I share the point of view of the Deputy Prime Minister, and he shares my point of view of course, that Canada's industry and the Government of Canada will indeed prevail at the WTO and at NAFTA. We all have to work for a clear win at WTO and at NAFTA.

In the meantime, my colleague, the Minister of Human Resources Development, has ensured that her department will reply and respond well to the needs of our individuals and our communities, and we are monitoring that very closely. We are also working with the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Industry to find solutions.

* * *

AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, while they are still planning and not reacting, they are hanging the families out to dry in this indifference. They seem to be content with the ignorance and they show equal indifference to the auto industry.

The auto industry is vital to the economy of Ontario and all of Canada. It has seen well over 15,000 jobs disappear in the past two years with more to come. Earlier this year the Canadian auto workers put forward a comprehensive strategy for the federal government to take action and protect auto jobs and the industry in Canada.

Will the minister take action to address the facing crisis or will he stand idly by as with the softwood lumber where he has done the exact same thing?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the member has only 35 seconds to put his question but he should give us a break because I am afraid that I missed some of the words.

What I would like to reiterate to the House is that as far as the trade policy and trade negotiations are concerned, we have a very skilful team that is really promoting Canada's interest. We have been having a good stretch, including the exemption of steel from U.S. action. We will continue to do the same thing on softwood lumber.

I think our trade policy is going very well.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Oral Questions

The Speaker: I am sure both the member for Windsor West and the Minister for International Trade appreciate all the assistance they are receiving from other hon. members, but it is tough for the Chair to hear the questions or the answers when there is this much assistance offered at the same time.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, last week the new Minister of Public Works and Government Services said that government programs had been systematically abused and that abuse may well be systemic. Parliament and Canadians deserve to know how many RCMP investigations are underway.

This is not a hypothetical question. This is a serious question. How many RCMP investigations are currently underway?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, I do not intend to speculate upon what the police may or may not be doing. From time to time issues arise that raise legal questions. The proper officials within the Government of Canada refer those matters to the RCMP. It is up to the RCMP to determine whether it will investigate or not and I will not impinge upon its work.

• (1445)

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is frightening to think that the minister does not know the answer to that question.

Contracting scandals, RCMP investigations, auditor general investigations, corruption covers that group of lads over there like scum on a pond. How many referrals to the RCMP and the auditor general will it take to make the government concede to our demand for a full and accountable, by the way, public inquiry into all government contracts?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would of course for political reasons love to match the hon. gentleman's inflammatory rhetoric, but I am dealing with a serious problem in a serious way.

I have been asked by the Prime Minister to solve the issues in this portfolio. I intend to do so and I am not going to allow idle speculation to interfere with the process.

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, every time there is a new revelation of misdeeds involving advertising and sponsorship the Prime Minister shrugs his shoulders and says "These things happen". The minister of public works speaks in calm tones and defends his predecessor's half measures.

For weeks we have been asking for a freeze on all discretionary ad contracts. What is the government afraid of and what is it covering up?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status

Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again with respect to the action that I took last week, I want to make it clear that where my department as the contracting agent either on behalf of itself or on behalf of any other government department or agency new advertising business to the firm Groupaction will not be entertained.

We are examining business that is caught in process on a case by case basis and we are making it abundantly clear to all other government departments what our position is.

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, another day, another cover up. Canadians are losing track of all the contracts, all the scams and all the players. We know this much. Taxpayers send their hard earned money to Ottawa and this gang ships it by the millions to its Liberal pals.

The RCMP has been called in to look at more and more cases and files. Canadians deserve a full public inquiry. Why will the government not order one?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a full departmental review is underway by my department. The treasury board will be conducting an examination about management frameworks and governance system having to do with sponsorships, advertising and polling. The public accounts committee is holding meetings and hearings. Wherever matters involve legal questions, references are made to the police. Of course the auditor general will be conducting a government-wide inquiry with all the powers that she has under the Auditor General Act.

[Translation]

Ms. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the facts indicate that not only is the public works department involved in what has now become known as the sponsorship scandal, but even the Prime Minister's entourage and office are in it up to the neck.

When it is possible to show that the problem, far from being limited to the public works department, goes all the way up to the Office of the Prime Minister, is it not legitimate to think that the only credible way left of getting to the bottom of this is through an independent public inquiry?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the events of the year 2000 show that the department of public works itself instigated the internal audit. That internal audit section of the department is described as excellent and courageous by the auditor general.

The work was done. Following the work, an implementation plan was developed to address the deficiencies that the internal audit discovered. In the spring of the year 2000 the process was reviewed again to make sure that the steps that needed to be taken had in fact been taken.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Ms. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how can the Deputy Prime Minister think that a piecemeal inquiry could get to the bottom of this, when it is clear that what we have here is an organized system, a system which the Prime Minister knew about and encouraged?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when the auditor general appeared before the public accounts committee last week, the auditor general said it was her hope that by the time she had completed her next audit, between now and the year 2003, she would be able to report that there were problems but that the government had proactively addressed them. That is my hope as well and I intend to deliver.

• (1450)

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, there has been plenty of time since the question was first asked and not answered for an assistant to pass the minister a note with the answer to a simple question.

There is no speculation here. It is not a subjective question. It is an objective question. How many investigations are underway by the RCMP on these government scandals? How many? It is a number question. How many?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with that question. References have been made to the RCMP. Only the RCMP will know which investigations they are undertaking.

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is easy to understand that there were so many he lost count.

Here is a different question. The federal government spent \$333,000 to sponsor a hunting and fishing show in Quebec City. The event was cancelled. It did not happen. My question has two parts and it is very simple. Who got the money and what did they do with it?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for reasons similar to the ones expressed in the question, that matter has been referred to the RCMP and I have taken steps today to begin the process of recovering the money.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL AID

Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Brampton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Cooperation. Last week the tragic collapse of the Zeyzoun dam in northern Syria resulted in numerous deaths and the evacuation of thousands of people from several flooded villages in the area. Will the minister

indicate what action the Canadian government has taken in response to this calamity?

Hon. Susan Whelan (Minister for International Cooperation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is concerned about the collapse of the Zeyzoun dam and we would like to extend our sympathies to the victims of this disaster.

We would also like to commend the government of Syria and the local Red Crescent Society for their prompt action in addressing the needs of the victims of this disaster.

Today I am announcing that Canada, through CIDA, will be contributing \$50,000 to the International Federation of the Red Cross to support the efforts of providing basic food, shelter and other needs to the over 8,000 Syrians who were left homeless.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, VIA Rail's operation loses \$165 million every year, which is paid for by the Canadian taxpayer.

Recently it was disclosed that VIA Rail was a \$1 million sponsor of a film production of the life of Maurice Richard.

Why is a government operation, subsidized by taxpayers in the amount of almost half a million dollars a day, spending \$1 million it does not have to sponsor the production of a hockey film?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there were questions about this file that troubled both me and my officials. The appropriate steps have been taken to invite an inquiry by the RCMP.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government manages to hand over a \$165 million subsidy each year to VIA without any outside help, so why was it necessary to pay Lafleur Communications Marketing a commission of \$112,000 to transfer this extra \$1 million from public works to VIA Rail? Is it because of its \$57,000 donation to the Liberal Party or is it just another way to cover up yet another fund-skimming scam?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a reference to the RCMP is hardly a cover-up

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we now know that the Prime Minister is directly involved in the sponsorship scandal and sanctioned it for close to two years.

When the Deputy Prime Minister refuses to defend the Prime Minister, is this not because the PM does not want to have a public inquiry because he is trying to protect his government, the Liberal Party of Canada, and above all, himself?

Oral Questions

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister of public works has answered questions properly. Perhaps the hon. member thinks the PMO ought not to be informed when a question is likely to be raised in the House or by the media.

Perhaps he thinks the Privacy Act ought to be ignored. I am not exactly familiar with his plan.

* * *

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs. As a result of the rising tension in India and Pakistan, many constituents in my riding of Etobicoke North are very concerned about their friends and relatives who are situated in the region. Could the minister tell us today what our government is prepared to do to help reduce this tension and resolve the problem?

• (1455)

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that last week I contacted the ministers of foreign affairs of both India and Pakistan. I urged the minister of Pakistan to end the terrorist attacks of any kind and any support of the Pakistani government, and we urged India to take steps to reduce tension between the two countries.

I will be meeting with my G-8 partners later this week. We will be addressing the issue of India-Pakistan. We believe that we can bring a co-ordinated approach to bear on this issue, which will enable the parties to get to a peaceful solution to what is an extremely dangerous situation.

* * *

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government has shown its real desperation on Kyoto. We are now advised that the former finance minister authorized a \$250 million endowment to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. These funds are being used in part to convince municipalities to endorse Kyoto.

Why is the government using taxpayers' money to promote its political position on Kyoto through a third party?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this appears to be the day for members of the Alliance to discover things that are long in the past. This was all announced in the budget, in two separate budgets one after the other. They have suddenly discovered it today. It has been a long time since we have had either the 2000 budget or the 2001 budget.

With reference to the work being done by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, there are a number of very imaginative projects. They are all fully available and he can get to the website of the FCM and find out what they are.

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Ms. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at the strategy meeting held to draw up communications tactics for the Prime Minister in case the sponsorship scandal hit the front pages before the election, privy council staff was also present.

How can the President of the Privy Council and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs explain that he too sanctioned this entire cover-up operation before the general election, when he was very well informed right from the start on the gravity of the situation?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a story like this cannot be fabricated. When faced with a situation like this one, it is normal for members of the PMO to be informed, not just public servants.

It is necessary. How could the Prime Minister answer questions if his staff were not informed? It is simple. That is all there is to it. There is no question of it being a cover-up.

* * *

CHILD POVERTY

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in 1989, parliament adopted a resolution to put an end to child poverty.

Since this commitment was made, the number of people relying on food banks in Canada has doubled, from 378,000 to 718,000. In Montreal alone, one out of every two children is not fed properly.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. In addition to the measly \$680 million for housing, when will the government take new measures to finally follow up on the commitment made by parliament and end poverty for these children?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that the 1990s were difficult for all Canadians, including those already living in poverty.

As a result of specific interventions made by the government, in partnership with the provinces and territories, we are, since 1996, seeing a decline in child poverty. Just two weeks ago, along with my colleagues, the provincial social services ministers, we presented the national children's benefit report. In it, the hon. member will see that child poverty has been reduced from 20.5% in 1996 to 17.2% in 1999.

He will see that the estimated 1.2 million families and about 2.1 million children saw an increase in their incomes. There—

The Speaker: The hon. member for St. John's West.

VOISEY'S BAY

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, the government of Newfoundland and Labrador has been negotiating with Inco for quite some time concerning the development of the Voisey's Bay site.

The main reason for the delay is concern over benefits to the province. Jobs are essential, as royalties are just clawed back by the federal government.

In light of this, does the Minister of Finance not think it is time to develop a system that sees have not provinces benefit more from the development of their resources?

• (1500)

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member knows that the equalization formula is reviewed periodically.

Certainly we will be interested in the views of provinces when it comes time for the next review of that, but in the meantime I think it is important to recognize that all provinces realize revenue and the equalization payments are based in part on their capacity to realize revenue. Surely that is fundamental to this kind of system.

* * *

[Translation]

HEALTH

Ms. Yolande Thibeault (Saint-Lambert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, according to experts, levels of obesity among Canadians, including children, continue to rise, thus putting considerable pressure on Canada's health care plan. Bad food habits and a lack of physical activity are among the causes of this trend.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health inform the House of the measures that can be taken to ensure that Canadians, and particularly young people, end this pattern, improve their health and enjoy a better lifestyle?

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a very important question that concerns all of us in this House.

As we know, one of the things that is not costly and that we can do to maintain and improve our state of health is simply to do some physical activity and lose some of that tummy. This would ease the pressure on our joints, improve our blood circulation, and it would be good for our heart and legs.

Of course, the Government of Canada is aware of the seriousness of the situation. Health Canada invested \$4 million to work with the provinces and territories, and with volunteer groups—

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order concerning oral question period, which took place a bit earlier today.

Routine Proceedings

I ask the Speaker to look into a statement made by a Bloc Quebecois member, in which he accused another member of the House of having *trahi son mandat d'office*, of having violated his oath of office.

I draw your attention to page 153 of the 6th French edition of *Beauchesne*, which clearly lists the word “*trahison*” as unparliamentary. I have requested a copy of *Hansard* for November 18, 1957 and July 15, 1959, in order to see the context in which the Speaker gave his ruling at the time.

However, accusing another member of having *trahi son mandat d'office*, as if *trahi* is not bad enough—I think that these are the exact words, if you check—cannot be considered parliamentary, let alone be accepted without going against the decorum of the House.

I therefore ask the Speaker to look into this as soon as is possible.

The Speaker: The Chair appreciates the comments of the hon. Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons.

I will carefully examine the remarks in question in today's *Hansard* and I will get back to the House if necessary.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1505)

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Hon. Andy Scott (Fredericton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 14th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

[English]

Pursuant to its order of reference of February 26 the committee has undertaken a statutory review of the mental disorder provisions of the criminal code and has prepared this report. Pursuant to Standing Order 109 the committee requests that the government provide a comprehensive response within 150 days of the tabling of this report in the House of Commons.

Routine Proceedings

Further, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 15th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. Pursuant to its order of reference of February 19 the committee has considered the subject matter of Bill C-284, an act to amend the criminal code (offences by corporations, directors and officers), and recommends that the government table in the House legislation to deal with the criminal liability of corporations, directors and officers. Pursuant to Standing Order 109 the committee requests that the government provide a comprehensive response within 150 days of the tabling of this report in the House of Commons.

I wish to thank the members of the committee. Both of these reports were unanimous and that is reliant on the goodwill and good effort of all members. I wish to thank them and staff on both counts.

* * *

PENSION BENEFITS STANDARDS ACT, 1985

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-474, an act to amend the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is an act to amend the Pension Benefits Standards Act to give more protection to members of pension plans. It does that in three or four ways but the highlight of the bill would ensure that there is adequate representation on the boards of trustees and pension committees and on the different counsel to pensions on behalf of the pension holders themselves.

It would also put a limit of some 10% of the amount of money that may be held in securities by the employer of that particular pension plan. This comes out of the problems that were found in Enron a little while ago in the United States. The bill would provide more protection for Canadians in terms of their pension plans.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I am pleased to read into the record the concerns of people from my constituency and beyond. They are concerned that the creation and use of child pornography is being condemned by the clear majority of Canadians. Yet the government is not taking proper action.

The petitioners call upon parliament to protect our children and take all necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote and glorify pedophilia do now cease.

HOUSING

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House to present a petition consisting of about 90 pages that calls on the government to enact a proper national housing strategy. These petitioners also support what is called the 1% solution for housing. This would ensure that there are adequate resources dedicated to the provision of affordable housing for every Canadian.

I would like to particularly thank Daniel Dufresne from Calgary who spent many hours collecting many of these petitions. They signify the great weight and importance that Canadians attach to ensuring that affordable housing is available to everyone in the country.

• (1510)

[Translation]

CANADA POST

Mr. Jean-Yves Roy (Matapédia—Matane, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present in the House a petition to recognize that Canada Post Corporation workers who deliver mail in rural areas should be able to benefit from acceptable working conditions, unlike what has been done in the past.

[English]

Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I have the privilege to present to the House a petition with some 30 signatures from concerned citizens.

The petition draws to the attention of parliament that rural route mail couriers have not been allowed to bargain collectively to improve their wages and working conditions. Since other workers who deliver mail in cities and rural areas have collective bargaining rights, the petition requests that parliament repeal section 13(5) of the Canada Post Corporation Act to permit rural route mail couriers to bargain collectively.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a constituent of mine, Mr. Bruce Fraser, who has collected 61 signatures. He would like to strengthen the laws concerning child pornography. He would like to send a strong message to pedophiles that we must protect our children against those who would exploit them. He is particularly concerned with the recent B.C. Supreme Court decision in light of John Robin Sharpe.

I would like to present this petition on behalf of Mr. Fraser and everybody in this country who would like to see a change to that.

[Translation]

CANADA POST

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition from signatories who are extremely concerned about the working conditions and pay of rural route mail couriers. This situation exists thanks to a clause in the Canada Post Corporation Act. To be precise, it is subsection 13(5), which prohibits them from benefiting from better working conditions than they currently have.

Therefore, I am happy to present this petition on their behalf.

Routine Proceedings

[English]

MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of constituents who call upon parliament to declare that Canada objects to the national missile defense program of the United States and that Canada should play a leadership role in banning nuclear weapons and missile flight tests.

[Translation]

VETERANS

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting a petition signed by veterans from my area, the Caraquet area. They are asking the Minister of Veterans Affairs and parliament to dedicate a wing of the Caraquet Hospital to veterans from the Acadian peninsula.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

M. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NPD): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition to present. Since there are nearly one million jobless people who do not have access to employment insurance, the petitioners call upon the Parliament of Canada to make changes to EI.

GASOLINE PRICES

M. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NPD): Mr. Speaker, I have a final petition from the people of my area, calling upon parliament to urge the government to strike an energy pricing commission so that oil companies will be forced to justify the gas price hikes that are being imposed on Canadians.

[English]

ADOPTION

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 it is my pleasure to present a petition signed by dozens of citizens from across Canada wishing to bring to the attention of the government the great contribution that adoptive parents make to Canadian society.

In addition to this and subsequent petitions I will present I have been inundated with hundreds of phone calls, faxes, e-mails and letters on this subject. The petitioners believe parliament should pass legislation similar to my private member's bill, Bill C-461, to provide for a tax deduction to help cover costs associated with adopting a child.

CANADA POST

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from people concerned about working conditions in the Peterborough post office. They point out that exposure to mold and asbestos is a proven cause of disease and that the Canada Post facility in Peterborough has continuing problems, both with mold and asbestos. They call upon parliament to encourage Canada Post to take all necessary action to ensure that its employees are not exposed to mold and asbestos.

● (1515)

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition from citizens in my area who are concerned about child pornography and about the way in which the courts have been interpreting the current law on child pornography. They call upon parliament to protect our children by taking all necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are outlawed.

[Translation]

CANADA POST

Ms. Diane Bourgeois (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I table a petition signed by people in my riding.

The signatories are concerned by the situation being experienced by rural route mail couriers who have, as we know, been fighting for some years to obtain Canada Post's recognition of their right to negotiate collectively and freely.

The petitioners call for these people, most of whom are women, to be treated fairly and given decent working conditions.

[English]

FISHERIES

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present a petition which draws to the attention of parliament the fact that the minister of fisheries has a constitutional obligation to protect wild fish and their habitat. The petitioners note that the auditor general and others have found that the minister of fisheries is not meeting this constitutional obligation. They call upon parliament to require the minister to fulfill his obligation to protect wild fish and their habitat from the effects of salmon farming.

[Translation]

CHEMICAL PESTICIDES

Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to table a petition signed by 170 people in the greater Montreal area. It reads:

[English]

The petitioners call upon parliament to enact an immediate moratorium on the cosmetic use of chemical pesticides until such time as their use has been scientifically proven to be safe.

[Translation]

They call for recognition of the long term impact of their use.

[English]

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I have the privilege to present to this House a petition signed by constituents of Crowfoot, and more specifically the communities of Three Hills and Trochu. The petition calls upon parliament to protect children by taking all necessary steps to ensure that materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are absolutely outlawed.

Government Orders

I fully support this petition which reflects the opinion of a majority of Canadians in condemning the creation and the use of child pornography.

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I would like to table two petitions today. These petitions have been signed by over 170 of my constituents from communities like Winkler, Morden, MacGregor, Portage la Prairie and Austin in Manitoba.

These petitions, as like a number of preceding petitions, point out the strong opposition of my constituents to the interpretations of the courts on child pornography laws. The petitioners call upon parliament to protect our children by taking all necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are outlawed.

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I too have a similar petition wherein the petitioners call upon parliament to protect their children by taking all necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochist activities involving children are outlawed.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

SPECIES AT RISK ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-5, An Act respecting the protection of wildlife species at risk in Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 5.

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after this slough of petitions, I am pleased to rise again and resume my comments on Bill C-5, the Species at Risk Act.

At the outset of my speech, I was trying to convince the House that there was a major inconsistency between what the provinces and the federal government agreed to on October 2, 1996, under the National Accord for the Protection of Species at Risk in Canada, and what we are debating today in the House, Bill C-5.

While we completely agree with the principles of the accord with regards to conservation—I say this because Quebec has already had an act respecting threatened species in place since 1989, as I stated, in addition to an act respecting the conservation and development of wildlife, and fishing regulations to protect threatened and vulnerable species on its lands—I point out that there is an inconsistency. The principles laid out in the accord clearly indicate that when it comes to protecting species, the federal government is committed to improving its co-operation with the provinces.

Again, the Quebec legislation on endangered species was passed in 1989 by the Liberal government of Robert Bourassa. Some of the Liberal members who supported this legislation are sitting in this House today. They are about to accept the fact that the government will pass a bill that will duplicate a Quebec act, overlap existing measures and create a double safety net, this in spite of what the Quebec national assembly did in 1989.

We on this side of the House can only condemn this blatant violation of the principles of co-operation that underlie the national accord for the protection of species at risk in Canada.

Through this bill, the federal government is trying to set aside the Quebec model of protection, which works fine. Here is what the then Minister of the Environment said in 1996 regarding this accord:

We cannot remain indifferent to the fact that this agreement opens the door to overlap between the future federal legislation—

the “future federal legislation” being Bill C-5 now before us.

—and the act that has been in force since 1989, an act that works well and has already proven useful.

The then Minister of the Environment added:

We risk creating more red tape instead of dedicating ourselves to what really matters to us: the fate of endangered species.

The then Quebec Minister of the Environment was right. We have before us a bill that will allow a federal act to apply on the Quebec territory. This is useless duplication. As I mentioned, the Quebec act already exists in Quebec and has allowed for the legal identification of over 340 species. Not only does this legislation allow us to identify species but, since 1989, a series of measures have been in place to allow for the implementation of recovery plans for endangered and threatened species

Today, in the year 2002, as the federal government is about to adopt a bill that affects the provinces, it was already 12 years ago that Quebec was defining principles to legally establish recovery plans for certain species. Direct enforcement was also provided for.

● (1520)

Certain clauses of the bill, especially 32 and 33, provide for direct enforcement. The proposed legislation would create federal officers responsible for enforcing this federal legislation on lands which would not necessarily be designated federal only or even come under federal jurisdiction. This legislation would allow these officers to take action on lands under provincial jurisdiction, when Quebec has had wildlife conservation officers for years now under its act respecting the conservation of wildlife.

Why duplicate officers? Why add a second group of enforcement officers, when the first is doing its job perfectly well?

Government Orders

This bill goes against the 1996 principles underlying the protection of endangered species in Canada. These principles are taken with co-operation. With this bill, they are now deciding to dispense with co-operation and bring in powerful legislation giving the federal government authority to interfere directly in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

The federal government is also deciding to make provision for a compensation scheme, but at the same time it is not, because it has just imposed a gag and has given itself permission to again put forward amendments which would alter the committee's decisions. This government could perfectly well have spelled out the compensation scheme. Beyond future regulations, it could have taken this golden opportunity to spell out the compensation scheme for landowners in Canada and in Quebec. But no. It has decided to ignore the studies done by the experts, such as well-known academic Mr. Pearce. The latter proposed that landowners who lost 10% of the value of their property be eligible for compensation of up to in excess of 50% of its value.

The government has decided to bring in legislation, but it is not sticking to its own jurisdiction. It has decided to interfere in provincial jurisdiction. Not only that, but it is refusing to tell us how the compensation scheme will work.

We are disappointed in the government's initiative and we will naturally be voting against it. A number of the amendments in Group No. 5 are, in our opinion, unacceptable. I will come back to this a little later. I now leave the floor to my colleagues.

● (1525)

[*English*]

Mr. Julian Reed (Halton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, considering that the debate has gone through clauses and so on, I would like to begin by making a remark in response to the member for Red Deer.

I was listening with great attention to what he had to say today about compensation, which is a huge issue for many of us in the House. If I heard him correctly, and I hope I did not, he suggested that the elimination of Motion No. 109 in the bill would somehow eliminate any attempt at compensation in the bill.

The fact is that the reverse is true. If the hon. member were to reread the bill he would find that the elimination of Motion No. 109 means that the government shall make regulations. It is very clear.

I will give him the benefit of not comprehending what is in the bill because I know, as a colleague working on the committee, that we all worked together with the best of intentions. I would hope that perhaps he could correct that at some later time.

One party complains that the compensation scheme will leave landowners stranded. Another party says that the compensation is outrageous and it should be done away with altogether. From one side we heard that the stick in the proposed bill is too soft a stick and that there is too much wiggle room for violators. On the other we hear that it is coercive and that it will not work.

I believe that over the many years and three manifestations of the bill we have actually come up with the Canadian thing. It has involved a good deal of compromise and understanding on the part of everyone but we believe we have something that will at last be

workable. I am not talking about a lot of compromises. It is a matter of balance.

The standing committee worked very hard on this over many years. Well over 300 motions were considered and over 120 amendments were passed. The government should be commended for its commitment to work with landowners, land users and resource users in the protection of species at risk.

The promise made by the Minister of the Environment to make compensation regulations shortly after proclamation and the subsequent withdrawal of Motion No. 109 is reflective of this commitment. I say to my hon. friends who are so upset about compensation that they should reread the bill so they can fully understand what is in it.

Motion No. 109 concerned clause 64 which provided for compensation. The effect of withdrawing the motion was that the governor in council will now be required to make regulations necessary for the provision of compensation under the act.

Bill C-5 is built on the principle of co-operation first. We are committed to a co-operative approach. Through the accord for the protection of species at risk signed in 1996 with the provinces and territories, we have already made it quite clear that we agree that co-operation is the way to get things done. After all, laws do not protect species, people protect species.

The protection of species at risk is the responsibility of every Canadian, whether they be rural or urban Canadians. We all have an impact on species and we should all be conscious of that.

● (1530)

There have been enough successes under the accord to show that our approach is right. We studied the United States and its legislation, held up as an example by those who support a different kind of approach, one that is more coercive. What we found was a backlog of court cases and a lot of will. That is not Canadian. It does not fit with our constitution. It is not who we are and it is not how we do things.

The policy development for this bill has taken nearly nine years. We have learned through trial and error and through study and research that the co-operative approach is the one we must lean on, the one we must foster, the one that each amendment must support.

We will see evidence of this in the government motions on voluntary measures to encourage landowners to protect critical habitat. I must commend the landowners in the country who have taken that to heart and are doing so much already.

This means too that scientists identify the critical habitat and activities that could destroy it and pass this along to landowners to try to find common sense solutions to preserve it. We are not living in a dreamworld here. We know there will be times, and we hope that they are few, when voluntary measures will not work. In that case the government will step in quickly and act decisively.

Government Orders

The legislation contains the steps to prohibit activities that could destroy the critical habitat of endangered species. It focuses on building co-operation rather than attempting to coerce action by Canadians. In other words, we are not going to clog the courtrooms and give rise to a new specialty of law if habitat in Canada goes unprotected.

We are going to work to get things done and quickly. This means getting out there on the land, on the waters, in the forests and on the shorelines.

A new general prohibition against any activities that may "adversely affect" critical habitat under federal jurisdiction for these reasons is not acceptable. We cannot have scientists' decisions triggering legal prohibitions. This both removes government's accountability as well as the incentive for stewardship as the first course of action.

The government has to protect critical habitat in its own jurisdiction. The government motions strengthen protection of critical habitat under federal authority.

We are moving to automatically protect critical habitat in national parks, marine protected areas, migratory bird sanctuaries and national wildlife areas.

To further strengthen the protection of critical habitat in other areas of federal jurisdiction, we are proposing mandatory protection if critical habitat is not protected through voluntary or other means within 180 days of identification. The timeline of 180 days provides an opportunity for those using the land or resources to voluntarily protect the critical habitat. At the same time, this approach ensures that critical habitat is protected in a timely manner.

The government and our partners will be working with those who use lands in federal jurisdiction to come up with voluntary measures to protect critical habitat. We are going to work as hard as we can to get stewardship arrangements into place to protect critical habitat within the timeframe.

The government is also proposing that the bill will require all federal ministers who are authorized under other federal acts to issue permits or licences for an activity to consider whether those activities could result in destruction of critical habitat prior to issuing the permits and licences.

The co-operative approach has won the support of many people. They have had a bit of trouble being heard but they are out there and they are already at work. We must ensure the approach we put forward continues a co-operative approach with these partners.

• (1535)

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to listen to my hon. colleague across the way. I want to start off exactly where he began his speech because I think he referred to clause 64 of the legislation.

He talked about Motion No. 109 that was withdrawn earlier today. It does change considerably the position the committee had which the government brought to the House earlier. I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that we understand only too well exactly what withdrawing the amendment means. It means that the

government, or the privy council, or the governor in council to use the exact technical phrase, shall make regulations.

That word shall is significant. It is something we wanted in the legislation absolutely, but we also wanted something else. While that is a step, it is such a baby step that it does not even take one-half size of a baby's shoe to move forward. The hon. member needs to recognize that putting it in a regulation does not have the same force as if it were in the legislation itself.

Moments ago just before the hon. member sat down he said there was mandatory protection of endangered species if they were not looked after within 180 days. That is in the legislation. That is not in the regulations. We are saying that the species at risk should be protected. However, it is not mandatory that the landowner or the person who suffered from the implementation of the act be compensated.

The only thing that is mandated is that regulations shall be created. It does not say when those regulations shall be created. It does not say what the compensation shall be. Let me read for the record the things the regulations are to cover. They are to cover:

(a) the procedures to be followed in claiming compensation; (b) the methods to be used in determining the eligibility of a person for compensation—

—the eligibility of a person, and that would include a corporation—

—the amount of loss suffered by a person and the amount of compensation in respect of any loss; and (c) the terms and conditions for the provision of compensation.

If those kinds of things were couched into what is a reasonable and fair compensation, one could say maybe some of these details ought not to be in the legislation. Something that ought to be in legislation is the principle on which the compensation shall be determined.

There is no doubt that the compensation should be determined on the basis of fair market value, not something that is apparently fair and reasonable. What is the point of talking about fair and reasonable? That gate is so wide open, the road is so wide as to drive us to wherever we want to go. It means absolutely nothing in terms of specifics.

There is no provision either in that particular clause that says it should be done in a timely manner. What is the point of agreeing that a person or company, or whatever, has suffered damage to the tune of several million dollars but there is no indication as to when the several million dollars shall be paid? Would it be paid 180 days after the ruling has come down, would it be 10 days later, or an infinite number of years later? We do not know. It is not there.

Removing this amendment is fine. It is moving a baby step forward but it does not deal with the fundamental principle of justice and the fundamental principle of democracy, and the fundamental principle on which democratic capitalism operates. That is the basis on which private entrepreneurs are to put money on the table to take the risks of developing means of production, means of service and thereby derive a profit, but it also serves the interests and the needs of society at large.

We need to encourage that. With this kind of legislation we want to assure that, but the legislation does not make that absolutely clear.

Government Orders

At this point I emphasize again that the Canadian Alliance and I personally are in no way opposed to the provision and protection of species at risk. We want to protect the species that are at risk. That is fundamental.

• (1540)

The hon. member mentioned co-operation. I agree wholeheartedly with him that many of the fishers, hunters, lumber companies and farmers are the first to take care and to preserve endangered species.

I remember so clearly when my father taught me how to plough on the farm. A burrowing owl was burrowing in one of our fields. My father said "When you plough in that field, you will probably find that burrowing owl somewhere. You have to make sure that you go well around that spot so that you do not disturb what the owl is doing. That is its habitat and we want to protect it". When I wondered why Dad cared that much, he said "I care that much because that bird has a right to live just like you do".

That is co-operation. That is voluntarism. That is what I respect and admire very much.

When we get into a position where a government can take away property, can expropriate land, can cause damage to the earning power of a company without adequate compensation, that is very dangerous. It creates a precedent that encourages people to not invest. It is a disincentive. That is what bothers me. That is the issue on which we want to rest our particular case.

There are other issues in the bill that I want to comment on. I want to register clearly and unequivocally that we want fair and reasonable compensation that is determined on the basis of market value, that is the definition of fair and reasonable, that it be in the legislation and that it be timely. We underscore that because until that amendment is made, we cannot support this legislation.

Any government that puts itself in the position of being able to completely ignore the scientific evidence about the species that are at risk, this can become a politicized decision from scientists. I am sure other members in the House know as I do that there is a considerable amount of science that in the first instance has a certain political element. However, when we deliberately create in legislation the potential of a government to take unto itself the power to overrule, that is a very dangerous precedent. There have to be checks and balances in this kind of decision.

I encourage all of us to consider very carefully what it is that removing this amendment will actually do and what the provisions are now. I assure everyone that we want to protect the species that are at risk. We also want to protect landowners and the people who suffer loss because of implementation of the act. We also want to make sure that the science is objective and unbiased and that it is not contaminated by infiltration of political considerations that might cause greater advantage to some people than to other people because of their political affiliation or their contribution to particular political parties.

• (1545)

[*Translation*]

Ms. H el ene Scherrer (Louis-H ebert, Lib.) Mr. Speaker, there has been much use of the word "collaboration" within the debate on the proposed species at risk legislation.

This is more than a mere word. Collaborative effort is the very foundation of this bill. It is the very fabric of all parts of the policy.

For example, the proposed legislation addresses all species at risk in Canada, as well as their essential habitat, wherever in the country that habitat may be located.

Collaboration, however, means that the federal government plays an important role, as do the provinces and territories, the landowners, the users of resources and all of us as well.

In the proposed species at risk legislation, this also involves a balanced approach based on nearly nine years of consultations and discussions with all sectors of Canadian society.

This is an approach that is unique to Canada. Not only does it reflect current practice, but it is also the very foundation of our constitution. It is also an approach we know works in the field. That is a fact.

I will give a few examples, if I may. We have a number of them, but I will quickly touch on two very specific ones.

One of these is the wood buffalo, the largest land mammal in Canada. It has already been in imminent danger of extinction. Its status has now improved and it is now in the threatened category.

This is the direct result of collaborative efforts between the federal government, the governments of B.C., Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories, as well as their partners.

It is the outcome of a recovery initiative based on collaboration. This is the term on which the emphasis must be put. The initiative was launched in 1957. It is still in place, and the buffalo population has benefited from it all these years. The wild population has risen from 200 to 3,000 over the past few decades.

Another example is the peregrine falcon. The peregrine was designated as endangered and now it too has moved up to the threatened category.

This too is the result of collaboration between the governments of Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Nunavut and Canada.

We believe there are now 500 nesting pairs in Canada, where there were 34 in the 1970s.

These are but two success stories in the long tradition of co-operation between the provincial, territorial and federal governments regarding species at risk.

Government Orders

In the spring of 1995, in order to improve the protection of species at risk in Canada, the provinces, territories and federal government held public workshops in many places across the country to determine what should be included in a national approach to protect species at risk.

This initiative led to the development of the accord to protect species at risk. This accord got the support of the Canadian ministers responsible for wildlife.

The accord recognizes that protecting species at risk is a shared responsibility and that a single jurisdiction cannot, alone, effectively protect species at risk. Species do not recognize jurisdictions.

No government has all the legal, political and other means to ensure adequate protection to species. Again, co-operation is essential.

The proposed Species at Risk Act is part of the federal government's contribution to the implementation of the accord.

This approach is in compliance with the commitment made under the accord by all the provinces and territories to protect species and their habitat, to the extent that they come under their jurisdiction.

This is an approach that emphasizes co-operation, so that we can ensure its success.

The provinces and territories took part in the development of the safety net of the bill and they co-operated in this regard.

This approach was expressly designed to provide provincial or territorial governments with the first opportunity to protect the essential habitat of a species that comes under their jurisdiction.

• (1550)

Given these facts, how could we possibly support amendments to the bill that would undermine this approach, which is based above all on co-operation? We also know that in order to change behaviour, we need incentives. We also know that there needs to be a great number of cases pending in the system. This is why we must re-establish obligations so that each government is responsible in its own jurisdiction, while allowing enough flexibility for the federal government to intervene anywhere, if it deems it necessary. This is the safety net. It is a delicate balance by which the proposed Species at Risk Act can provide protection for all species and for all essential habitat in Canada, while protecting the co-operation between different levels of government that is absolutely essential for the successful protection of species and their habitat on private land.

The government motions also clarify territorial responsibilities. Canada's three territories are responsible for all of their wildlife species, not simply species that are considered game, as set out in the current version of the bill.

The government believes that the protection provided by the provinces and territories must be effective in order to avoid resorting to federal prohibitions.

However, we insist that the policy must be developed in an open and inclusive manner, instead of through legislative measures. The work on this has already begun with the provinces and territories. The government motions ensure that this initiative based on co-

operation is not compromised by the imposition of any unilateral program.

Some critics proposed that we adopt an approach similar to the United States' Endangered Species Act. This act takes an authoritative and controlling approach, which orders people to act at their own expense. It hardly leaves room for co-operation.

Here are a few examples of remarks made by American officials who were commenting on what they are now doing. Representatives from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, for example, said that they had lost control of the species protection process because they were overloaded with the huge number of court orders. They reported that their 2001 budget for listing species was spent on enforcing compliance with settlement agreements and court orders.

The home secretary said "For a long time, we spent precious money on lawyers' fees and fighting in the courts instead of protecting species and fighting to bring them back from the brink of extinction".

This fall, it was estimated that 240 court orders have not been implemented by the U.S. government because the resources were used in legal battles.

Because of this atmosphere of mistrust between landowners and the U.S. government, which is made worse by the hostile approach of the U.S. legislation, no information is available concerning the situation of over half of the endangered or threatened species living on private property in the United States.

When species at risk legislation is unduly focused on penalties and prohibitions, it is remarkably difficult to enforce. Is that really what we want here? Absolutely not.

The co-operative approach of the Accord for the Protection of Species at Risk is already working. Since it was approved, most provinces and territories have introduced or amended legislation in order to respect the terms of the accord.

The federal, provincial and territorial governments are now working on bilateral agreements and a policy to establish effective protection under the accord. By working together on our accords, we ensure that each government understands its responsibilities and what triggers the safety net.

Before this bill is passed, we must do our work under the accord. We should be a world leader. We should not be fighting with each other. This bill deserves our support.

• (1555)

[English]

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise during report stage of Bill C-5 to speak to the amendments in Group No. 5.

Government Orders

I have been listening to and following the debate. A number of issues have been raised by the government to which I and other members in the House take exception. Part of the responsibility of the government is to pass legislation that is workable and recognizes the diversity represented not only in the House but across the country. Recognizing diversity will be necessary to protect species at risk.

As a number of government members have said, it has been a nine year process so far. Quite frankly, it has been a process of trial and error. From what I have seen it has involved mainly delay, obfuscation and deception. We have still ended up with a less than satisfactory piece of legislation. We have seen the government force closure 76 times in the House. It is now doing so again.

I will speak directly to the amendments. I will use an example of a species representative of all species at risk in Canada to illustrate the government's lack of political will to do anything about species at risk in a workable, concrete or coherent manner.

The fact that Motion No. 109 has been dropped is commendable because it allows the hard work done by the committee to be noticed. The amendment was brought in with the consent of committee members including a number of Liberal members. It is nice to see the motion back in the legislation.

Motion No. 75 would enable the minister to make regulations for critical habitat for aquatic species or migratory birds on federal lands. It would remove the enabling authority for aquatic species and migratory bird protection through regulations. It would allow the minister to recommend regulations to the cabinet for the protection of critical habitat at which time the cabinet could choose whether or not to act. That is totally unacceptable. Either we protect wildlife in Canada or not, but we should not leave it to cabinet to decide.

The committee was uniform in its declaration that there should be a third party scientific agenda. It is not a problem. It is a simple issue. Protecting endangered species or habitat in Canada is absolutely no problem. The only problem is lack of political will. The government has come up with a fantasy that the co-operative approach would somehow work. Co-operation is fine and important. In the long run it may be the key to successful legislation. However the legislation must have teeth. There must be a reason for private landowners and people to buy into it.

The issue hinges on compensation. It is the key to the legislation. However the issue has not been addressed. If we provide compensation for landowners who must take land out of production because an endangered species is found on it we will have found the key to a successful piece of legislation.

The public has bought into the idea of protecting endangered species. However Bill C-5 would not provide the tools to do so.

• (1600)

I said earlier that I would like to take one species to show what the inaction of this government has done toward making that single species extinct, because it is still barely hanging on. There is still just a little bit of a gene pool that allows a few Atlantic salmon, which is the species I am talking about, to actually return to the rivers in Atlantic Canada, spawn, go out to the ocean, come back and spawn

again. It is inconceivable that the government, in the time it has been here, has done as little as it has done to protect Atlantic salmon.

Atlantic salmon are extinct now in 14 rivers in Nova Scotia's southern uplands, the area of Nova Scotia that I represent. When I was a kid those rivers had thriving populations of Atlantic salmon. We are talking about one generation here. We are not going back to the turn of the century or the 1850s. We are talking about 25 years ago when there were thriving populations of Atlantic salmon.

Those rivers today have 10% of their salmon remaining, the ones that are not extinct that is. Another 50 rivers in Nova Scotia are in serious danger and have seriously threatened salmon populations from acid rain. While salmon stocks remain in some of the rivers, it is a barely viable population base and has been recognized for some time as a species at risk.

In their own brochure, the Nova Scotia Salmon Association criticized the government. It wanted to show the negative impact of acid rain on fish stocks, which it called the silent killer. The association notes state that like the canary in the coal mine, Atlantic salmon is the biological indicator that signals loss in water quality. If we do not have good freshwater quality, we cannot have Atlantic salmon reproducing.

What has the government done about Atlantic salmon? It has shut down the hatcheries in Atlantic Canada, in New Brunswick and in Nova Scotia. There is no such thing as restocking the rivers unless it is strictly a private restocking effort. It has done enough genetic research to find out that the Atlantic salmon stocks in the rivers in the inner Bay of Fundy are distinct species, a subgroup of Atlantic salmon, and it has done nothing to protect the critical habitat for that subspecies.

The Atlantic Salmon Association, a privately run organization, raised \$500,000 to study the genetic make-up of those salmon in the inner Bay of Fundy. The government, which is supposed to protect endangered species, managed to find \$150,000 to dedicate to the project and it has not even given the money over yet. It is scandalous.

In 1960 we found out Nova Scotian salmon, eastern Canadian salmon migrated to the west Greenland Sea and overwintered there. In the late sixties, early seventies, eighties and nineties, the fishery that developed in the offshore made that whole group of species nearly extinct.

In 2001, 40 years after we found out where the salmon were going, Greenland set its harvest at 200 tonnes of salmon, or approximately 70,000 salmon. However low numbers and low prices resulted in a catch of only 40 tonnes, representing 15,238 salmon, 9,800 of those salmon were from Nova Scotian and eastern Canadian rivers. Nothing has been done. This is just one species. We can name a dozen.

• (1605)

My point is that one species alone tells the story and sets the record of the government on protecting endangered species.

Government Orders

Mr. Murray Calder (Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to rise and speak to Bill C-5, the species at risk act. As the chair of the national rural caucus this is something with which the rural caucus has been very involved.

Before I go into my speech I would like to take the time to help the member for Red Deer. I understand he has a television show to do on this subject tonight. I listened to his facts and some of them are wrong. This all hinges around clause 64 within the bill.

Subclause 64(1) basically gives direction to the minister for compensation and subclause 64(2) now states that a governor in council shall develop regulations for compensation. The confusion for the member for Red Deer was the fact that Motion No. 109, had it carried, would have changed the word "shall" to "may". The rural caucus found that totally unacceptable.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, the member for Kitchener Centre, can verify the fact that we repeatedly went after her on this issue of "may" versus "shall". I commend the minister. I believe he had three meetings with the rural caucus on the issue and the parliamentary secretary had a couple more. Two of the members of the rural caucus who were very active in this included the member for Churchill River, who was very concerned about the issue, and the member for York North.

The minister saw fit to listen to our arguments on Motion No. 109 and withdrew it. The rural caucus was very appreciative of that because it helped us out very much on the compensation aspect. I believe it has taken us in the right direction.

The people of rural Canada have been heavily involved in the development of the legislation that we are considering today. They support Bill C-5's emphasis on stewardship. They have had a big role in the formation of our policy in this area and for a very good reason. They know how important stewardship is because they have acted as stewards for generations and generations.

I was a farmer in my other life and I was taught by my father that if we were to see a killdeer's nest out in the centre of a field we would immediately stop the tractor, set up stakes and make sure the nest was not destroyed. I was taught that as a child and it has stayed with me as an adult.

Farmers and people in rural Canada are very good stewards and they were naturalists long before it came into vogue. That is the reality of the people who live in rural Canada.

This work is being done through small actions and huge projects but it all conserves Canada's rich, national heritage. We need to make sure that these people see that this work is valued, that it is essential and that it is at the very foundation of Canada's approach to habitat and species protection. If we delay, we send a message that this work is not good enough. No one here intends to do that. If we act now we let rural Canadians know that their contribution is the foundation of our policy on species at risk and habitat protection.

Let us not delay on that message any longer. Let us get on with it. Let us put federal species at risk legislation in place in Canada. It is the least we can do.

The proposed species at risk act ensures that there is involvement of the people closest to the species and to the land. That is something rural caucus fought for and received, and we thank the minister for that. This involvement stems from an overall co-operative approach. We did not just happen across this approach. In fact we set about developing it after much studying, many discussions and after an examination of what works and what does not in other countries and situations. We know that this one will work.

Fundamentally, we have to remember that our constitutional structure is such that we must work at all times with the provinces and the territories on any major policy.

● (1610)

There is a good reason for this structure and most everyone here would agree that it is one that is fair, workable and, above all, Canadian.

There are few examples as good as the development of the strategy for the protection of species at risk to show how well this system can work. There was co-operation among governments, co-operation that began many years ago, to set the stage for a successful strategy. That success can be found in the federal-provincial-territorial agreement called the accord for the protection of species at risk. Under this accord, we have all committed to protecting species, their habitats and to bringing in legislation and programs.

For decades the federal, provincial and territorial governments have been working together on wildlife management. Rural Canadians have been directly involved in this approach in many ways. This is not just for species at risk. All species benefit.

Stewardship, such as that under the North American waterfowl management plan, where provinces and territories have joined the federal government and their counterparts in the United States to preserve hundreds of hectares of wetlands and protect species of waterfowl. Farmers, hunters, landowners and conservation organizations have worked side by side to make this happen. Clearly we all have to recognize that species at risk is truly an issue of national concern and nobody can do it all alone.

We need this continued co-operation. We need to be able to lean over the fence between the federal government and the provincial or territorial governments. That fence makes good neighbours and it makes us partners. That neighbourly spirit brought us the accord in 1996, the accord that commits governments to legislation and programs. These are commitments that many of our provincial and territorial partners have met. These are commitments that the federal government must meet.

The accord formed the Canadian Endangered Species Conservation Council which has met a number of times and is working on an assessment and recovery planning that is so essential to meet the needs of the species.

The accord provides for the early identification, protection and recovery of all species at risk throughout the country.

Considerable progress has been made by the provinces and the territories in improving a legislative base for the protection of the species at risk in Canada since the endorsement of the accord.

Government Orders

Now it is our turn. The provinces and territories worked with us in developing Bill C-5. The proposed bill recognizes their contributions. Their support is absolutely critical to the success of the bill. We cannot protect species at risk throughout Canada without the provinces and the territories. It is they who manage most of the lands and the activities that affect the species and the critical habitat. They set the land management policies, direct the development laws and deliver many of the programs. Provinces and territories control a significant amount of land and many species rely on these lands. They have had many resources that we need to deliver the habitat enhancement and the protection, including the protection of wetlands and parklands.

Together we set a course for the concept of a safety net that ensures that no species will fall through the cracks before a government has failed to act. That safety net ensures that all species and critical habitat are protected everywhere in Canada. That is the work we need to do and that is the work we are doing.

• (1615)

Mr. Andy Burton (Skeena, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I find myself with mixed feelings standing in the House during report stage of the species at risk act to address the motions in Group No. 5.

I am of mixed feelings because the government has forced through a motion to limit debate, meaning it has had enough of listening to the legitimate concerns brought forward by members of parliament as expressed to them by their constituents. The government in its wisdom has decided to ignore the concerns we and many Canadians have raised about the bill. Instead the Liberals have decided to use the power of their majority government to ram the bill through. They will crack the whip, defeat opposition amendments and pass a flawed bill.

I remind the House that the Canadian Alliance supports legislation to protect species at risk. The government would have Canadians falsely believe Bill C-5 is designed to protect species at risk even though mandatory compensation, a major component to ensuring species are protected, has been left out. Canadians should therefore disregard the Liberal government's false claims of heroism toward species at risk. Bill C-5 would not protect such species unless it included compensation.

In an effort to rectify the many flaws evident in Bill C-5 the opposition has moved some 60 amendments at report stage. The government has also moved many amendments which I find quite unorthodox. The government had every opportunity to ensure the bill was properly crafted before introducing it in the House of Commons. It introduced similar legislation on two other occasions but has still failed to get it right.

The government has failed to such an extent that the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, an all party committee dominated by Liberal MPs, had to do additional drafting work and spend several months fixing the bill. The committee reviewed over 300 amendments to Bill C-5. Yet the government has seen fit to introduce nearly 60 amendments at report stage. As a legislator I cannot help but compare the current bill as amended by the committee to what it would look like if the government's many motions at this stage of debate were accepted.

The government amendments to the bill at this late stage in the process seek to reverse most of the work done by the committee.

Canadians must find this ironic coming from a government which prides itself on its wish to democratize parliament and make it more accountable to constituents. The government claims to allow MPs to vote the wishes of their electorate before those of their party leader, yet in this case it is doing exactly the opposite of what it promised to do. Not only is the government backing down on its promise to respect the wishes of Canadians as represented by their MPs. By limiting debate as it did earlier today it is effectively saying "Democracy is okay, but it has its limits and we are tired of democracy now".

This is exactly the kind of make up the rules as it goes along tactic one could expect from a Liberal majority government. The Canadian Alliance, I am proud to say, not only respects species at risk. It respects the wishes of MPs to represent their electorates first. Partisan politics aside, I hope the government will see fit to support our amendments. They would result in more protection for species at risk, which is what we are here to debate today.

As members know, I have moved some 19 amendments to the bill at report stage. Several deal with intent to cause harm to a species as opposed to inadvertent harm. Others attempt to ensure adequate consultation with stakeholders, landowners and land users. One seeks to add in the preamble that sustainable development and the protection of species at risk should be the main goals of legislation. Others deal with the need for mandatory compensation to landowners or resource users in the event that complying with the legislation caused loss of property, decline in property value, loss of use or enjoyment of the property, or financial costs.

I have moved two motions in the group before us today, namely Motion No. 21 and Motion No. 26. Both motions touch on voluntary agreements, recovery strategies, and action and management plans for the preservation of species at risk and their critical habitat. These are all important endeavours. The Canadian Alliance supports these objectives of Bill C-5.

As currently written the bill would allow the minister to enter into agreements with other governments or environmental groups but does not specify the possibility of entering into agreements with landowners. Motions Nos. 21 and 26 would add this as an explicit option for the minister. Landowners, lessees and other users should be specified to send a signal that the government is open to a co-operative approach to implementation.

• (1620)

My amendment in Motion No. 21 would provide that a proposed agreement be made public 30 days before being finalized and that the minister consult with all people affected. This is to give legislative certainty that the minister would respect the rights of property owners and involve them in discussions.

Government Orders

The Canadian Alliance believes every opportunity should be taken to stress that property owners, resource users and others with a direct or on the ground interest in the administration of the species at risk act are involved in every step of the process. At this time the legislation does not allow for hands-on involvement by landowners. We in the Canadian Alliance are trying to fix that with the amendments in Group No. 5.

As I mentioned earlier, the government has made numerous amendments to the legislation. Although many of the government motions in Group No. 5 are of a technical nature, a few pose serious concerns. Motion No. 75 seeks to eliminate accountability of action plans. Motion No. 109 would have eliminated requirements for the minister to develop regulations for compensation. The government withdrew it, thank goodness, a small step in the right direction we were thankful to see. Motion No. 116 would reduce the requirement for the minister to consult. Motion No. 131 would cause jurisdictional concerns with the provinces over delegation of authority under the act.

Government Motion No. 131 specifies that the minister may delegate his powers under the act to any other minister of the crown in right of Canada, meaning any other federal cabinet minister. This would narrow the clause to prevent delegation to provincial ministers. The motion is unnecessarily restrictive. It would prevent possible avenues of co-operation between the federal and provincial governments. Given the bill's huge potential to trespass on provincial responsibilities it is highly inappropriate that provincial ministers be excluded. Provincial ministers are included in other sections, so why not here?

Government Motion No. 38 says that if the minister added a species to the list on an emergency basis COSEWIC would have to submit a written status report on the species to the minister within a year and put the report on the public registry. This is positive. It would allow landowners and other interested parties to see the scientific justification for the new listing.

This high degree of ministerial discretion means landowners would need a clear process for protecting their interests and definite rules for compensation should they incur losses. Unlike municipal rezoning there would be no public process in which landowners could have input. Being at the mercy of the minister they would have to be able to put their confidence in firm, transparent rules. I commend my hon. colleagues opposite for a positive amendment. It is too bad there are not many more.

Government Motion No. 43 would make drafting amendments to subclause 32(1) by removing a phrase that is not necessary.

Motion No. 75 introduces an amendment to clause 49. Subclause 49(1) currently says action plans must include a whole list of things such as:

(e) an evaluation of the socio-economic costs of the action plan and the benefits to be derived from its implementation—

The government seeks to change this. Socio-economic cost benefit analysis should be part of any all-encompassing bill like Bill C-5. How can the government introduce such sweeping legislation and not know the costs of implementing it as well as the costs of not protecting a species? This lack of knowledge would impede the

government's ability to determine adequate compensation plans. It is inconceivable that the government would want to delete the entire section, but it would do so with Motion No. 75.

Finally, Bill C-5 does not adequately deal with the issue of compensation. Compensation is not an extra. It is essential to the entire framework of protecting species at risk. It would not only ensure landowners and resource users did not bear all the costs of protecting species single-handedly. It would send an important symbolic message that the government understood their fears and recognized the need to take account of their interests. Compensation at fair market value should be an integral part of any species at risk legislation.

• (1625)

In conclusion, without explicitly mandating compensation the legislation it would stand to harm landowners and the species it was designed to protect. For struggling landowners compensation is often the only incentive for protecting species at risk. It is human nature for landowners to resort to the shoot, shovel and shut up method of dealing with species at risk. Quite frankly, without compensation Bill C-5 would encourage that kind of behaviour.

We do not want to see that. If we are all committed to protecting species at risk we will make this change to the bill. I urge all members of the House to support adding compensation to Bill C-5, the species at risk legislation.

Mr. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will focus my remarks today on the aboriginal issues and opportunities in the proposed species at risk act. The way opportunities have been seized in the development of the legislation is quite a story. It is a story we have ignored in a long debate that seems to have only two sides and no middle.

I will highlight some of the opportunities the proposal presents and some of the roads that have been taken. In developing the proposed legislation an important opportunity was seized and new ground was broken with respect to the involvement of aboriginal peoples and aboriginal knowledge.

So it should be. The lands and waters on which a large number of species at risk depend are inhabited and managed by aboriginal peoples. Many species at risk such as the wood bison are valued by Canada's first peoples for their ecological role, cultural importance and use as a traditional food source. There was an opportunity and we took it. We took it in partnership with Canada's aboriginal peoples to ensure their participation in the development of the new law. This was unprecedented.

Government Orders

I will explain. In the four years prior to the tabling of the proposed species at risk act discussions were held with all the national aboriginal organizations and most of the regional aboriginal organizations across the land. Emerging from the discussions was the Aboriginal Working Group on Species at Risk, a working group representing national aboriginal organizations. The group was established in 1998 and continues to meet on a regular basis. Once again it was a matter of opportunity.

The aboriginal working group has provided advice on the development and implementation of the proposed species at risk act. It has provided a significant advisory capacity by helping us fully understand aboriginal stewardship of the land as well as the issues, needs and capacities of aboriginal peoples to help in the protection of species at risk. One result of this hard work is that the proposed act explicitly recognizes the essential role of aboriginal peoples in the conservation of wildlife.

This was more than a matter of opportunity. As the government came to understand, it was a matter of necessity. I will further explain how the aboriginal working group helped the government understand its opportunities with respect to the proposed legislation.

Under the proposal before us aboriginal traditional knowledge would have to be considered in decision making. There would be strong requirements to co-operate with aboriginal peoples in recovery efforts. The government would establish a national aboriginal council on species at risk.

I will discuss each of these accomplishments and seized opportunities in turn. The fundamental basis on which decisions are made was altered by the inclusion of traditional or community knowledge as criteria for decision making. In the past the status of wildlife species as well as wildlife management decisions such as determining quotas and access to wildlife were often based solely on scientific information. Aboriginal traditional knowledge is the knowledge base of the indigenous peoples of Canada who depend on the land for their long term survival. Through observation and experimentation holders of this knowledge continue to develop a dynamic and innovative knowledge base of the land, the environment and the species within it.

Like aboriginal peoples we derive results through observation and experimentation. However the means of interpretation and recording are different. For example, scientists are trained to interpret results according to set standards in a written form to facilitate communication and understanding in the academic community. Aboriginal traditional knowledge holders use different methods to interpret results for presentation to their community in an oral form. We would be losing the chance to paint the fullest possible picture if we did not do it both ways. That is why the proposal includes this type of knowledge.

Further, the proposed species at risk act would explicitly require COSEWIC to consider aboriginal traditional knowledge in its deliberations. It would provide for a subcommittee on aboriginal traditional knowledge to be established to facilitate the consideration of aboriginal traditional knowledge in decision making. Efforts to set up the subcommittee are already underway, led by the aboriginal working group and supported by COSEWIC.

These are opportunities we cannot turn away from. We cannot lose these important additions to the body of work already underway on species at risk in Canada.

● (1630)

There is another opportunity in the stronger requirements for aboriginal involvement in the recovery efforts. The bill contains the requirement for co-operation with aboriginal organizations in the preparation of all key recovery documents, recovery strategies, action plans and management plans.

We have said for nearly nine years that we all share in the responsibility of protecting wildlife. Perhaps no one group represents or demonstrates a commitment to that responsibility more than Canada's aboriginal peoples. Under this legislation the establishment of a national aboriginal council on species at risk will set into law a partnership that already has produced many positive results. It will be in keeping with the kinds of discussions and advice that went into making this legislation. Its establishment will be consistent with the Government of Canada's commitment to strengthen its relationship with aboriginal peoples. This is an enormous step forward. By establishing such a mechanism for aboriginal involvement, we are recognizing and putting into law the importance and relationship of aboriginal peoples to land and wildlife.

With the national aboriginal council, with this legislation, with the incorporation of aboriginal traditional knowledge into the assessment and recovery of species, we are moving forward. The proposed legislation is groundbreaking in its regard of the knowledge of the generations of aboriginal peoples who have lived on the land as part of the process in determining species at risk and the appropriate recovery efforts. The establishment of the national aboriginal council is formal recognition and acknowledgment. It is a formal partnership that will be workable for and valuable to all parties. It is a partnership we are working hard to foster with others: landowners, farmers, fisherman, conservation groups, and those in the resource sector who will be greatly aided by the proposed species at risk legislation.

The incorporation of Canada's first people and the knowledge they have built up over generations will be an excellent addition to the bill. It will cover parts of the country where first nations still have stewardship of the land and will add particular knowledge that we can use in other parts of the nation.

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak to Group No. 5, I note that it is interesting to hear some of the members from the opposite side of the House putting a political spin on this legislation that is significantly different from what we saw in prior incarnations of this debate on the earlier groups. I think we will see even more of that when we get to the debate on third reading.

Government Orders

What we have to keep in mind in addressing these specific Group No. 5 amendments is that in fact there are no major changes on the part of the government and no major recognition on the part of the government of the democratic process within the committee structure of the House. The reality is that the committee did its work and it made the amendments, with all party support in a number of cases. When that came back to the House at report stage, we were faced with an overwhelming number of amendments from the government, including a good number of them in Group No. 5, which gutted the work that the committee did.

We have before us 20 amendments in Group No. 5, 15 of them government amendments striking down all the work the committee did on those amendments in those sections, with one exception, which we heard about just today, when the government backed off and dropped Motion No. 109.

An hon. member: A PC amendment.

Mr. Joe Comartin: Yes, which my friend from the Progressive Conservative Party wants to claim credit for. I am prepared to give him a little bit, but the reality is that on that section all members of the committee, I believe, were in favour of that amendment. Several of us, myself included, had amendments of a similar nature, as did members of the Liberal Party who sat on that committee.

What I would have liked to see, and I believe the people of Canada would have liked to see it, is that same attitude with regard to dropping Motion No. 109. I would have liked to see the government taking a similar tack with regard to all the other amendments that it has in Group No. 5 and in fact in the four groups before that.

With regard to this set of amendments, we will hear debate about the need for this to be a flexible bill, for discretion. We heard it from the Minister of the Environment earlier today when we were faced with closure by the government. I do not think one person on the environment committee would disagree about the need for flexibility within the bill. What we were saying to the minister, and what we continue to say him and to the government, is that this is not the be-all and the end-all. It is really the issue of the carrot and the stick, discretion being the carrot and certain mandatory legislative provisions being the stick.

What has happened with the minister and with the legislation as envisioned by the government, and now put back by these amendments, is way too large a degree of discretion being incorporated into the bill and obviously, if it passes, into the law, and nowhere near enough mandatory requirements.

We heard again today about the importance of co-operating with the provinces and other authorities, municipal authorities in some cases, and certainly with the first nations Metis and aboriginal communities in many respects. Again, the committee was very sensitive to those needs but we also recognized, particularly with regard to the provinces that have legislation in this field, some just very recent, that it quite frankly was not working or was not working very well at all.

• (1635)

It is absolutely necessary for the federal government to play an active role. The amendments in Group No. 5 are really in many

respects putting back discretion to where the environment committee said that the government had gone too far and should build in some mandatory structure in the legislation. This is a complex area of the bill. We cannot downplay how complex the legislation is in terms of the infrastructure the environment committee built into it. We were saying to the government that it needed the infrastructure, the ability to go in and at times enforce. The basic approach would be to co-operate, to get the job done and protect all these species, but ultimately if it does not happen there needs to be the stick. There is a need for being able to move in. The legislation does not give that to us.

Let me address some of the specific points we are faced with in Group No. 5 that were changed from what the environment committee did. I want to give the example of a little one. It irks me because it is so petty on the part of the government.

A committee of scientists has been working for over two decades now, I believe, on listing endangered species, those that have expired and those on the critical list, if I can put it that way. To a great extent these scientists have done it with little or no funding and, in a lot of cases, with little co-operation from government departments. They went ahead because of their dedication to the natural environment and to the protection of endangered species.

Our committee told the government it had to start to support that committee and its work on identifying and listing endangered species. That means providing it with the necessary financial resources. Our committee built in some specific structure around that. What happened? One of amendments would take that back. If the government amendment goes through, we would be saying that it would be at the minister's sole discretion to decide whether the work this committee is doing justifies financial support.

The obvious question that jumps to my mind is, how soon will it be before the minister says that he or she does not really like what the committee is doing, that it is not conscientious enough about the minister's concerns and that the committee would not be funded any more? That is the kind of pettiness that the department has built into the bill.

There is a broader area around the whole question of protecting critical habitat. I know that I am nearly out of time, but I could go on for another hour. Because of the complexity of this question, I want to make just two points. There were interim protections built in that were not there before and now will be taken out once again if these amendments go through. The extension of the protection of the bill, and subsequently the act, to aquatic and migratory birds is being severely curtailed by the amendments being proposed by the government in Group No. 5.

The list goes on. In spite of all the spin that even now some members of the committee are putting on it, the reality is that the bill is extremely weak. It is much weaker than what the United States and Mexico have. The government is clearly showing its lack of commitment to protecting endangered species in this country.

Government Orders

•(1640)

Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have heard members opposite concerned about the shutting down of debate. Canadians need to know that the bill has been worked on and debated for somewhere close to eight years now. It has gone through three incarnations and we must bring it to a close somehow.

Meanwhile, over the course of all of those years and just last year 11 new species were added to the endangered species list. Seven species were upgraded and one was de-listed. That is an average of 17 species affected on an annual basis. While members have been debating this, something in the order of 136 species have been affected. It is not exactly a sterling record of movement on the part of members of parliament.

Overwhelmingly the degradation of ecosystems and loss of habitat represents the threat to endangered wildlife. The member who just spoke said this was a combination of carrot and stick. He is right. The stick is clearly the listing process. When the committee on the status of endangered wildlife in Canada proposes a list there has to be a decision made within nine months. For critical habitat on federal lands all critical habitat identified in a recovery strategy or action plan would be protected. More specifically, if after 180 days any portion of the critical habitat is left unprotected, the legal order would have to be made.

That is the stick. The idea of the bill is to avoid the stick, to avoid getting on the list because if a particular species is found on the list and one is a landowner, one would probably have some problems. Many landowners have recognized this. There are woodlot owners across Ontario and Quebec who proudly display their membership and conservation organizations. There are fishers in Atlantic Canada who have invested in nets that avoid trapping whales and sea turtles. Ranchers in Ontario and Alberta have assisted in the recovery of a loggerhead shrike.

Landowners have started to recognize that this kind of thing is in the best interests for all. They want to do the right thing and the right thing is good business. None of them is looking for a handout or the promise of one. They just want to see that the right thing is done and that it is fair and reasonable. That is what rural people are interested in. They are ethical in protecting the waters where fishers have worked for generations and protecting woodlands and prairies. That is in everybody's interest including those who live off the land.

Is it totally naive to rely on this stewardship of the environment, this volunteerism, this willingness to do the right thing? Or is the government being naive and in the process ripping off the landowner? Here is where the stick comes in because that in some respects is the carrot. We have dealt with the carrot which is do the right thing because it is in everyone's interest.

Compensation is a vital pillar to the success of the bill. Nowhere in the debate did the government propose that there would never be any compensation regime and that the landowners would be left swinging in the breeze so to speak. The standing committee amendment clarified that compensation should be provided to anyone who suffers a loss from the extraordinary impact of critical habitat protections in a fair and reasonable way. The government agreed with that. It is hard, however, to be more definitive than that. At any moment can we tell a landowner or anyone else for that

matter that 1.6 hectares cannot be used for cultivation for three weeks because that is currently the nesting site for a thrush? How do we calculate that?

•(1645)

In another life I practised real estate law. I have acted on both sides of the equation with both landowners and municipalities that expropriated land. I never met any side that was happy with an expropriation and the compensation scheme. We would indicate the number of acres needed, the relative market value and we would argue about the number within a certain range.

This kind of compensation scheme is far more difficult and extensive than an appropriation of real estate. Yet the landowner will still retain title to the land as in the example that I just gave. Therefore we will have the situation where the landowner still owns the land, yet cannot use the land for three or four weeks in this critical period of time.

How do we compensate for that? What is the value of that land? What is the price of doing the right thing? Those are difficult questions and it is difficult to reduce it to law. The term fair market value applied to land acquisition and land expropriation situations has little relevance in the situation where we are trying to compensate a landowner when there is a species that is endangered.

We need to have the practical experience of implementing the stewardship and recovery provisions of the bill and in dealing with questions of compensation. It is fine and dandy for members opposite to say that landowners must be compensated but it is difficult to establish a grid of compensation for a species that uses the land for a period of time on expensive or relatively inexpensive land. Establishing a prescriptive approach in the legislation without the practical experience may well have an unintended effect on excluding some legitimate claims.

Part of the difficulty over the eight years has been the law of unintended consequences. If we were to set up a regulatory regime which sets up a grid we would create winners and losers. Some of the losers may be the people whom we wanted to compensate. The expertise of qualified evaluation experts would be used to determine the adverse impact on the interest in the property or a quantification of the loss of benefits that may result from not being able to carry on certain activities. There may well be experts who can advise on what that is worth. However having sat on both sides of this for simple compensation cases I remain somewhat skeptical.

There is a general and global compensation regulation scheme that is being set up. I compliment the government for withdrawing Motion No. 109 so that a compensation scheme shall be set up. I congratulate the Liberal rural caucus in its efforts in this area and acknowledge the efforts of the parliamentary secretary who has ably represented the government to the members of the rural caucus and other members and also acknowledge the hard work of the standing committee. This is a far more difficult bill than many members realize.

Government Orders

●(1650)

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to contribute to this important stage of Bill C-5, the species at risk legislation. It has had a rough and tumble ride on the Liberal benches over these last few weeks and for good reasons.

The House may be well aware that the bill was incredibly void on what we viewed as four principal points. It did not have the scientific aspect that we needed to determine the list regarding whether a species was at risk or not. Having a true scientific listing would ensure that it was scientific and not political.

The economic and social implications should be taken into account at the recovery stage, in the action plan of the act. The government has made a move on this particular plank. It has moved in a positive direction on having a better framework and having mandatory protection of critical habitat on federal lands, including aquatic species.

That is another position that the Progressive Conservative Party has held true. Our position is from the document that we tabled in March 2000 known as "Carrots before sticks". It is a comprehensive program that follows closely the recommendations of the species at risk working group on what good, sound and effective species at risk legislation should have.

Beyond the listings and looking after its own backyard and having better protection on federal lands, including aquatic species, the Government of Canada has not moved that far. Let us be quite clear. The Minister of the Environment only moved in that direction because Liberal backbenchers were going to stand with the opposition and vote down this act because it was not effective.

That was clearly the signal that the Liberal members were sending across the board. The Minister of Environment had a choice. One was to lose not only the bill but likely his position in cabinet. He would have been next Sunday's Shawinigan sacrifice had he not implemented these particular amendments. Kudos to him for at least making the recommendations he did to move in that direction.

The bill is void on four points. Not only is the listing format not a true scientific listing, although it is better than what the government has proposed in the first place, it is still somewhat discretionary and is too discretionary with respect to mandatory protection of critical habitat on federal lands. However, kudos to the government for at least moving in a better direction. The Progressive Conservative Party of Canada will be supporting the amendments of that nature that have been added.

Another point where the act is still weak relates to the fact that we do not have mandatory protection of migratory birds, which is clearly in the purview of the federal government. There are even amendments in Group No. 5 that pertain to that particular aspect. We have lost an opportunity there on migratory birds. I am not saying that as a spoof, as some members have before, because of my last name being similar to that of a blue heron.

However, the greatest deficiency in the bill is that there is not enough clarity with respect to the compensatory regime that the Government of Canada will have in this act. It is not a matter of whether the law will be tough enough. It is whether it will be

effective as well. If we are always saying that a law has to be tough, we are using a punitive approach as opposed to rewarding stewardship.

There was a comprehensive amendment that was adopted in clause 10 of the bill known as a national stewardship plan. It would foster positive behaviour by providing scientific advice to landowners and perhaps even consideration of financial incentives for protecting species at risk because all Canadians benefit from the preservation of our biodiversity as well.

●(1655)

I am heartened by the government's wisdom, although it may have been precipitated by pressure from the rural Liberal caucus. We had tabled an amendment which said at the very least that the government needs to notify landowners that there is a species at risk on their property so that they can take the appropriate action. The government wanted to gut that Progressive Conservative amendment known as Motion. No. 109. The government has chosen not to remove the provision the Tories presented in committee which was supported by all five parties in this Chamber. That was a positive step in the right direction.

I want to talk about the compensatory regime again. The previous speaker mentioned that it is a very difficult issue to reduce to law. That is what we are here to do. We are here to write laws and to provide the framework so that we know what actions will or will not be predictably made by the Government of Canada. We write laws. That is what we do. It is extremely condescending to take the approach that we would not want to reduce it to law because at the end of the day, it will have to be addressed through regulations.

If the Government of Canada wants to provide a framework for compensation through a regulatory regime as opposed to enshrining it in the act, that would be okay if that was its choice to go that route. However the minimum the government would owe rural Canada would be to simultaneously table draft regulations. It should simultaneously table the regulations with the act so the landowners know what they are getting in the package to protect species at risk. That would provide more clarity. Perhaps the intergovernmental affairs minister should have lent a hand on that particular aspect.

This is where the bill is still void. It is still weak on listing, although it is better than it was before. It is still weak on mandatory protection of critical habitat on federal lands, although it is better than it was before. It is still too weak and unacceptable on the protection of migratory birds. It is definitely not acceptable in providing clarity with respect to the compensatory regime and about what landowners should expect to have.

Kudos to the government for at least keeping the notification aspect in the act itself. I would like to point out one aspect which Mr. Speaker, I am sure you are very well aware of through a heated debate you may have had in the context of your own caucus. All members of the committee wanted to ensure that we included the traditional knowledge of our aboriginal people to complement the scientific knowledge, the actions the Government of Canada should take and knowledge about the dwindling populations of species, information from aboriginal people which should be absorbed in the act to make it better.

Government Orders

Instead of making aboriginal peoples a full partner, the Government of Canada added a provision that actually gutted first nations contributions. The member of parliament for Churchill River in Saskatchewan tabled an amendment that reversed the government's reversal. The Government of Canada has now seen the light and will support that Liberal member's motion.

Let us not be too revisionist here, although we are on the revision of the revision of the revision. The Government of Canada had an opportunity to welcome first nations contributions and it almost rescinded them. That is an aspect of the bill we should highlight as well.

Again, given that we have had eight years to prepare legislation, we should have developed sound and effective legislation as opposed to mediocre legislation at best.

I tip my hat to my friends and colleagues on the environment committee from all parties, the Canadian Alliance, the Bloc, the NDP and Liberal members as well, because any gains that were made in the bill were made through the hard work of that committee. It is very anti-democratic for the Government of Canada to have rescinded a lot of the good hard work that we have done.

● (1700)

Mr. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the waters off Atlantic Canada there are fishers and tour boat operators who are part of programs to keep the leatherback turtles from getting caught in the nets. No one told them they had to do this. When they learned about the problem, they worked with conservation and recovery groups to find solutions.

What message do we want to send these people? Do we want to tell them it is not good enough and give them notice that we will see them in court? I do not think so. I think we want to say they are doing great work, to thank them and find other ways to work together.

That is how those people feel too. They are exactly the people that Bill C-5 will support in efforts to protect species at risk. Bill C-5 is a good piece of legislation. It is a combination of co-operation backed by strength. It is time to get it into place.

In Atlantic Canada provinces have worked hard to fulfill their obligations under the accord for the protection of species at risk and to put provincial legislation into place to protect species. All over the shores of Atlantic Canada conservation organizations are working side by side with tour operators and fishing communities, with beachfront owners and the whale watching community. This is what we mean by a co-operative approach. It reflects the people of Atlantic Canada. It reflects the people of Canada as a whole. It is the way to get things done.

The bill before us fulfills a federal commitment with the provinces and the territories under the accord for the protection of species at risk. It sets out in the full letter of law the key components of assessment and listing, of recovery planning and of habitat protection. It also reinforces stewardship.

I am here today to support the government motions that restore co-operation as the preferred approach to protecting critical habitat.

We farm over 1,000 acres of woodland and it often concerns me. We also want to protect the species.

Canadians are giving of their time and resources to protect our wildlife species and their habitat. It is happening all over Canada. These are individuals and they are also big companies. They are fishers, farmers, miners and loggers. Others wish they had our success.

In the United States, where many will point to endangered species legislation that has been in place for 25 years, our success so far on stewardship and conservation is the subject of envy. U.S. courts are choked with cases under the law, drawing precious resources away from actually protecting wildlife.

We have already made huge strides and backed them up with the establishment of the habitat stewardship program. Under the program \$45 million over five years has been targeted for stewardship activities.

In its first year the habitat stewardship program established over 70 partnerships with first nations, landowners, resource users, nature trusts, provinces, the natural resource sector, community based wildlife societies, educational institutions and conservation organizations. In its second year the habitat stewardship program funded nearly 160 projects.

These projects targeted more than 200 species identified to be at risk. They also assisted in developing partnerships among more than 400 individuals and organizations across Canada.

For instance, volunteer Canadians from all walks of life are involved in the beach guardian programs in Atlantic Canada to protect the habitat of the piping plover, the Gulf of St. Lawrence aster and the maritime ringlet butterfly. We are monitoring the population of the right whale and helping fishers to find ways of preventing the whales from getting tangled in gear.

We are assisting those stranded leatherback turtles which I mentioned. We are also preserving the Trois Monts de Coleraine area from the Vermont border to Mont Caribou with its 30 indigenous plant species that are rare or endangered. We have also provided more favourable tax treatment for the contribution ecologically sensitive lands. Over 23,000 hectares already have been donated as ecological gifts.

● (1705)

I point out that the co-operative approach is reinforced in government motions to further strengthen critical habitat protection in federal jurisdictions. The government has proposed that Bill C-5 provide automatic critical habitat protection in a national park, a marine protected area, a migratory bird sanctuary or a national wildlife area as soon as it is identified in a recovery strategy or action plan.

Government Orders

To further strengthen the protection of critical habitat in other areas of federal jurisdiction, we are proposing mandatory protection if critical habitat is not protected through stewardship initiatives within 180 days of its identification.

These government motions on critical habitat are reinforced by a further motion that requires all federal ministers to consider the possible impacts on identified critical habitat prior to issuing any licence or permit for any activity.

We all share a responsibility for protecting wildlife. The federal government is a leader in protecting species at risk and their critical habitats in Canada. The rest of the world can be proud of us. In active partnership with provinces, territories, landowners, farmers, fishermen, aboriginal people, conservation groups, the resource sectors and others, we are using what works and providing more tools to make it work better.

These are the actions that make the difference. These are the people we must support. This is the approach we must take. Debate will not get us any further. Debate will not reinforce our appreciation for the work already under way and get more work done. Debate is delaying the response we must make to our obligations. It is time to move on and reinforce the work and actions of so many.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to sit on the environment committee because I consider it to be a great committee and members I have worked with have been great. It should be a paying committee because we can learn a great deal on it.

I said earlier today that I believed the bill was moving in the wrong direction. I do not oppose the bill as much as I oppose the approach taken with the bill.

My hon. colleague who just spoke listed various groups that are working at the present time and doing a tremendous job without the bill, and therein lies the key. Co-operation should be first, not confrontation first.

Having lived on the prairies as a boy and going back 50 years, I never once saw a sign in rural areas telling people that no hunting was allowed. That has become a recent sign. I never saw a sign telling people that they could hunt with permission only. However today we see lots of no trespassing signs. I mention that because landowners are sick and tired of people who do not respect their property.

I agree with my hon. colleague that the first thing that should be done is the identification of species as well as their habitat. Hopefully the people involved in the identification process will go to the owner, be it the provincial government, a rancher, a farmer, or whoever and discuss the habitat situation with them. They must not walk away from the person who owns that farm or that ranch before a species or its habitat is identified.

Before the property is listed as a habitat, some agreement must be made to compensate that person for the loss of their property. That has to come first. If government people identify a species, declare the property its habitat and talk to the individual involved after the fact, the bill will not work. One of my hon. colleagues opposite said he knew the bill would work. I hope it does but it will not work if we go about it in a backward way. Let me give the House an example.

This spring I received a fax from an administrator in the rural government who asked me to go to his area immediately because the government was in trouble with DFO. I told him he had to be kidding because he was in an area considered grain growing country. I thought it was a joke. DFO officials had gone down to his area to look at a long ditch farmers had put in to drain the headwaters of the run off down to the Souris River. Individuals were angry about this because of the approach taken by the federal government. I would like to suggest that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is king of the cabinet. That department overrules the environment department almost every time and that ought not to be. If cabinet cannot agree on this, then how is the bill going to be successful?

To make a long story short, the people from DFO trespassed in some cases on private land. They prepared their report, which by the way was a joke. Guess what? That rural municipality received a bill of \$43,800.

• (1710)

The government cannot take that approach with this bill and make it work. It will not work, at least where I come from it will not. What the government has to do is to work on the co-operative side first, not the confrontational side. I have seen this work, as my hon. colleagues said, with burrowing owls. I have seen it work with other species.

The bill does not talk about one thing. Say a half section is declared a habitat and is taken off the farmer's tax title. He will not pay taxes on that half section any more. Nothing is mentioned in the bill about grants to the government in lieu of taxation. Therefore we have a lot of work to do with the local people first.

I want to go back and suggest this to the House. The habitat must be identified with permission from landowners. It must be discussed with them. The impact on the operation of the landowners must be discussed, if this piece of land is to be extracted. I am thinking of one now which is what we call a coulee. Half way down that coulee is an aquifer which provides the water for over half a section of grazing.

What would happen if that coulee and aquifer were declared as part of the habitat? Would only the coulee be paid for with the water on it and the rest of the acreage would be worthless for pasture without water? All these things must be done across the kitchen table, with a cup of coffee and agreements must be reached or it will not work.

Government Orders

I have dealt with people on many issues for many years. Things will be solved when there is compliance and when we start at the bottom. Then we report back, a declaration is made and the farmers or ranchers know exactly for what they will be compensated. They sign it or perhaps a lease is drawn up until they see what happens with the endangered species. It all has to be done at the grassroots level first or the bill will fail just like it did in the U.S. That is exactly why it failed in the U.S. and that is what this bill would do.

Nobody, including myself, wants to see any more erosion of endangered species.

I heard a very good rumour. They say that if we have not heard a rumour by four o'clock, then we should start one. I just heard a rumour that deer mice will be on the endangered species list. I hope they become totally extinct. They kill children and they kill other animals. Let us get rid of them in total.

What we really bothers me is all this nonsense we hear from people on the radio or on the TV. They are all environmentalists. Driving to the airport, I heard an environmentalist say that the shoot-out of the gophers had thrown the ecosystem of Saskatchewan out for four years. What a bunch of nonsense. However that is the problem. People are listening to the wrong people.

I plead with the government to take a look at this. Take a look at the strategy of the bill. Understand that the federal government should sit down with the landowners, the local governments and the industry and identify the habitat. The endangered species has to be identified. The government has explain the importance of that to them, then it will work.

The government has to advise landowners how long the land will be taken out of production. If it is permanent, then it has to be talked about. The government should know what the lands means to the person's business. The person has to be told that the money will be upfront. We all know that it will not work if the people are asked to sign and are then told that maybe they will be paid.

I plead with the government to go to the grassroots. I have worked with these people all my life and it will work this way. It will not work as the bill is currently written.

• (1715)

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will try to discuss a few of the points being made this afternoon, beginning right away with the very spirited and passionate intervention by the member for Souris—Moose Mountain. The member for Souris—Moose Mountain has done a terrific job this afternoon because he has in a very clear and lucid manner described step by step exactly what this bill is all about as it is written now.

I am glad that he made this point because certainly what this bill is doing is rejecting the U.S. approach, no matter how often members opposite claim that the approach of Bill C-5 can be compared to that of the American approach. It definitely is not. It has been written on the basis of the principles outlined by the member for Souris—Moose Mountain, namely, co-operation first not confrontation.

I can assure everyone that this is how the bill is written and anyone who wishes can see how it would work with action plans, consultations, planning and a sequence of events which leaves the

confrontational aspect as the very last resort to be invoked when everything else fails. I can assure the House about that because we have lived with this bill, as the member for Souris—Moose Mountain knows, for quite some time. In that respect I am in a way grateful because his impassioned intervention has really helped to make it quite clear what this bill is all about. He has done it better than I could have.

The second point has to do with the very thoughtful intervention by the member for Windsor—St. Clair. In his intervention he invoked the necessity of the need for flexibility. He spoke about the carrot and the stick. Again we see a different approach because the member for Windsor—St. Clair wants a balance between the two. Whereas the member for Souris—Moose Mountain wants co-operation first rather than confrontation.

The bill itself invokes the stick as a last resort measure. It is a sequence of steps that shows there is a desire to be flexible, to avoid the experience south of the border and to develop the highest degree and level of co-operation that can be achieved with civil society. Of course time will tell whether that is the right approach. We now have to give this approach a chance to see how it works. Of course legislation can always be improved in a second phase.

That leads me to the various rather passionate interventions this afternoon on compensation. I have the impression that the researchers on the side of the Alliance perhaps have not done as good a job as they could have. The member for Skeena, if I understood him correctly, as well as the member for Kelowna did recognize, unlike the member for Red Deer, that compensation was written into the bill. It is no longer permissive. It is a must.

Not only that but the writing of the bill is now mandatory and also the words “fair and reasonable compensation” are in subclause 64 (1). Some members opposite have made the point that instead of “fair and reasonable” they would rather have “fair market value”. That, of course, can be discussed. I would argue that fair and reasonable can be as good as fair market value at times of market depressions. It could actually help and be useful as a concept or a guideline to the affected farmer or woodlot owner rather than fair market value.

• (1720)

Of course that is a debate for economists and we do not want to invest too much time in that. There is one opinion for every economist in this respect.

The fact is that on page 36 of the bill it states:

The Minister may...provide fair and reasonable compensation—

Government Orders

It then sets out the procedure, the methods and the terms and conditions for the provision of compensation, but not in detail. Some members of the opposition would like to have the regulations written into the act but that would be absurd. The regulations are called regulations because they are not law. The law sets the parameters for the regulations. The regulations then are written to implement the law. It is then the task of a parliamentary committee to see to it that the regulations are in conformity with the law. To expect that the law would define every detail of the regulation would be absurd. A committee of parliament would be sitting for years before it could report the bill back to the House. Let us be practical here, for Heaven's sake. The official opposition party actually claims to be one of the most practical parties in the world so let it live up to that reputation.

I would be remiss if I did not make a reference to the speech by the member for Fundy—Royal. He made a fair intervention but we must correct one impression that he left in the House about migratory birds. Migratory birds have not been forgotten. Migratory birds and their habitat have been included in the bill. The protection of the habitat for migratory birds is now mandatory on federal land.

Some people will ask why we left out the provinces. The official opposition would be screaming if we were to impose it on the provinces.

It seems to me that not many in the House would have a strong argument to blame the government for having limited its mandatory provision for migratory birds only to federal land, of course in the hope that the provinces will adopt mirror legislation and adopt the same approaches on provincial land.

Let us hope that in a few years when the bill will be debated again, birds which have the unfortunate experience of landing on a provincial stone will not be at a disadvantage vis-à-vis birds which land on a federal stone, but that the provinces will in good faith adopt the approach of the federal government, adopt mirror legislation so that we have an approach to the protection of endangered species that is not hampered by political boundaries.

To conclude, it would be remiss on my part not to indicate to the House that the Prime Minister has taken an interest in the bill. The result has been that vast improvements to the legislation have taken place on the subject of mandatory habitat protection on federal land and also on the dimension of the scientific list. That could then be the subject when we go into third reading because these are items that are not covered by this particular group of motions.

Let me tell members that the bill has been vastly improved. It has certain features that are highly welcome. On the theme of compensation, I would urge members of the opposition to carefully read section 64(1) and to become fully aware of what it contains rather than listening to hearsay or hastily prepared papers as apparently was the case this morning with the member for Red Deer who launched into a criticism of the bill, which actually his own members corrected, for which we were extremely grateful.

• (1725)

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to address Bill C-5, an important piece of legislation. I want the House to know that the Canadian Alliance feels very strongly that there should be endangered species

legislation. We have always argued that. However we have also always taken issue with the government's approach.

I remind the House that this is the government's third attempt at this legislation which should tell people something. It tells us that in the previous two tries it was very ham-fisted in how it approached this. It did not take the efforts of local land holders and lower level governments into account when it brought down its legislation.

As my friend from Souris—Moose Mountain pointed out, the government has been top down in the past. I admit that it is trying to correct some of this now but I have to fundamentally disagree with the chair of the environment committee who just spoke a moment ago. When we get down to the issues that are at the nub of the difference between the Canadian Alliance and some of the other parties in this place, it is the issue of compensation.

My friend across the way says that we should be comfortable leaving regulation to define this. However I think the member across the way would recognize that it is also true that when we do that things can go any which way. Because this is at the nub of the whole issue, the issue of compensation and what is fair and reasonable to fair market value, it should be laid out in the legislation.

I think the member would also acknowledge that the issue of compensation was clearly one of the big problems in the United States. Having no guarantee of fair market value for compensation invited the sorts of troubles the United States ran into. We all heard about shoot, shovel and shut-up which was the concept where it became a liability for property owners to have endangered species on their property because there was no guarantee of compensation, so people would destroy endangered species. In the end there was endangered species legislation that led to the destruction of endangered species, and we do not want that in Canada.

That was why we have been very tough on this issue. I grew up in a rural area and I had the chance to get to know mother nature a little bit. My father always took me out hunting when I was young. I appreciate the environment. My father used to get so angry at government programs that encouraged farmers to farm every square inch of a piece of property, really pay them to destroy the corners of fields where the pivots did not reach and there was wild habitat along fences. It led to the destruction of a lot of habitat and undoubtedly led to the decline of endangered species.

We want to avoid that so we are being as tough as we can be on the issue of compensation. We do not want a situation where somewhere down the road regulations are made or courts define this legislation in a way where there is not that full and fair compensation that the member who just spoke talked about. We need to have that or we will have exactly the opposite effect to what we were trying to achieve. We will end up putting in place a regime that encourages the destruction of endangered species. We do not want that.

Government Orders

In my riding we have burrowing owls. I think we have loggerhead shrikes still around. We have swift foxes. We have some animals that are on the endangered species list and we want to keep them.

In response to the chair of the environment committee I want to say that we are concerned about endangered species. We want them but we think that the nub is the issue of compensation.

Although the government has come some distance, it is thanks to a pretty powerful opposition, not only the official opposition, the Canadian Alliance, but from landowners and others as well.

• (1730)

A while ago the chair of the Liberal rural caucus, the member for Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey, rose and spoke in this place. Have members ever noticed how people start to conform to their environment after a while? The member for Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey is a chicken farmer. I see him conforming to his environment. He squawked, beaked off and his feathers were clearly ruffled but in the end he laid an egg. He laid an egg because for many months on end he told anybody who would listen how they were going to force all kinds of changes to this legislation and that if they did not do it that they would vote against the bill.

About a week ago that same member, who apparently represents a lot of rural MPs, caved in like a house of cards and said that they would be relying on the Senate to make the changes that they want. There were a number of changes. Some had to do with compensation, others had to do with how endangered species would be designated and those kinds of things.

In the end, once again we saw a Liberal member rise, make all kinds of promises about what he would do and when the whip came down he caved in. I think rural people, especially in Ontario, deserve better than that. They deserve better representation.

When rural Ontarians and people across the country who are represented in Liberal ridings have valid concerns and a member, like the member I just referred to, makes promises about what he will do if legislation does not get changed and then completely caves in, I think the country should note that and hopefully remember it and remind the member of it when they do not get the changes that they want.

The member sent out a press release and said that he had spoken to the minister and the Senate will go ahead and make the changes. On the face of it that sounds to me like almost a question of privilege. I do not see how he can go to the minister and somehow the Senate, which is an independent body, will do the minister's bidding. That to me is absolutely crazy. It presumes that the minister is calling the shots. I would think that the Senate would be upset about that because it sounds like it is completely in the pocket of the minister. I would think the Senate itself would stand up and say that it will do exactly what it wants to do based on what it thinks is best.

The Senate is supposed to be the chamber of sober second thought. Let us hope that it is. Let us hope that it brings about some of the changes that we would all like to see happen. However there is certainly no guarantee of that.

I really think the member for Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey completely overstepped his bounds and made all kinds of empty

promises that he could never keep in the hope that somehow magically it would all turn out, but it did not.

I regret very much that we are seeing closure invoked on this issue. The government is again resorting to this anti-democratic method to close off debate on an issue that does not just concern the official opposition. Members on the government side, as I have just pointed out, are very concerned about this, as are members of the NDP, the Conservatives and the Bloc. Everybody has concerns about the legislation.

The government has already invoked closure more times than any government in the history of Canada. I think Canadians deserve to have their voices heard through their elected representatives. Unfortunately those voices will not be heard to the extent that they should be on this legislation.

I hope at the end of this debate, which will be prematurely cut off, that members across the way summon the courage to do what they said they would do and vote against Bill C-5.

• (1735)

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it would be appropriate if I first expressed myself in my first language, otherwise it is hard to say what I have to say.

[Editor's Note: Member spoke in Cree]

[English]

I beg forgiveness from the species that we have threatened by our large egos as human beings, by our greed to sustain ourselves and to sustain ourselves beyond what we really need to sustain life on the planet. I beg forgiveness from the mammals, the four-leggeds, the ones that have wings, the ones that swim and the ones that crawl. I beg forgiveness from all plants and life on the planet Earth. I beg forgiveness because without consciousness the bill would not be. If we had not done what we have done until now, we would not require Bill C-5. We have done great damage to ourselves.

This beautiful planet comes under the jurisdiction of the law in Canada. If we were to measure the history of Canada on a yardstick, there is a measured history here of 35,000 years and even beyond. Our extirpation of animals has occurred in the last few decades. The impact has been done by ourselves and we have to correct it somehow.

I look at Bill C-5 as a vessel for future decisions to be made on the inevitable problems we will have. In the journey we have as a young country, Bill C-5 is finally a commitment that our country has made to the world.

The United Nations convention on biodiversity challenged Canada to come up with legislation that says we will protect endangered species at risk. This is what we have done.

Government Orders

We are debating a group of amendments on stewardship action plans. The main crux of it is clause 10, how to do it. The Canadian conservation council is created by the bill. Thirteen territorial ministers and three federal ministers, they being heritage, fisheries and environment, would make up the Canadian conservation council. These decision makers will be making recovery strategies and action plans. They will be implementing them in many regions, in the provinces and under federal jurisdiction.

Thanks to the work of the standing committee and the work in large part by ourselves in the House of Commons, we have included the aboriginal people. We have created a national aboriginal council on endangered species. It completes the circle because we will have to work at this together. It calls on all of us to exercise our responsibilities to take care of the species.

Sure, our rights have to be protected but we have to exercise our responsibilities. We must exercise our responsibilities in a co-operative manner. It has been highlighted that the provinces, the federal ministries and the aboriginal jurisdiction are all very much part of the discussion.

The landowners, land users, farmers, trappers, ranchers, hunters, fishermen, people who live off the land, tourists, outfitters, miners and loggers, all these people will have to look at a proper way of dealing with endangered species.

We have a framework and vessel that we can use. Our children will be able to use this legislation to protect themselves in the future. A proper dialogue is being created. Federal-provincial disputes can be clarified at the Canadian conservation council. If there are disputes involving aboriginal, federal and provincial jurisdictions, the aboriginal council will speak to these issues and sort them out before legal challenges take place.

● (1740)

This is what I speak about regarding Bill C-5, that this co-operative manner will succeed. I have faith that the bill will proceed to an honourable end. We will have opportunities to correct it. We are a young country as was mentioned. This is the first time this law will come into place. Once it passes, there will be opportunities to review it and change it in the future.

The other challenge I would like to put forward is not necessarily to the House. The bill will create a national aboriginal council. I beg that when the six representatives are chosen for the national aboriginal council that they be chosen by region. We must protect all regions of the country. If we were to do it by political jurisdiction and demographics, the cities and the southern jurisdiction would make the decisions on strategies and action plans for the country.

Let us dissect our country into six regions which could represent the river regions. The St. Lawrence, the Great Lakes and the Atlantic coast could be represented. The Hudson Bay watershed, the old romanticized Rupert's Land region, could be represented. The Mackenzie River that flows to the north, and the north and south Saskatchewan rivers that flow into Lake Winnipeg could be represented. The Pacific watershed that flows into the west and the Arctic waters in the coastal region of the north could be represented. Those are the regions that could be represented on the national aboriginal council.

Not only would aboriginal people take their grievances to the council, but any landowners such as farmers and ranchers could take their grievances to the council as well. The council could be a consciousness of our people and of our species.

The relationship we have is very critical because we are bound by consciousness. We can make the changes here as human beings. We as parliamentarians, as decision makers, can make the decisions when it comes to law, but when it comes to action plans and strategies, let us depend upon the Canadian endangered species conservation council. The 13 provincial and territorial ministers, the three federal ministers and the six aboriginal representatives can sort out how we make our decisions in the future.

A very scary comment was made by one of the members opposite. It was in the context of hoping that one species would be gone. I would say let us humble ourselves from having the power to say let us wipe out a species off the planet. All of these gifts we have been given on mother earth are for a purpose. They are tests. If we do not pass these tests, we will fail and the generations to come will pay. Sure, a deer mouse tests us because of the illness it gives us, but it may wake us up to a bigger mistake that we are making. Let us humbly respect all species on the planet.

I close by giving thanks to the aboriginal working group and its co-chairs for their foresight in bringing these issues forward. I thank the Minister of the Environment and his staff for making this possible. I also thank all the leaders of the national aboriginal organizations who contributed toward making the necessary amendments that I had put forward.

I thank the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development. It has done well. Also, all the members opposite and on the government side have done well in bringing these issues forward. For making this debate possible, I thank our leader the Prime Minister for seeing the bill as a priority for us to deal with before we rise. It is very appropriate that we handle it now.

● (1745)

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we are speaking under the closure motion that was passed earlier today. It is unfortunate that the government saw fit to stop the debate on this issue because it is one that has taken time and it needs more time for Canadians to bring forward their ideas and comments.

The committee did a good job. It met for many hours and hundreds of witnesses came forward with good ideas. Amendments were brought forward and a lot of work was done. Then when the bill came back to the House all of that work was reversed and the bill was put back to the way the government wanted it to be.

We support endangered species legislation and we always have, but we differ with the government on the way it is trying to deliver it. This heavy handed approach where huge penalties are brought in to force people into line is not the way to go.

A lot of the things that have been done in Canada to protect habitat and species have been done voluntarily. We have all witnessed areas that have done that.

Government Orders

In my own area, whenever the irrigation districts make a reservoir or try to improve the irrigation district they always leave wetlands and areas for wildlife to nest and thrive. I was in the eastern irrigation district in Brooks with the member for Medicine Hat and saw some areas where the burrowing owl nests. We saw burrowing owls, antelope and mule deer all in the same area. It was amazing. It is right along highway 36 just south of highway 1. They have made a conscious effort to protect that area. It can be done and it has been done.

Bringing in a heavy handed approach with huge penalties that will be put on people if they disturb some habitat even unintentionally is the wrong way to go.

I belong to the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group. We recently had an opportunity to be in the United States. We met with some congressmen and senators. One of the issues we talked about was species at risk. We brought forward what was happening in Canada with this bill and we had some comments back from some of the elected officials in the United States.

One member in particular told us that the endangered species protection act in the United States has turned into a zoning tool. It is being used to stop development. It is being used to change zoning laws. It has not done what it was intended to do in the beginning which was to protect endangered species. That is what our bill has been fashioned after with this heavy handed approach without recognizing the amount of work that has been done on the land and the fact that the best stewards of the land are the people who live there and earn their living either through farming or the natural resources sector. He cautioned everyone.

Some Canadian senators were there and they were listening. They are waiting for the bill to get to the Senate so they can have a closer look at it. Contrary to what has been said previously by others, they do not feel they are going to rubber stamp the bill. They have some concerns with it where it deals with the powers of the federal government and the powers of the provinces and how the federal government can apply a law over what the provinces already have. There will be some interesting discussions when the bill gets to the Senate.

The fact that this legislation does not address the compensation issue has been talked about at length. That is a concern and one of the things we were asking to have in the legislation. From day one, going back to previous bills, we have always said if there was not fair market value compensation in the legislation that we would not be able to support it.

We still cannot support the legislation as it exists because any talk of compensation would be put into regulation. That is just not good enough. If it is the intention of the government to offer compensation to landowners then it should be put in the legislation. We should spell it out so we all feel comfortable that it will be done.

• (1750)

Until that is put in, if affected landowners, even unknowingly, out doing whatever they do, whether it is ranching, farming or working in the natural resource sector, unintentionally disturb the habitat, they can be charged. Why would people want to continue with all the volunteer systems that have been put in place to protect these

habitats knowing that if they make an area attractive to an endangered species and one does come to their land, that land could be taken out of production with no compensation to the landowners? It is just the reverse of what needs to be done.

If the compensation issue is taken care of upfront, it would encourage people to protect these species. We would have none of this shoot, shovel and shut up mentality that has crept into some of the areas of the United States because of bad legislation. These people do not go out of their way to do this. They do it because the legislation is designed in such a way that they cannot abide by it.

One of the things that has to be and should have been addressed is the whole issue of proper consultation, and not only in the timeframe of the bill being put together. As I say, there was a lot of consultation done by the chairman of the environment committee and his people. When amendments were made to the bill it started looking pretty good. Positive changes were made. Then when it came back to the House the government introduced amendments to reverse most of that work. That consultation period has taken place, but we also need consultation when the bill is in effect. We have to be able to go out and talk to landowners and let them know what the situation is and make them aware. This whole process needs to be carried on and on so that everyone can buy into the protection of endangered species.

The member for Churchill River, who just spoke, has a whole different outlook on this because of his background, his native upbringing. One of the ways of their culture, their history and their background is that they must consider how any decision they make or anything they do would affect the next seven generations. I feel that if we in this country would have had that in our minds going way back to the early days certainly we would have a better understanding of our species at risk and there certainly would not be as many species at risk. Mankind has done a terrible job with our environment over time. We need to make some changes. That is why we would support effective species at risk legislation if it were brought forward.

I want to get back to what has happened south of the border. If our country ever had a trial of legislation that the government was considering, all we would have to do is look to the United States to see that it has not worked and it will not work. After all the years that its legislation has been in place there is no evidence that any species at risk has been protected or brought back.

Until we get this issue of compensation into the legislation we cannot support the bill. I wish it had been done so that we could have supported the bill. There are other things we are concerned about, but that is our big issue. I am sure that would have gone a long way toward protecting species. As it exists now, there is still the danger that people will go out of their way to remove the habitat that endangered species would be attracted to or, indeed, remove a species itself.

It does not look like we will get that put in now because closure has been brought into effect. It will not happen. We will be voting on this later today, but as this bill is implemented, somewhere down the line I am sure that some serious changes will need to be made so that we can indeed protect the species we intend to protect.

Government Orders

•(1755)

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address some of the comments raised by members from the rural Liberal caucus in regard to clause 64. I have looked at clause 64 and the amendments under that clause. The members seem to have the impression that landowners need not worry now, that there is going to be protection in law for fair compensation, perhaps even fair market value compensation.

From what I can see in this legislation, if a landowner is standing before a judge and has to rely on what is in clause 64, with all due respect I do not think they have very much to stand on. There is a lot of wiggle room and discretion involved in the clause. There are no clear guarantees of property rights under those provisions. The word "may" is a permissive word. There is no mandatory requirement with that word. I really think they are misreading the impact of these amendments under clause 64.

The real problem with the legislation is a heavy-handed, command and control approach with respect to affected landowners. I have said this before, and I certainly believe it: The government believes that it can get results by simply ordering and commanding those results. I think that in the modern age it is becoming more and more clear that if a person wants results, a person manages those results and relies on co-operation and an understanding of all the processes involved to get those results. Just simply ordering results will not get those results.

This type of approach, as the member for Lethbridge pointed out, has been employed in the U.S. We have that as a laboratory we can use to see how this sort of command approach has worked. There are hundreds of cases in the United States that show how this approach actually threatens endangered species.

I want to share just one case. There are many, but I just wanted to go through one case to underscore the problem. The name of the individual in this case is Ben Cone. He owned 7,200 acres of woodland in North Carolina. The 7,200 acres had been clear-cut in the 1930s and through good management practices it had been restored in the 1970s and 1980s. The Cone family had managed that woodland and made a living out of it by a careful, selected harvesting of that woodlot. In 1991 the wildlife service entered his property and declared that approximately 1,500 acres were to be set aside as a habitat to protect 29 woodpeckers that had been listed and had been identified in that area.

The effect of this was that Mr. Cone could no longer harvest the 1,500 acres of property. He could not really do very much with it. It lost its economic value. It lost its use to the Cone family. The value of the property was something like \$2.3 million. After this process was over, the value had dropped to \$83,000. They had lost that much value. What did Mr. Cone do with the remaining 5,800 acres of land? He clear-cut it. He abandoned his selective forestry practices and reverted to clear-cutting practices because he did not want the wildlife service coming in, finding another species at risk in his area and having it affect more of his land.

However, Mr. Cone also had a lot of neighbours who had woodland and timberland just like he had. We can guess what they did. They clear-cut the land. Thousands and thousands of acres were clear-cut in this North Carolina area for one simple reason: They did

not want the wildlife service coming in and in effect expropriating their property by declaring any portion of their land habitat.

•(1800)

I think this underscores the point that this heavy-handed, command and control system does not protect species at risk. In fact it endangers those species, and this case simply underscores that fact. There are a lot of cases like this, and I am surprised that the government is not aware of those unintended consequences.

I have a few other comments about the legislation. There are no guaranteed compensation rights in Bill C-5. Relegating it to regulations and bureaucrats is not reassuring to landowners. There is no clear process in the bill for determining compensation and it should have been dealt with. Another deficiency in the bill, something that was missed, is the fact that there is no co-operative approach for creating and funding good conservation and stewardship programs.

However, there is something that would not be missed. I do not know of any initiative taken by a Liberal government over the last 30 or 40 years whereby a seed was planted and did not grow into a large empire, an empire with a lot of civil servants and bureaucrats. The firearms registry legislation is a recent history of this fact. I do not know of a single seed planted in this town for any type of legislation that did not lead to a bureaucracy.

There are government departments in every province and territory in this country. Departments like fisheries and oceans are armed with people heading out into rural Canada to intrude into the lives of people who are just trying to make a living. I can see a big shift of wealth. People who create the wealth and pay the bills in this country are seeing their money going to the government to fund another empire. That is another area of the legislation that concerns me, and I do not think the committee paid much attention to that aspect of the bill. I do not think the committee looked into the economic impact of this sort of legislation and what it entails.

I want to emphasize the fact that Canadian Alliance members and the Canadian public want effective policy and legislation to protect species at risk. Unfortunately, this legislation, because of its failure to accept and recognize some basic rights such as property rights of owners, will drive those folks underground and the real victims in this legislation will be the very thing that the legislation intends to protect: species at risk.

Government Orders

It is really unfortunate that the amendments proposed by the committee to address these concerns were not dealt with. I think the government wants to push this stuff through and put the cost of species at risk onto the shoulders of landowners in rural Canada. In all fairness, urban people probably cause far more harm to wildlife through their overconsumption and the toxic waste, pollution and so on created by urban life. Those things have probably caused more problems for animals and species at risk in this country than any rural individual has, but the cost of the legislation is being imposed on the rural population and the landowners of rural Canada, not on urban people, and that is very unfair.

● (1805)

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I was going to say it was a pleasure to join in the debate this evening on Bill C-5, the species at risk legislation, but it is not. The reason is because for the 77th time the Liberal government has brought in time allocation to shut down debate on an important piece of legislation.

Perhaps Canadians should ask themselves why they should care about that. When they ask themselves that question they should contemplate why they should care about democracy. Increasingly we do not see democracy in this supposed hallowed hall of democratic debate.

Time and time again we see a government intent on limiting debate, shutting down debate and bringing in time allocation. In this case there are hundreds of amendments to debate in five different groups. There are some 150 amendments which shows how deeply flawed the bill was right from the beginning. We will be voting on those amendments this evening, and yet the government limited debate on them.

After all the time the government had to put together legislation to protect and preserve species at risk, one must ask if this is the best it could do. The Liberal government brought in deeply flawed legislation which required many amendments and then shut down debate on those very amendments. That is what is happening today.

I must point out to Canadians the hypocrisy of the government's position when it comes to time allocation. This is the 77th time since it came into power in the fall of 1993, or really January 1994 until June 2002, a little less than 8.5 years of governing this nation.

I recall running for election back in 1992-93. The government came out with what could only be classified now as its infamous red book of promises. One of the centrepieces of its 1992-93 red book was the restoration of the trust and respect of the institution of parliament. What has happened in the 8.5 years the Liberals have governed? Polls now consistently show that Canadians are more fed up with the way this country is governed now than at any time in its previous history. What did the Liberals say in their infamous red book? In chapter 6 called "Governing with Integrity" they said:

Canadians have always prided themselves on the quality of their democratic institutions. Yet after nine years of Conservative rule, cynicism about public institutions, governments, politicians, and the political process is at an all-time high. If government is to play a positive role in society, as it must, honesty and integrity in our political institutions must be restored.

The most important asset of government is the confidence it enjoys of the citizens to whom it is accountable. There is evidence today of considerable dissatisfaction

with government and a steady erosion of confidence in the people and institutions of the public sector.

This erosion of confidence seems to have many causes: some have to do with the behaviour of certain elected politicians, others with an arrogant style of political leadership. The people are irritated with governments that do not consult them, or that disregard their views, or that try to conduct key parts of the public business behind closed doors.

They went on to say in their red book:

A Liberal government will take a series of initiatives to restore confidence in the institutions of government. Open government will be the watchword of the Liberal program.

● (1810)

The Liberals went on to say under the subtitle of "Parliamentary Reform":

In the House of Commons, a Liberal government will give MPs a greater role in drafting legislation, through House of Commons committees.

If that is not a broken promise I do not know what is. We have seen time and time again that even when we get a committee report from one of the standing committees in this place the Liberal government either ignores or does the opposite or brings in its own amendments at report stage to discount and throw out the work done by the committee. Yet the government promised to restore trust, integrity, and respect in this institution.

I could go on at great length about how it said it would do it. In this time of multi-scandal we hear every day in question period scandal after scandal and about how the government is operating, how it is treating what should be the sanctity of taxpayers' dollars. On page 95 of their infamous red book the Liberals said:

—a Liberal government will appoint an independent Ethics Counsellor to advise both public officials and lobbyists in the day-to-day application of the Code of Conduct for Public Officials. The Ethics Counsellor will be appointed after consultation with the leaders of all parties in the House of Commons and will report directly to Parliament.

An hon. member: Is that not what is happening?

Mr. Jay Hill: One of my colleagues asks is that not what is happening? Of course it is not, despite the promises in this red book. I know I am not allowed to use a prop. It was only a photocopy. I do not have an original still kicking around since 1992. It is an endangered species. Hopefully the Liberals will be an endangered species on the ballots in the next federal election.

Through the use of time allocation, the abuse of tax dollars, the refusal to have an ethics counsellor that reports to and is accountable to parliament, the government is doing more to destroy the trust and respect of taxpayers in this institution than any government, even the Mulroney government. That is really saying something, that it could go far beyond what Brian Mulroney did in the nine years he was in power between 1984 and 1993.

I could go on and quote at great length what the Prime Minister said and what the whip of the government said when she was in opposition back in 1989. The whip said in speaking about the Mulroney government:

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.

Government Orders

I am sure every Canadian would say that the description by the hon. whip of the government today would equally fit the present Liberal government on how it has performed and behaved over this last while.

A number of my colleagues have indicated what the biggest problem is with this species at risk legislation, over and above the fact that the government had to bring in time allocation. I would love to go on at great length and talk about the actual bill and the amendments that were put forward, unfortunately time is always of the essence and we are always cut off. We are always cut off in this place by the government with its heavy handed attitude toward true and legitimate debate.

• (1815)

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have heard more of my colleague's comments because he was getting right down into the meat of the issue. Unfortunately with the Liberal government's heavy handed approach, it wants to cut off intelligent and reasoned debate. That is unfortunate because what he was leading up to reflected thoughtful debate of which he and his constituents are capable. His constituents as well as mine are disappointed at this turn of events, that the government would take this democratic institution and use heavy handed methods to stifle debate.

My colleagues from the Canadian Alliance and I proposed a number of amendments to the bill. The Canadian Alliance supports endangered species legislation. Our amendments attempted to ensure that the legislation would be fair to both the stakeholders and effective in protecting endangered species. The bill as it stands today is neither. It does not protect the interests of the stakeholders and it does not protect endangered species.

The government has failed to calculate the legislation's long term cost to every taxpayer and failed miserably to estimate or even consider the burden that the legislation may place on landowners and farmers. It has totally ignored the need of Canadians to be informed and consulted on matters that their way of life is dependent upon. This approach serves not only to foster mistrust of the federal government but ultimately renders the legislation less effective. It does not promote a spirit of co-operation between those who are making the laws and those who must adhere to them.

Many of the government amendments before us today would reverse several months of work by the environment committee and would cause members on this side of the House much concern. The environment committee made up of members from all parties worked together to ensure that the specific needs of stakeholders and the endangered species were met. What happened? It got to the House and amendments were made, amendments that were arrogant and cynical toward the democratic process and the rights of individual members to represent their constituents.

The arrogance and cynicism displayed by these types of tactics is nothing new to my colleagues in opposition. After 18 months in parliament it is becoming unfortunately old hat to a relatively newcomer such as myself. Such an approach to law making will have far reaching consequences that go beyond the politics and will strike at the very heart of the legislation. The government has failed to recognize the fundamental principles on which our country and

system of law are based: first, the issue of the recognition of property rights and second, the accountability of government.

We maintained throughout the course of the debate on the bill that property owners, resource users and any other citizens affected by the provisions of the species at risk act must be included in every step of the process. Indeed co-operation with landowners and resource users is critical to the very success of the legislation.

• (1820)

We in the Canadian Alliance believe voluntary agreements, action and management plans and other strategies designed to protect endangered species are important. We therefore support the provisions of the bill that would enable such strategies.

However there is a problem with the bill as it is currently written. Although it would allow the environment minister to enter into agreements with environmental or other groups it would exclude the possibility of entering into agreements with landowners. Our amendments would add the possibility of minister-landowner agreements as an explicit option for the minister. This would address two crucial areas: first, it would respect property rights; second, it would bring accountability back to government.

The amendment proposed in Motion No. 21 would provide that any proposed agreement be made public 30 days before being finalized and that the minister consult with all people affected by it. This would provide certainty in the law that the minister would respect the rights of property owners and involve them in discussions. By ensuring that owners, lessees and other landowners were included in the provisions parliament could communicate to Canadians that the government was open to a co-operative approach.

The recklessness of introducing such sweeping legislation with no data whatsoever on the costs or on what if anything Canadians could expect in the way of compensation is rather astounding. Clause 49 of the legislation currently mandates that action plans should include "the cost of not proceeding with the action plan". Government Motion No. 75 would delete this requirement. This would be a further step backward. We do not support the motion.

I will comment briefly on jurisdictional matters with respect to the bill. Under the bill as it stands today, if a province did not have endangered species legislation or was deemed by the federal government to have inadequate legislation the federal environment minister would have the power to impose federal law on the province. As many of my colleagues have pointed out, the preservation of endangered species is under shared jurisdiction. Taking a heavy handed unilateral approach would do nothing for the cause of co-operative federalism.

This is not only an issue of lack of trust between government and citizens who are landowners. It would contribute to lack of co-operation between governments that need to work together in our federation. The first step in working together with another government is to respect the British North America Act, 1867 or, as it is now called, the Canada Act, 1982. If a little more respect was paid to basic constitutional principles we would not have many of the problems we have in interprovincial and federal-provincial relationships.

Government Orders

In closing, we in our party cannot support the bill because it would not effectively protect endangered species. Its heavy handed, top down approach would be destructive to federal-provincial relations. The bill in front of us is seriously flawed. Without the amendments we have proposed Bill C-5 would have disastrous results.

• (1825)

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I will restate clearly and unequivocally that the Canadian Alliance is committed to protecting and preserving Canada's natural environment and endangered species.

As I have said in the House many times, my wife and I lived by a lake in the Rocky Mountains where we brought up a wonderful family of three children. We are completely committed to the natural environment. We are committed to endangered species at a personal level. That is also the position of our party.

However the process has been highly frustrating. This is the third incarnation of the species at risk act. In every process, this one included, we have heard legitimate and intelligent input from stakeholders and experts who are deeply concerned about the issues and have brought their concerns to committee. In every instance the environment minister of the day has turned back their common sense proposals. On May 2 the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton was quoted in the *London Free Press* as saying:

Of course there is (frustration) with the system...Why do committees exist? It's to be a counterbalance, and it's fundamentally flawed, wrong and improper when the work of a committee can be undone by a minister at his own whim.

I agree with the Liberal member completely. Another Liberal, the hon. member for Thunder Bay—Superior North, is quoted in the same article. He stated:

We all go through the process at times at the committee level of getting the recommendation put in and the minister's department doesn't see fit to include them and, yeah, there's always that frustration.

There is a tad of frustration, and not just on this side of the House. A May 2 Ottawa *Citizen* article stated:

Environmental groups and certain MPs were focusing their efforts yesterday on winning one last concession from the government before the bill comes to a vote. They want the bill to guarantee the protection of the critical habitat of endangered species on federal land.

The *Citizen* article quoted the hon. member for York North who has been involved with these issues for a long time. She said:

I think it's important that we find a bill that protects habitat for species...I believe that we're moving towards a resolution of that issue and I'm looking forward to seeing that in the bill.

Interestingly, the same article quoted the environment minister who was asked if he would agree to such a change. He gave a two letter, one word answer: "No", he would not change. What has changed between then and now? What has changed with the people involved in the issue such as the hon. members I mentioned, the hon. member for Davenport and others? Liberal backbenchers have succumbed to the pressure of the government and will permit this badly flawed piece of legislation to go through.

The Canadian Alliance is committed to protecting and preserving Canada's natural environment and endangered species. However Bill C-5 would not do that. It would not even come close. Why is that? There are many flaws in the bill but one primary flaw: It would not work without guaranteeing fair and reasonable compensation for

property owners and resource users who suffer losses. Farmers, ranchers and other property owners want to protect endangered species but should not be forced to do so at the expense of their own livelihoods.

The government wants to amend Bill C-5 to reverse many of the positions taken by its own MPs on the environment committee. It is another example of top down control from the Prime Minister's office. It again shows the contempt in which the government holds members of parliament.

As I stated at the outset, in all instances there has been input by interested parties. One of the most interesting was the Species at Risk Working Group otherwise known by the acronym SARWG. The group issued a joint statement of principle. The statement was so good, profound and sound it could have been used as a foundation for any good species at risk act. Instead this diverse group had its interventions fundamentally ignored.

• (1830)

Landowners, land users and rural residents whom I represent would bear the brunt of the species at risk act. Motion No. 109 would eliminate the requirement to develop regulations for compensation. Compensation is not an extra. It is essential to the entire framework of protecting endangered species. For instruction on the issue we should look to countries with legislation that does provide adequate protection for landowners, which ensures that they and other land users are encouraged rather than penalized for looking after species at risk.

Compensation would not only ensure landowners and resource users did not single-handedly bear all the costs of protecting species. It would send an important symbolic message that the government understood their fears and recognized the need to take their interests into account.

The government will not even commit to developing a regulatory framework. Consistently in the House we are faced with skeleton laws made by the Liberal government, laws that have only the basic outline of what is expected. The regulations, the meat on the bones, are turned over to the bureaucracy and are completely out of the control of the people elected to this place to represent their constituents and the people of Canada.

The minister says he hopes to have draft general regulations ready for public review and comment soon after royal assent. That is not good enough by a long shot. How helpful is that? It should be available now for the House to debate. The minister acts as if providing a few regulatory scraps is evidence of his gracious benevolence. After all, it is not required. He can do it if he feels like it.

Government Orders

This is exactly like a bill we are considering in the heritage committee. Bill C-48 has to do with copyright. It too is nothing more than a skeleton law. We do not know what the regulations will be. The Minister of Industry and the Minister of Canadian Heritage wrote letters to the committee telling it to pass it as is. They told the committee to get the bill through so it could be enacted. They said once it was enacted the government would come back to committee sometime in the next year with the regulations. That is not good enough. Bill C-10, the Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act which has just passed the Senate, is exactly the same thing. It is also a skeleton bill.

We are charged not only by our constituents but by all the people of Canada with responsibility for bringing forward good laws and legislation that people understand and that we can vote for intelligently. However in Bill C-5 there are again no regulations. There is no meat on the bones. The way the Liberals consistently deal with legislation is unacceptable. It holds the entire institution of the House of Commons in contempt. Government Motion No. 109 would weaken the law. Subclause 64(2) of Bill C-5 currently reads:

The Governor in Council shall—

Shall is the important word.

—make regulations that the Governor in Council considers necessary for carrying out the purposes and provisions of subsection (1), including regulations—

What did the government do? Did it strengthen the wording? There is no way to strengthen the word shall so the government changed it to may. The government said it might get around to it. It does not care if it weakens the law.

I appeal to the hon. member for Davenport and the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Louis, for whom I have tremendously high personal regard, to take another look at the bill in good conscience. They should realize it would not protect endangered species, something I know they want as much as I do.

•(1835)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, allow me to say a few words on Bill C-5, the Species at Risk Act. The current process has been going on for close to nine years and it has led us to where we are today regarding the species at risk legislation.

I remind the House that the nine years of this process were not spent making a series of brief proposals, rejecting them and making new ones again. Nor was it a matter of saying “We do not like this idea; we will propose another one”.

On the contrary, this process of nine years was a cumulative process that helped developed an informed policy. And at each stage, we looked at what we had learned before taking the next step.

Of course, we consulted a large number of individuals and groups. We looked at what was being done in other countries and in another jurisdictions, including provincial jurisdictions. We reviewed, we listened and we reviewed some more.

In fact, last year, before the species at risk bill was introduced in February 2001, consultations had been held across Canada. For

example, national workshops were organized to develop the foundations of the policies and the framework of the bill on species at risk.

We read thousands of letters that were taken into consideration in the design of the bill. Moreover, discussions took place with aboriginal people from all regions of the country and with national aboriginal organizations.

Wildlife management boards, academics, environmental NGOs, conservation groups, international organizations, the provinces and territories, and stakeholders from the fishing, forestry, agricultural, mining and labour sectors also took part in the consultations.

This is to say that we heard an extremely diversified group of people from coast to coast to coast, for the very reason that we wanted to try to meet and listen to all those who are concerned about this bill.

Let us also not forget the members who, of course, spent quite a bit of time on this bill.

In fact, collectively we devoted more than 250 hours to discussions and deliberations around this species at risk bill. Last year, for example, the House Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development received more than 80 submissions and heard more than 90 witnesses.

I think we can say today that we have heard the entire range of views. We have also made every reasonable effort to take those points of view into account. Listening to people is not enough, one must also deal with the information they provide. Our goal was to strike a balance between the various points of view we heard. I think we can say today that, without a doubt, we have achieved that goal.

This species at risk bill is the best solution under the circumstances. It takes into account our constitutional structure, our Canadian approach, our need to involve people in conservation measures, and it takes into account as well the numerous requirements and interests of landowners throughout the country.

Thought must be given to everything that has been accomplished since this bill began to be drafted. When the federal Species at Risk Act was introduced for the first time, it did not contain many provisions on conservation. It did not make reference to the importance of stewardship and still less to the measures that are the key means of true habitat protection and conservation.

We have listened to Canadians in rural regions, the farmers, fishers, forestry workers and other users of natural resources.

All indicated to us that the stewardship initiatives that have been in place for a long time in Canada have yielded confirmed results.

●(1840)

We support the proposal made by the standing committee to authorize the Minister of the Environment to direct the development of a stewardship action plan. We have committed funding of \$45 million over five years through the habitat stewardship program.

These changes were very well received by Canadians from every rural region in the country. The most important change was probably regarding compensation. The bill now contains compensation provisions. There must be fair and reasonable compensation for losses suffered as a result of any extraordinary impact from prohibitions on destroying essential habitat.

We support the amendment proposed by the standing committee that requires there be regulations on compensation.

Under the proposal and the bill under consideration, these regulations will be developed in close consultation with all those affected. The development process for the regulations on compensation will be transparent and inclusive. It will include landowners and land and resource users.

We heeded the advice given by environmental groups and by members of the standing committee who supported a broader application of the legislation. We expanded the scope of the bill so that it now includes all species at risk in addition to their essential habitat wherever that may be in Canada.

The development of recovery, action, and management plans must respect high standards of co-operation. As the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development recommended, these three documents must also be made available for public comment.

We also focused on landowners and on those who use land and resources, particularly rural Canadians.

In the interests of greater openness, transparency and accountability, we added a provision requiring that the recommendations of a roundtable composed of persons interested in matters respecting the protection of wildlife species at risk be included in the registry. The Minister must respond publicly to these recommendations within 180 days.

I challenge all of us to find any recovery measure, any regulation, any species situation assessment report, or any other document required by the legislation which does not have to be included in the registry.

I challenge all of us to find anything at all in this proposal which would not be the subject of consultations or which would not be monitored, and the implementation and effectiveness of which would not have to be reviewed at regular intervals.

We worked with the standing committee to add 233 species to the initial legal list. This means that recovery programs and management plans will be required for 233 species within set timeframes. As soon as the legislation takes effect, this requirement will apply to all 233 species on the legal list, including those managed by the provinces.

This means—as I have already mentioned in another speech in the House—that, in so far as possible, the essential habitat for almost

Government Orders

200 species listed in the “extirpated”, “endangered” and “threatened” categories will have to be identified.

We are proud of the bulk of the bill. We are probably the proudest of its approach to aboriginal involvement. This is without precedent.

The bill represents a considerable investment of time and effort. After almost nine years, we have got it right. It is the best solution for Canada. It is time to pass this bill.

●(1845)

The Speaker: It being 6.45 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith all questions necessary to dispose of the bill at report stage now before the House.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 18.

[*Translation*]

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 18?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 18 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 21. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The 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.

An hon. member: On division.

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

(Motion No. 21 negatived)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 22. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

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.

An hon. member: On division.

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.
(Motion No. 22 negatived)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The 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: The division on Motion No. 26 stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The 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: The recorded division on Motion No. 31 stands deferred.

• (1850)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 33 stands deferred.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
(Motion No. 37 agreed to)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: The division on Motion No. 38 stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 43 stands deferred.

Government Orders

The next question is on Motion No. 75. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 75 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 85. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 85 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 116. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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: The recorded division on Motion No. 116 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 120.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 117. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 117 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 118. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 118 carried.

(Motion No. 118 agreed to.)

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The 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: The recorded division on Motion No. 129 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 131. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Government Orders

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: The recorded division on Motion No. 131 stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 132. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: The division on Motion No. 132 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 133. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 133 stands deferred.

• (1855)

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of the bill.

Call in the members.

[*Editor's Note: For continuation of proceedings see Volume B*]

CONTENTS

Monday, June 10, 2002

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Canadian Transportation Agency

Mr. Dubé	12367
Motion	12367
Mr. Harvey	12368
Mr. Moore	12370
Ms. Davies	12371
Mr. Laframboise	12372
Mr. Dubé	12374

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Species at Risk Act

Bill C-5—Time Allocation Motion

Mr. Boudria	12374
Motion	12374
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	12374
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	12375
Mr. Bigras	12375
Mr. MacKay	12375
Mr. Burton	12375
Mr. Bigras	12376
Mr. Comartin	12376
Mr. Casson	12376
Mr. Bigras	12377
Mr. Bailey	12377
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	12377
Mr. Hearn	12378
Mr. Fitzpatrick	12378
Mr. Bigras	12378
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	12379
(Motion agreed to)	12380
Report Stage	
Bill C-5, Report Stage	12380
Mr. Lunney	12380
Division on Motion No. 6 deferred	12382
Division on Motion No. 16 deferred	12382
Division on Motion No. 17 deferred	12382
(Amendment agreed to)	12382
(Motion No. 20, as amended, agreed to)	12382
(Motion No. 24 agreed to)	12382
(Amendment agreed to)	12382
(Motion No. 25, as amended, agreed to)	12382
Division on Motion No. 29 deferred	12383
Division on Motion No. 72 deferred	12383
Division on Motion No. 76 deferred	12383
Division on Motion No. 114 deferred	12383
Division on Motion No. 126 deferred	12383
Division on Motion No. 127 stands deferred	12383
The division on Motion No. 130 deferred	12384
Motion No. 18	12384
Mr. Reid	12384
Motion No. 21	12384

Mr. Burton	12384
Motions Nos. 22 and 26	12384
Motion No. 27	12384
Mr. Burton	12384
Motion No. 31	12384
Motions Nos. 33, 37, 38, 43, 75 and 85	12384
Motions Nos. 116 to 118	12385
The Deputy Speaker	12385
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	12385
Motion No. 129	12385
Motions Nos. 131, 132 and 133	12385
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	12385
Mr. Bigras	12386

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

National Spina Bifida and Hydrocephalus Awareness Month

Mrs. Redman	12387
-------------------	-------

National Defence

Mr. Mayfield	12387
--------------------	-------

Charles Daudelin

Ms. St-Jacques	12387
----------------------	-------

Girl Guides

Ms. Phinney	12387
-------------------	-------

Millennium Scholarships

Mr. Proulx	12387
------------------	-------

Health

Mr. Spencer	12388
-------------------	-------

Millennium Scholarships

Mr. Marcil	12388
------------------	-------

Lise Waters

Ms. Bourgeois	12388
---------------------	-------

Economic Development

Mr. Regan	12388
-----------------	-------

Veterans Affairs

Mrs. Hinton	12388
-------------------	-------

Portugal Day

Mr. Peric	12389
-----------------	-------

Philippine Heritage Week

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis	12389
--------------------------	-------

Government Contracts

Ms. Guay	12389
----------------	-------

Snowboarding

Ms. Fry	12389
---------------	-------

VIA Rail

Mr. Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	12389
---------------------------------------	-------

Burlington	
Ms. Torsney	12389
Millennium Scholarships	
Mr. Merrifield	12390
Government Contracts	
Mr. Cardin	12390

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Government Contracts	
Mr. Harper	12390
Mr. Goodale	12390
Mr. Harper	12390
Mr. Goodale	12391
Mr. Harper	12391
Mr. Goodale	12391
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	12391
Mr. Goodale	12391
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	12391
Mr. Goodale	12391
Mr. Duceppe	12391
Mr. Goodale	12391
Mr. Duceppe	12391
Mr. Goodale	12392
Mr. Gauthier	12392
Mr. Goodale	12392
Mr. Gauthier	12392
Mr. Goodale	12392
Poverty	
Ms. Davies	12392
Mr. Manley	12392
Ms. Davies	12392
Mr. Manley	12392
Government Contracts	
Mr. MacKay	12392
Mr. Marcil	12393
Mr. MacKay	12393
Mr. Marcil	12393
Mr. Ritz	12393
Mr. Goodale	12393
Mr. Ritz	12393
Mr. Goodale	12393
Mr. Lebel	12393
Mr. Goodale	12393
Mr. Lebel	12393
Mr. Goodale	12394
Mr. Reynolds	12394
Mr. Goodale	12394
Mr. Reynolds	12394
Mr. Goodale	12394
Mr. Guimond	12394
Mr. Goodale	12394
Mr. Guimond	12394
Mr. Goodale	12394
Mr. Sorenson	12394
Mr. Goodale	12395

Mr. Sorenson	12395
Mr. Goodale	12395
Research and Development	
Mr. Pacetti	12395
Mr. Marcil	12395
Softwood Lumber	
Mr. Masse	12395
Mr. Pettigrew	12395
Automobile Industry	
Mr. Masse	12395
Mr. Pettigrew	12395
Government Contracts	
Mr. Keddy	12396
Mr. Goodale	12396
Mr. Keddy	12396
Mr. Goodale	12396
Mrs. Skelton	12396
Mr. Goodale	12396
Mrs. Skelton	12396
Mr. Goodale	12396
Ms. Gagnon (Québec)	12396
Mr. Goodale	12396
Ms. Gagnon (Québec)	12397
Mr. Goodale	12397
Mr. Moore	12397
Mr. Goodale	12397
Mr. Moore	12397
Mr. Goodale	12397
International Aid	
Mr. Assadourian	12397
Ms. Whelan (Essex)	12397
Government Contracts	
Mr. Gouk	12397
Mr. Goodale	12397
Mr. Gouk	12397
Mr. Goodale	12397
Mr. Crête	12397
Mr. Manley	12398
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Cullen	12398
Mr. Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale)	12398
Kyoto Protocol	
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	12398
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	12398
Government Contracts	
Ms. Lalonde	12398
Mr. Manley	12398
Child Poverty	
Mr. Godin	12398
Mrs. Stewart	12398
Voisey's Bay	
Mr. Heam	12399
Mr. Manley	12399

Health	
Ms. Thibeault	12399
Mr. Castonguay	12399

Points of Order	
Oral Question Period	
Mr. Boudria	12399

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Regan	12399

Committees of the House	
Justice and Human Rights	
Mr. Scott	12399

Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985	
Mr. Nystrom	12400
Bill C-474. Introduction and first reading	12400
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	12400

Petitions	
Child Pornography	
Mr. Bailey	12400
Housing	
Ms. Davies	12400
Canada Post	
Mr. Roy	12400
Mr. Peric	12400
Child Pornography	
Mr. Anders	12400
Canada Post	
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean)	12400
Missile Defense Program	
Mr. Easter	12401
Veterans	
Mr. Godin	12401
Employment Insurance	
M. Godin	12401
Gasoline Prices	
M. Godin	12401
Adoption	
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	12401
Canada Post	
Mr. Adams	12401
Child Pornography	
Mr. Adams	12401
Canada Post	
Ms. Bourgeois	12401
Fisheries	
Mr. Cummins	12401
Chemical Pesticides	
Mr. Lincoln	12401

Child Pornography	
Mr. Sorenson	12401
Mr. Pallister	12402
Ms. Carroll	12402

Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Regan	12402

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Species at Risk Act	
Bill C-5. Report stage	12402
Mr. Bigras	12402
Mr. Reed	12403
Mr. Schmidt	12404
Ms. Scherrer	12405
Mr. Keddy	12406
Mr. Calder	12408
Mr. Burton	12409
Mr. Bagnell	12410
Mr. Comartin	12411
Mr. McKay	12413
Mr. Herron	12414
Mr. Eyking	12415
Mr. Bailey	12416
Mr. Caccia	12417
Mr. Solberg	12418
Mr. Laliberte	12419
Mr. Casson	12420
Mr. Fitzpatrick	12422
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	12423
Mr. Toews	12424
Mr. Abbott	12425
Ms. Folco	12426
Division on Motion No. 18 deferred	12427
(Motion No. 21 negated)	12427
(Motion No. 22 negated)	12428
Division on Motion No. 26 deferred	12428
Division on Motion No. 31 deferred	12428
Division on Motion No. 33 deferred	12428
(Motion No. 37 agreed to)	12428
Division on Motion No. 38 deferred	12428
Division on Motion No. 43 deferred	12428
Division on Motion No. 75 deferred	12429
Division on Motion No. 85 deferred	12429
Division on Motion No. 116 deferred	12429
Division on Motion No. 117 deferred	12429
(Motion No. 118 agreed to.)	12429
Division on Motion No. 129 deferred	12429
Division on Motion No. 131 deferred	12430
Division on Motion No. 132 deferred	12430
Division on Motion No. 133 deferred	12430

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Communication Canada - Publishing
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :

Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) 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://www.parl.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 Communication Canada - Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Ontario 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 : Communication Canada - Édition, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9**



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 137 • NUMBER 202 • 1st SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

**Monday, June 10, 2002
(Part B)**

—

Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

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

Monday, June 10, 2002

[*Editor's Note: Continuation of proceedings from Volume A*]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1915)

[*Translation*]

SPECIES AT RISK ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-5, An Act respecting the protection of wildlife species at risk in Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 5.

[*Editor's Note: Continuation of proceedings from Volume A*]

Before the taking of the vote:

The Speaker: As I indicated to the House before the bells, we will only proceed with the motion numbers that were read by the Speaker as well as the name of the mover.

[*English*]

We will continue that way through the voting. I hope it will help speed matters up and assist hon. members. Each hon. member has a copy of the order paper on his or her desk and I invite them to follow the motions in the order paper.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 1.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 307*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Bourgeois
Breitkreuz	Burton
Cadman	Cardin
Casson	Comartin
Cummins	Day
Duceppe	Duncan
Elley	Epp
Fitzpatrick	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Gallant
Gauthier	Godin
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey

Guay
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lanctôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Masse
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Guimond
Harper
Heam
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
Wasylcia-Leis
Yelich— 88

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhalival
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay

Government Orders

Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood— 137

Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lanctôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Masse
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Comartin
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Laframboise
Lunn (Saenich—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
Wasylcia-Leis
Yelich— 88

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrar
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Keys
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (London West)
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Guamieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney

• (1925)

[*English*]

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 lost.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, first, let me issue a disclaimer. I never knew there were so many combinations of noes and yeses. I will make a couple of mistakes throughout the evening, however, in an effort to speed up the process for the House I believe you would find consent to apply the vote on the motion just considered by the House to the following motions: Motions Nos. 28, 104 and 67.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 28, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 310*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Government Orders

Manley
 Marleau
 Matthews
 McGuire
 McLellan
 Minna
 Murphy
 O'Reilly
 Pacetti
 Parrish
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Pratt
 Proulx
 Redman
 Regan
 Robillard
 Savoy
 Scott
 Shepherd
 Speller
 St. Denis
 Stewart
 Telegdi
 Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
 Tonks
 Ur
 Volpe
 Whelan
 Wood— 137

Marcil
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 McCallum
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
 Mitchell
 Nault
 Owen
 Paradis
 Patry
 Peschisolido
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Price
 Provenzano
 Reed (Halton)
 Richardson
 Saada
 Scherrer
 Sgro
 Simard
 St-Jacques
 Steckle
 Szabo
 Thibault (West Nova)
 Tirabassi
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Wappel
 Wilfert

Lanctôt
 Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
 Mark
 Masse
 McNally
 Meredith
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Nystrom
 Pallister
 Penson
 Rajotte
 Reynolds
 Robinson
 Schmidt
 Solberg
 Spencer
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Vellacott
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Mayfield
 Ménard
 Merrifield
 Moore
 Obhrai
 Paquette
 Perron
 Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
 Ritz
 Roy
 Skelton
 Sorenson
 Strahl
 Toews
 Wasylcia-Leis
 Yelich— 88

NAYS

Members

Alcock
 Anderson (Victoria)
 Augustine
 Barnes (London West)
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bevilacqua
 Blondin-Andrew
 Boudria
 Brown
 Bulte
 Calder
 Carignan
 Castonguay
 Cauchon
 Coderre
 Comuzzi
 Cotler
 Cuzner
 Dhaliwal
 Drouin
 Easter
 Eyking
 Folco
 Fry
 Godfrey
 Guarnieri
 Harvard
 Hubbard
 Jackson
 Karetak-Lindell
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Laliberte
 Lee
 Lincoln
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Marcil
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 McCallum
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
 Mitchell
 Nault
 Owen
 Paradis
 Patry
 Peschisolido
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Price
 Provenzano
 Reed (Halton)
 Richardson
 Saada
 Scherrer
 Sgro
 Simard
 St-Jacques

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
 Byrne
 Charbonneau
 Desrochers
 Farrah
 Girard-Bujold
 Marceau
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 Pagtakhan
 Plamondon
 Sauvageau
 St-Julien
 Vanclief

Brien
 Caplan
 Dalphond-Guiral
 Dromisky
 Fournier
 Jordan
 Myers
 Owen
 Picard (Drummond)
 Rocheleau
 St-Hilaire
 Tremblay
 Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 104, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 312)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott
 Anders
 Asselin
 Bailey
 Benoit
 Bigras
 Breitreuz
 Cadman
 Casson
 Cummins
 Duceppe
 Elley
 Fitzpatrick
 Gagnon (Champlain)
 Gauthier
 Goldring
 Grewal
 Guay
 Hanger
 Harris
 Herron
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Hinton
 Johnston
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)

Ablonczy
 Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
 Bachand (Saint-Jean)
 Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
 Bergeron
 Bourgeois
 Burton
 Cardin
 Comartin
 Day
 Duncan
 Epp
 Gagnon (Québec)
 Gallant
 Godin
 Gouk
 Grey
 Guimond
 Harper
 Hearn
 Hill (Macleod)
 Hilstrom
 Jaffer
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Laframboise

Adams
 Allard
 Assadourian
 Bagnell
 Beaumier
 Bellemare
 Bertrand
 Binet
 Bonin
 Bradshaw
 Bryden
 Caccia
 Cannis
 Carroll
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Collenette
 Copps
 Cullen
 DeVillers
 Dion
 Duplain
 Efford
 Finlay
 Frulla
 Galloway
 Goodale
 Harb
 Harvey
 Ianno
 Jennings
 Keyes
 Kraft Sloan
 LeBlanc
 Leung
 Longfield
 Macklin
 Malhi
 Manley
 Marleau
 Matthews
 McGuire
 McLellan
 Minna
 Murphy
 O'Reilly
 Pacetti
 Parrish
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Pratt
 Proulx
 Redman
 Regan
 Robillard
 Savoy
 Scott
 Shepherd
 Speller

Government Orders

St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibault (West Nova)
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)	Tirabassi
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Völpe	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood— 137	

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 67, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 329)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Bourgeois
Breitkreuz	Burton
Cadman	Cardin
Casson	Comartin
Cummins	Day
Duceppe	Duncan
Elley	Epp
Fitzpatrick	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Gallant
Gauthier	Godin
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Harper
Harris	Hearn
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hinton	Jaffer
Johnston	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laframboise
Lancôt	Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Masse	Mayfield
McNally	Ménard
Meredith	Merrifield
Mills (Red Deer)	Moore
Nystrom	Obhrai
Pallister	Paquette
Penson	Perron
Rajotte	Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Reynolds	Ritz
Robinson	Roy
Schmidt	Skelton
Solberg	Sorenson
Spencer	Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Toews
Vellacott	Wasylycia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Yelich— 88

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (London West)
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan

Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
Yelich— 75

Government Orders

Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

The Speaker: Accordingly I declare Motions Nos. 28, 104 and 67 defeated. Motion No. 74 is therefore defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 12. A negative vote on Motion No. 12 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 13.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you ask you would find consent that those who voted on the immediately preceding motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting no, and that the same vote be applied to Motions Nos. 13, 105, 106, 121, 95, 5, 15, 79 and 129.

• (1930)

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will vote yea to those motions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond: The members of the Bloc Québécois vote yea on these motions.

Mr. Yvon Godin: The NDP members will vote nay on these motions.

[*English*]

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Progressive Conservative Party vote no.

(The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 308)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Paquette

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comartin
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Godin
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hearn
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
Nystrom
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Robinson
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi

Government Orders

Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Whelan
Wood— 150

Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder

Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vancielief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comartin
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Godin
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hearn
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pietou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhalival
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
Nystrom
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Robinson
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Whelan
Wood— 150

(The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 309)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffier
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
Yelich— 75

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comartin
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Godin
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hearn
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pietou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

PAIRED

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay

Vanclief

Venne — 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 105, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 313)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
Velich — 75

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comartin
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Godin
Guamieri
Harvard

Alecock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Goodale
Harb
Harvey

Hearn
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

Government Orders

Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
Nystrom
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Robinson
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Whelan
Wood — 150

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrar
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 106, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 314)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Day
Duncan
Epp

Government Orders

Fitzpatrick	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Gallant
Gauthier	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harper	Harris
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laframboise
Lancôt	Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Moore	Obhrai
Pallister	Paquette
Penson	Perron
Rajotte	Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Reynolds	Ritz
Roy	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Toews
Vellacott	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Velich — 75	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Barnes (London West)	Beaumier
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Carignan	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Coderre	Collenette
Comartin	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Cuzner
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duplain	Easter
Efford	Eyking
Finlay	Folco
Frulla	Fry
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hearn	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore)
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Mark
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Masse	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Nault	Nystrom
O'Reilly	Owen
Pacetti	Paradis

Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Robinson
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Whelan
Wood — 150

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 121, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 318)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Roy

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt

Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
Yelich — 75

Solberg
Spencer
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comartin
Coppes
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Godin
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hearn
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylcyia-Leis

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
Nystrom
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Robinson
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Whelan

Wilfert

Government Orders

Wood — 150

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 95, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 323)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
Yelich — 75

Abloncy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Laframboise
Lunn (Saainich—Gulf Islands)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia

Government Orders

Calder	Cannis
Carignan	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Coderre	Collenette
Comartin	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Cuzner
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duplain	Easter
Efford	Eyking
Finlay	Folco
Frulla	Fry
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hearn	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Mark
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Masse	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Nault	Nystrom
O'Reilly	Owen
Pacetti	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peschisolido
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed (Halton)
Regan	Richardson
Robillard	Robinson
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tirabassi
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood — 150

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne — 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 336)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Benoit
Bergeron	Bigras
Bourgeois	Breitkreuz
Burton	Cadman
Cardin	Casson
Cummins	Day
Duceppe	Duncan
Elley	Epp
Fitzpatrick	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Gallant
Gauthier	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harper	Harris
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laframboise
Lañctôt	Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Moore	Obhrai
Pallister	Paquette
Penson	Perron
Rajotte	Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Reynolds	Ritz
Roy	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Toews
Vellacott	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Yelich — 75	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Barnes (London West)	Beaumier
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Carignan	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Coderre	Collenette
Comartin	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Cuzner
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duplain	Easter
Efford	Eyking
Finlay	Folco
Frulla	Fry
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hearn	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno

Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
Nystrom
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Robinson
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Whelan
Wood— 150

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 15, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 338)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant

Government Orders

Gauthier
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lanctôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
Yelich— 75

Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comartin
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Godin
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hearn
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
Nystrom
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido

Government Orders

Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Pratt
 Proulx
 Redman
 Regan
 Robillard
 Saada
 Scherrer
 Sgro
 Simard
 St-Jacques
 Steckle
 Szabo
 Thibault (West Nova)
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Tonks
 Ur
 Volpe
 Wasylycia-Leis
 Wilfert

Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Price
 Provenzano
 Reed (Halton)
 Richardson
 Robinson
 Savoy
 Scott
 Shepherd
 Speller
 St. Denis
 Stewart
 Telegdi
 Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
 Tirabassi
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Wappel
 Whelan
 Wood— 150

Strahl
 Vellacott
 Yelich— 75

Toews
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS

Members

Alcock
 Anderson (Victoria)
 Augustine
 Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
 Beaumier
 Bellemare
 Bertrand
 Binet
 Bonin
 Bradshaw
 Bryden
 Caccia
 Cannis
 Carroll
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Collette
 Comuzzi
 Cotler
 Cuzner
 Dhaliwal
 Drouin
 Easter
 Eyking
 Folco
 Fry
 Godfrey
 Goodale
 Harb
 Harvey
 Herron
 Ianno
 Jennings
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Laliberte
 Lee
 Lincoln
 MacAulay
 Macklin
 Malhi
 Manley
 Mark
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 Matthews
 McGuire
 McLellan
 Minna
 Murphy
 Nystrom
 Owen
 Paradis
 Patry
 Peschisolido
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Price
 Provenzano
 Reed (Halton)
 Richardson
 Robinson
 Savoy
 Scott
 Shepherd
 Speller
 St. Denis
 Stewart
 Telegdi
 Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
 Tirabassi
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Wappel
 Whelan
 Wood— 150

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
 Byrne
 Charbonneau
 Desrochers
 Farrah
 Girard-Bujold
 Marceau
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 Pagtakhan
 Plamondon
 Sauvageau
 St-Julien
 Vanclief

Brien
 Caplan
 Dalphond-Guiral
 Dromisky
 Fournier
 Jordan
 Myers
 Owen
 Picard (Drummond)
 Rocheleau
 St-Hilaire
 Tremblay
 Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 79, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 340)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott
 Anders
 Asselin
 Bailey
 Bergeron
 Bourgeois
 Burton
 Cardin
 Cummins
 Duceppe
 Elley
 Fitzpatrick
 Gagnon (Champlain)
 Gauthier
 Gouk
 Grey
 Guimond
 Harper
 Hill (MacLeod)
 Hilstrom
 Jaffer
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Lanciôt
 Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
 Mayfield
 Ménard
 Merrifield
 Moore
 Pallister
 Penson
 Rajotte
 Reynolds
 Roy
 Skelton
 Sorenson

Ablonczy
 Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
 Bachand (Saint-Jean)
 Benoit
 Bigras
 Breitreuz
 Cadman
 Casson
 Day
 Duncan
 Epp
 Gagnon (Québec)
 Gallant
 Goldring
 Grewal
 Guay
 Hanger
 Harris
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Hinton
 Johnston
 Laframboise
 Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 McNally
 Meredith
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Obhrai
 Paquette
 Perron
 Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
 Ritz
 Schmidt
 Solberg
 Spencer

Adams
 Allard
 Assadourian
 Bagnell
 Barnes (London West)
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bevilacqua
 Blondin-Andrew
 Boudria
 Brown
 Bulte
 Calder
 Carignan
 Castonguay
 Cauchon
 Coderre
 Comartin
 Copps
 Cullen
 DeVillers
 Dion
 Duplain
 Efford
 Finlay
 Frulla
 Galloway
 Godin
 Guarnieri
 Harvard
 Hearn
 Hubbard
 Jackson
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keyes
 Kraft Sloan
 LeBlanc
 Leung
 Longfield
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Marcil
 Marleau
 Masse
 McCallum
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
 Mitchell
 Nault
 O'Reilly
 Pacetti
 Parrish
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Pratt
 Proulx
 Redman
 Regan
 Robillard
 Saada
 Scherrer
 Sgro
 Simard
 St-Jacques
 Steckle
 Szabo
 Thibault (West Nova)
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Tonks
 Ur
 Volpe
 Wasylycia-Leis
 Wilfert

Government Orders

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanciel	Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 129, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 362)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Benoit
Bergeron	Bigras
Bourgeois	Breitkreuz
Burton	Cadman
Cardin	Casson
Cummins	Day
Duceppe	Duncan
Elley	Epp
Fitzpatrick	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Gallant
Gauthier	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harper	Harris
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laframboise
Lancôt	Lunn (Saamich—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Moore	Obhrai
Pallister	Paquette
Penson	Perron
Rajotte	Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Reynolds	Ritz
Roy	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Toews
Vellacott	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Yelich— 75	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Barnes (London West)	Beaumier
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Carignan	Carroll

Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Coderre	Collenette
Comartin	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Cuzner
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duplain	Easter
Efford	Eyking
Finlay	Folco
Frulla	Fry
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hearn	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Mark
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Masse	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Nault	Nystrom
O'Reilly	Owen
Pacetti	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peschisolido
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed (Halton)
Regan	Richardson
Robillard	Robinson
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tirabassi
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood— 150

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanciel	Venne— 26

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 12, 13, 105, 106, 121, 95, 5, 15, 79 and 129 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 103.

Government Orders

(The House divided on Motion No. 103, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 311)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Masse
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bergeon
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Comartin
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
Wasylcia-Leis
Yelich — 88

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Coppes
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (London West)
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey

Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood — 136

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

● (1940)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 103 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 107.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent that all those who voted on the immediately previous motion with the addition of the member of parliament for Ottawa South be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting no and the same vote applying to Motions Nos. 108, 111, 128 and 127.

● (1945)

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present will vote yea, except those who have been instructed to do otherwise by their constituents.

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois support these motions.

[*English*]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP are voting no to this motion.

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party votes yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting with the government on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 107, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 315*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Bourgeois
Breitkreuz	Burton
Cadman	Cardin
Casson	Cummins
Day	Duceppe
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Québec)	Gagnon (Champlain)
Gallant	Gauthier
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Harper
Harris	Hearn
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hinton	Jaffer
Johnston	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laframboise
Lancôt	Lunn (Saenich—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Moore	Obhrai
Pallister	Paquette
Penson	Perron
Rajotte	Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Reynolds	Ritz
Roy	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews	Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Yelich — 82

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)
Beaumier	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown

Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Carignan
Carroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Coderre
Collenette	Comartin
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Drouin	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla
Fry	Galloway
Godfrey	Godin
Goodale	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Karetak-Lindell
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Macklin	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marcil
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Masse	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Nault	Nystrom
O'Reilly	Owen
Pacetti	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peschisolido
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed (Halton)
Regan	Richardson
Robillard	Robinson
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi	Tonks
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood — 143	

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphonde-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne — 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 108, which was negated on the following division:)

*Government Orders**(Division No. 316)*

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
Yelich — 82

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comartin
Copp
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Godin
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell

Keyes
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Whelan
Wood — 143

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
Nystrom
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschosolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Robinson
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 111, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 317)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Goldring
Grewal

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Gouk
Grey

Guay
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Guimond
Harper
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffier
Keddy (South Shore)
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
Yelich — 82

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Keys
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comartin
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Godin
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
Nystrom
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price

Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Whelan
Wood — 143

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Government Orders

Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Robinson
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

PAIRED

Members

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 128, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 319)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson

Ablonezy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffier
Keddy (South Shore)
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer

Government Orders

Strahl
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
Yelich— 82

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Keys
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Whelan
Wood— 143

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comartin
Copp
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Godin
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
Nystrom
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Robinson
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 127, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 349)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffier
Keddy (South Shore)
Lafambe
Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
Yelich— 82

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder

Government Orders

The next question is on Motion No. 2. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 11, 48, 51, 98 and 102. If Motion No. 2 is defeated then Motions Nos. 49 and 94 will have to be put to the vote.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, we will have a standing vote on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 320)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Benoit
Bergeron	Bigras
Bourgeois	Breitkreuz
Burton	Cadman
Cardin	Casson
Cummins	Day
Duceppe	Duncan
Elley	Epp
Fitzpatrick	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Gallant
Gauthier	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harper	Harris
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laframboise
Lancôt	Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Moore	Obhrai
Pallister	Paquette
Penson	Perron
Rajotte	Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Reynolds	Ritz
Roy	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Toews
Vellacott	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Yelich — 75	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Barnes (London West)	Beaumier
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Carignan	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Coderre	Collenette
Comartin	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Cuzner
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin

Cannis	Carignan
Carroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Coderre
Collenette	Comartin
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Drouin	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla
Fry	Galloway
Godfrey	Godin
Goodale	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Karetak-Lindell
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Macklin	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marcil
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Masse	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Nault	Nystrom
O'Reilly	Owen
Pacetti	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peschisolido
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed (Halton)
Regan	Richardson
Robillard	Robinson
Sada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi	Tonks
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan	Wilfert

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphonde-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne — 26

[*English*]

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 107, 108, 111, 128 and 127 defeated.

Government Orders

Duplain	Easter
Efford	Eyking
Finlay	Folco
Frulla	Fry
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hearn	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore)
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Mark
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Masse	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Nault	Nystrom
O'Reilly	Owen
Pacetti	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peschisolido
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed (Halton)
Regan	Richardson
Robillard	Robinson
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tirabassi
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood— 150

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphonde-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne— 26

• (1955)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 11, 48, 51, 98 and 102 lost.

The question is on Motion No. 49. A negative vote on Motion No. 49 necessitates the question being put on Motions Nos. 50 to 55.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent that those who just voted on Motion No. 2 be recorded as

voting on Motion No. 49, with Liberal members voting yes and the same vote applying to Motions Nos. 23 and 29.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Quebecois members will be voting in support of this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the NDP members will vote nay on this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party vote no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I vote with the government on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 49, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 321*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)
Beaumier	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bourgeois	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Cardin	Carignan
Carroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Cuzner
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duceppe	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla
Fry	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Galloway
Gauthier	Godfrey
Goodale	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Karetak-Lindell
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laframboise
Laliberte	Lanctôt
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Macklin	Mahoney

Government Orders

Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paquette
Parrish
Peric
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Roy
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood— 155

Maloney
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Paradis
Petry
Perron
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 23, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 325)***YEAS**

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Augustine
Bagnell
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Binet
Bonin
Bourgeois
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Cardin
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duceppe
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Goodale
Guay
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Keys
Kraft Sloan
Laliberte
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paquette
Parrish
Peric
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Roy

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (London West)
Bélangier
Bennett
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway
Godfrey
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laframboise
Lanctôt
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Paradis
Petry
Perron
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Richardson
Saada

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Bailey
Benoit
Burton
Casson
Cummins
Duncan
Epp
Gallant
Goldring
Grewal
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Masse
McNally
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Penson
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Comartin
Day
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Harper
Hearn
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
Wasylcia-Leis
Yelich— 70

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier

Government Orders

Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood— 155

Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Bagnell
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Binet
Bonin
Bourgeois
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Cardin
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Copps
Cullen

Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway
Godfrey
Guamieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laframboise
Lanctôt
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Paradis
Patry
Perron
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Bailey
Benoit
Burton
Casson
Cummins
Duncan
Epp
Gallant
Goldring
Grewal
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Masse
McNally
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Penson
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Comartin
Day
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Harper
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Lunn (Saenich—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
Wasylycia-Leis
Yelich— 70

Dion
Duceppe
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Goodale
Guay
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
Laliberte
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paquette
Parrish
Peric
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Roy
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood— 155

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrar
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 29, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 344)***YEAS**

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Augustine

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Abbott
Anders
Bailey
Benoit
Burton

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Breitkreuz
Cadman

Government Orders

(The House divided on Motion No. 94, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 322)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bergeron
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Laframboise
Lunn (Saenich—Gulf Islands)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Goodale
Harb
Harvey

Casson
Cummins
Duncan
Epp
Gallant
Goldring
Grewal
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Masse
McNally
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Penson
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Comartin
Day
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Harper
Hearn
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Lunn (Saenich—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
Wasylycia-Leis
Yelich— 70

PAIRED

Members

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vancielief

● (2000)

[English]

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 49, 23 and 29 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 94.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House with the Liberal members voting no.

The Speaker: Is there consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will vote yea.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote yea on this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the NDP members will vote yea on this motion.

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative members vote nay.

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I am voting with the government on this motion.

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Comartin
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lanctôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Masse
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Toews
Wasylycia-Leis
Yelich— 81

Government Orders

Hearn
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood — 144

Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood — 143

Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carrigan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhalwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hearn
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

● (2005)

[*English*]

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 94 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 96. A negative vote on Motion No. 96 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 97.

(The House divided on Motion No. 96, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 324*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Comartin
Day
Duncan

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley

Government Orders

Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Masse
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Toews
Wasylcyia-Leis
Yelich — 81

Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Collenette
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paradis
Patri
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood — 143

Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Guamieri
Harvard
Hearn
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

• (2015)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 96 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 35.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think if you asked you would not find consent to apply the vote on this motion which is a standing vote.

(The House divided on Motion No. 35, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 326)***YEAS**

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Comartin
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Laframboise

Government Orders

Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Masse
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Toews
Wasylcia-Leis
Yelich — 81

Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood — 143

Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hearn
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

● (2020)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 35 carried.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you might seek unanimous consent that the vote on Motion No. 35 be applied to Motion No. 131.

● (2025)

The Speaker: Is it agreed that the vote on the previous motion apply to Motion No. 131?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, we would like to add the member for Vancouver East to this motion?

(The House divided on Motion No. 131, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 363)***YEAS**

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collenette
Coppes
Cullen

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Comartin
Davies
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Cummins
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Masse

Government Orders

Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Toews
Wasylycia-Leis
Yelich — 82

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 131 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 39. This vote will apply to Motions Nos. 44, 57, 80, 86, 90 and 122.

(The House divided on Motion No. 39, which was negatived on the following division:)

*(Division No. 327)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott
Anders
Bailey
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Cummins
Duncan
Epp
Gallant
Gouk
Grey
Harper
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffar
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mayfield
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Penson
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
Yelich — 57

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Benoit
Burton
Casson
Day
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Goldring
Grewal
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister
Rajotte
Reynolds
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allard

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)

Assadourian
Augustine
Bagnell
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collenette
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
DeVillers
Dion
Duceppe
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Godin
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hearn
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
Laliberte
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Minna
Murphy
Nystrom
Owen
Paquette
Parrish
Peric
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Robinson
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (London West)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Binet
Bonin
Bourgeois
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Cardin
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comartin
Copps
Cullen
Davies
Dhalwal
Drouin
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Guay
Harb
Harvey
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laframboise
Lancôt
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Paradis
Patry
Perron
Petigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Roy
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Whelan
Wood — 168

Government Orders

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne— 26

• (2035)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 39 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 44, 57, 80, 86, 90 and 122 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think if you would seek it you would find that there is unanimous agreement that the vote on Motion No. 39 be applied to Motions Nos. 3, 14 and 31.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous agreement to proceed in that manner?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 334)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bailey	Benoit
Breitkreuz	Burton
Cadman	Casson
Cummins	Day
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Fitzpatrick
Gallant	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Hanger
Harper	Harris
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Meredith	Merrifield
Mills (Red Deer)	Moore
Obhrai	Pallister
Penson	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Toews
Vellacott	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Yelich — 57	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)

Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	Beaumier
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bourgeois
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Cardin
Carignan	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Collenette	Comartin
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies
DeVillers	Dhalival
Dion	Drouin
Duceppe	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla
Fry	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Galloway
Gauthier	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hearn	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore)
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laframboise
Laliberte	Lancôt
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Mark
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Masse	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Ménard	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Nault
Nystrom	O'Reilly
Owen	Pacetti
Paquette	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peschisolido	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Robinson	Roy
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tirabassi
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood— 168

*Government Orders***PAIRED**

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vancielief	Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 14, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 337)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bailey	Benoit
Breitkreuz	Burton
Cadman	Casson
Cummins	Day
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Fitzpatrick
Gallant	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Hanger
Harper	Harris
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Meredith	Merrifield
Mills (Red Deer)	Moore
Obhrai	Pallister
Penson	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Toews
Vellacott	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Yelich— 57	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	Beaumier
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bourgeois
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Cardin
Carignan	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Collenette	Comartin
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies

DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duceppe	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla
Fry	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Galloway
Gauthier	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hearn	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore)
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laframboise
Laliberte	Lancôt
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Mark
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Masse	Mathews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Ménard	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Nault
Nystrom	O'Reilly
Owen	Pacetti
Paquette	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peschisolido	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Robinson	Roy
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tirabassi
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood— 168

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vancielief	Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 31, which was negated on the following division:)

*Government Orders**(Division No. 354)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bailey	Benoit
Breitkreuz	Burton
Cadman	Casson
Cummins	Day
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Fitzpatrick
Gallant	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Hanger
Harper	Harris
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Meredith	Merrifield
Mills (Red Deer)	Moore
Obhrai	Pallister
Penson	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Toews
Vellacott	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Yelich — 57	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	Beaumier
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bourgeois
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Cardin
Carignan	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Collenette	Comartin
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duceppe	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla
Fry	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Galloway
Gauthier	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hearn	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laframboise
Laliberte	Lanctôt
LeBlanc	Lee

Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pietou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Mark
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Masse	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Ménard	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Nault
Nystrom	O'Reilly
Owen	Pacetti
Paquette	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peschisolido	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Robinson	Roy
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tirabassi
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood — 168

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne — 26

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 3, 14 and 31 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 56.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe that you would find consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yes with the same vote to apply to Motions Nos. 6, 16, 17, 126, 130 and 75.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will vote no to those motions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote no to these motions.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party will vote no to these motions.

[English]

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party votes no.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I will vote with the government on these motions.

(The House divided on Motion No. 56, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 328)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)
Beaumier	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Carignan
Carroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Drouin	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla
Fry	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	LeBlanc
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Nault	O'Reilly
Owen	Pacetti
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peschisolido	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi	Tonks

Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Government Orders

Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood— 136

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Bourgeois
Breitkreuz	Burton
Cadman	Cardin
Casson	Comartin
Cummins	Davies
Day	Duceppe
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Québec)	Gagnon (Champlain)
Gallant	Gauthier
Godin	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harper	Harris
Hearn	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laframboise	Lañctôt
Lunn (Saenich—Gulf Islands)	Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Masse
Mayfield	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Moore	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pallister
Paquette	Penson
Perron	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Robinson
Roy	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews	Vellacott
Wasylycia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Yelich— 89	

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 6, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 341)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)

Government Orders

Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)
Beaumier	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Carignan
Carroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Drouin	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla
Fry	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	LeBlanc
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Nault	O'Reilly
Owen	Pacetti
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peschisolido	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi	Tonks
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood— 136

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Bourgeois
Breitkreuz	Burton
Cadman	Cardin
Casson	Comartin
Cummins	Davies
Day	Duceppe
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Fitzpatrick

Gagnon (Québec)	Gagnon (Champlain)
Gallant	Gauthier
Godin	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harper	Harris
Hearn	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laframboise	Lancôt
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Masse
Mayfield	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Moore	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pallister
Paquette	Penson
Perron	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Robinson
Roy	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews	Vellacott
Wasylycia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Yelich— 89	

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclicf	Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 342)***YEAS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)
Beaumier	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Carignan
Carroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Drouin	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla

Government Orders

Fry
 Godfrey
 Guarnieri
 Harvard
 Hubbard
 Jackson
 Karetak-Lindell
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Laliberte
 Lee
 Lincoln
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Marcil
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 McCallum
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
 Mitchell
 Nault
 Owen
 Paradis
 Patry
 Peschisolido
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Price
 Provenzano
 Reed (Halton)
 Richardson
 Saada
 Scherrer
 Sgro
 Simard
 St-Jacques
 Steckle
 Szabo
 Thibault (West Nova)
 Tirabassi
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Wappel
 Wilfert

Galloway
 Goodale
 Harb
 Harvey
 Ianno
 Jennings
 Keyes
 Kraft Sloan
 LeBlanc
 Leung
 Longfield
 Macklin
 Malhi
 Manley
 Marleau
 Matthews
 McGuire
 McLellan
 Minna
 Murphy
 O'Reilly
 Pacetti
 Parrish
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Pratt
 Proulx
 Redman
 Regan
 Robillard
 Savoy
 Scott
 Shepherd
 Speller
 St. Denis
 Stewart
 Telegdi
 Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
 Tonks
 Ur
 Volpe
 Whelan
 Wood— 136

Perron
 Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
 Ritz
 Roy
 Skelton
 Sorenson
 Strahl
 Toews
 Wasylycia-Leis
 Yelich— 89

Rajotte
 Reynolds
 Robinson
 Schmidt
 Solberg
 Spencer
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Vellacott
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
 Byrne
 Charbonneau
 Desrochers
 Farrah
 Girard-Bujold
 Marceau
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 Pagtakhan
 Plamondon
 Sauvageau
 St-Julien
 Vanclief

Brien
 Caplan
 Dalphond-Guiral
 Dromisky
 Fournier
 Jordan
 Myers
 Owen
 Picard (Drummond)
 Rocheleau
 St-Hilaire
 Tremblay
 Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 17, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 343)***YEAS**

Members

Adams
 Allard
 Assadourian
 Bagnell
 Beaumier
 Bellemare
 Bertrand
 Binet
 Bonin
 Bradshaw
 Bryden
 Caccia
 Cannis
 Carroll
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Comuzzi
 Cotler
 Cuzner
 Dhaliwal
 Drouin
 Easter
 Eyking
 Folco
 Fry
 Godfrey
 Guarnieri
 Harvard
 Hubbard
 Jackson
 Karetak-Lindell
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Laliberte
 Lee
 Lincoln
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Marcil
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 McCallum
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
 Mitchell
 Nault
 Owen

Alcock
 Anderson (Victoria)
 Augustine
 Barnes (London West)
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bevilacqua
 Blondin-Andrew
 Boudria
 Brown
 Bulte
 Calder
 Carignan
 Castonguay
 Cauchon
 Collettette
 Copps
 Cullen
 DeVillers
 Dion
 Duplain
 Efford
 Finlay
 Frulla
 Gallaway
 Goodale
 Harb
 Harvey
 Ianno
 Jennings
 Keyes
 Kraft Sloan
 LeBlanc
 Leung
 Longfield
 Macklin
 Malhi
 Manley
 Marleau
 Matthews
 McGuire
 McLellan
 Minna
 Murphy
 O'Reilly
 Pacetti

NAYS

Members

Abbott
 Anders
 Asselin
 Bailey
 Benoit
 Bigras
 Breitreuz
 Cadman
 Casson
 Cummins
 Day
 Duncan
 Épp
 Gagnon (Québec)
 Gallant
 Godin
 Gouk
 Grey
 Guimond
 Harper
 Hearn
 Hill (Macleod)
 Hilstrom
 Jaffer
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Laframboise
 Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Mayfield
 Ménard
 Merrifield
 Moore
 Obhrai
 Paquette

Ablonczy
 Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
 Bachand (Saint-Jean)
 Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
 Bergeron
 Bourgeois
 Burton
 Cardin
 Comartin
 Davies
 Duceppe
 Elley
 Fitzpatrick
 Gagnon (Champlain)
 Gauthier
 Goldring
 Grewal
 Guay
 Hanger
 Harris
 Herron
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Hinton
 Johnston
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Lanctôt
 Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
 Mark
 Masse
 McNally
 Meredith
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Nystrom
 Pallister
 Penson

Government Orders

Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peschisolido	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi	Tonks
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood— 136

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Bourgeois
Breitkreuz	Burton
Cadman	Cardin
Casson	Comartin
Cummins	Davies
Day	Duceppe
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Québec)	Gagnon (Champlain)
Gallant	Gauthier
Godin	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harper	Harris
Hearn	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laframboise	Lanctôt
Lunn (Saamich—Gulf Islands)	Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Masse
Mayfield	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Moore	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pallister
Paquette	Penson
Perron	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Robinson
Roy	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews	Vellacott
Wasylcia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Yelich — 89	

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrar	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers

O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vancilief	Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 126, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 348)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)
Beaumier	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Carignan
Carroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Drouin	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla
Fry	Gallaway
Godfrey	Goodale
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	LeBlanc
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Nault	O'Reilly
Owen	Pacetti
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peschisolido	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi	Tonks
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan

Government Orders

Wilfert

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Cummins
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
Wasylcia-Leis
Yelich — 89

Wood— 136

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Comartin
Davies
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Masse
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 130, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 350)***YEAS**

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Beaumier

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger

Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paradis
Petry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood— 136

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Cummins
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Godin

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Comartin
Davies
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Goldring

Government Orders

Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harper	Harris
Heam	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laframboise	Lanctôt
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Masse
Mayfield	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Moore	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pallister
Paquette	Penson
Perron	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Robinson
Roy	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews	Vellacott
Wasylcia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Yelich — 89	

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne — 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 75, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 358)***YEAS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)
Beaumier	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Carignan
Carroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Drouin	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla
Fry	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Guarnieri	Harb

Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Iano
Jackson	Jennings
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	LeBlanc
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcel	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Nault	O'Reilly
Owen	Pacetti
Paradis	Parish
Patry	Peric
Peschisolido	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi	Tonks
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood — 136

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Comartin
Davies
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lanctôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Masse
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson

Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
Wasylycia-Leis
Yelich — 89

Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 56 carried. Accordingly, I declare Motions Nos. 6, 16, 17, 126, 130 and 75 carried.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 78.

• (2040)

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yes.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote no to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP vote yes to this motion.

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I will vote with the government on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 78, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 330)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (London West)
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua

Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comartin
Copps
Cullen
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Whelan
Wood — 143

Government Orders

Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collenette
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Godin
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
Nystrom
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Robinson
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier

Government Orders

Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Mayfield
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Heam
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
Yelich — 82

Frulla
Galloway
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood — 143

Fry
Godfrey
Guarnieri
Harvard
Heam
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 78 carried.

[*English*]

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 84.

(The House divided on Motion No. 84, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 331)***YEAS**

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collenette
Copp
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Comartin
Davies
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister

NAYS

Members

Abloncy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Cummins
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Masse
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette

Government Orders

Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Toews
Wasylcia-Leis
Yelich — 81

Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Assadourian
Augustine
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Beaumur
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Calder
Cardin
Carroll
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
Cuzner
DeVillers
Dion
Duceppe
Duplain
Efford
Epp
Finlay
Folco
Fry
Gagnon (Champlain)
Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Grewal
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harb
Harris
Harvey
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
Laliberte
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McGuire
McLellan
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Minna
Moore
Nault
Obhrai
Pacetti
Paquette
Parrish
Penson
Perron
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Rajotte
Reed (Halton)

Anderson (Victoria)
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bélangier
Bennett
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Binet
Bonin
Bourgeois
Breitkreuz
Bryden
Burton
Cadman
Cannis
Carignan
Casson
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cummins
Day
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duncan
Easter
Elley
Eyking
Fitzpatrick
Frulla
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Gauthier
Goldring
Gouk
Grey
Guay
Hanger
Harper
Harvard
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Hubbard
Jackson
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laframboise
Lancôt
Lee
Lincoln
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Merrifield
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murphy
O'Reilly
Owen
Pallister
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Regan

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrar
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vancielief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

● (2045)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 84 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 112.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yes and the same vote to apply to Motions Nos. 132 and 133.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members vote yea on this motion.

● (2050)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote yes to this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party will vote no to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservatives members vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I vote yes to this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 112, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 332*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allard

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anders

Government Orders

Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Richardson
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer
St. Denis
Stewart
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Yelich — 217

Reynolds
Ritz
Roy
Savoy
Schmidt
Sgro
Simard
Solberg
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood

Copps
Cullen
Cuzner
DeVillers
Dion
Duceppe
Duplain
Efford
Epp
Finlay
Folco
Fry
Gagnon (Champlain)
Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Grewal
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harb
Harris
Harvey
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
Laliberte
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McGuire
McLellan
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Minna
Moore
Nault
Obhrai
Pacetti
Paquette
Parrish
Penson
Perron
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Rajotte
Reed (Halton)
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Richardson
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer
St. Denis
Stewart
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Yelich — 217

Cotler
Cummins
Day
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duncan
Easter
Elley
Eyking
Fitzpatrick
Frulla
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Gauthier
Goldring
Gouk
Grey
Guay
Hanger
Harper
Harvard
Hearn
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Hubbard
Jackson
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laframboise
Lancôt
Lee
Lincoln
Lunn (Saarich—Gulf Islands)
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Merrifield
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murphy
O'Reilly
Owen
Pallister
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Regan
Reynolds
Ritz
Roy
Savoy
Schmidt
Sgro
Simard
Solberg
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood

NAYS

Members

Comartin
Godin
Nystrom
Wasylycia-Leis — 7

Davies
Masse
Robinson

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 132, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 364)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allard
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Assadourian
Augustine
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Calder
Cardin
Carroll
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collenette

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anders
Anderson (Victoria)
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bélangier
Bennett
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Binet
Bonin
Bourgeois
Breitkreuz
Bryden
Burton
Cadman
Cannis
Carignan
Casson
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comuzzi

Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Richardson
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer
St. Denis
Stewart
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Yelich — 217

*Government Orders***NAYS**

Members

Comartin
Godin
Nystrom
Wasylycia-Leis— 7

Davies
Masse
Robinson

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 133, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 365)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allard
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Assadourian
Augustine
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Calder
Cardin
Carroll
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collenette
Copp
Cullen
Cuzner
DeVillers
Dion
Duceppe
Duplain
Efford
Epp
Finlay
Folco
Fry
Gagnon (Champlain)
Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Grewal
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harb
Harris
Harvey
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anders
Anderson (Victoria)
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bélangier
Bennett
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Binet
Bonin
Bourgeois
Breitkreuz
Bryden
Burton
Cadman
Cannis
Carignan
Casson
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cummins
Day
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duncan
Easter
Elley
Eyking
Fitzpatrick
Frulla
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Gauthier
Goldring
Gouk
Grey
Guay
Hanger
Harper
Harvard
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom

Hinton
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
Laliberte
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McGuire
McLellan
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Minna
Moore
Nault
Obhrai
Pacetti
Paquette
Parrish
Penson
Perron
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Rajotte
Reed (Halton)
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Richardson
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer
St. Denis
Stewart
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Yelich— 217

Hubbard
Jackson
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laframboise
Lancôt
Lee
Lincoln
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mathews
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Merrifield
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murphy
O'Reilly
Owen
Pallister
Paradis
Patri
Peric
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Regan
Reynolds
Ritz
Roy
Savoy
Schmidt
Sgro
Simard
Solberg
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood

NAYS

Members

Comartin
Godin
Nystrom
Wasylycia-Leis— 7

Davies
Masse
Robinson

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau

Government Orders

Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

[*English*]

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 112, 132 and 133 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 113.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on this motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yes and the same vote applying to Motions Nos. 38, 43 and 18.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote no to these motions.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP will vote no to these motions.

[*English*]

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party vote yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I vote yes to this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 113, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 333)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anders
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Bailey
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	Barnes (London West)
Beaumier	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Burton	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Carignan
Carroll	Casson
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Cummins
Cuzner	Day
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duncan	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Elley	Epp
Eyking	Finlay
Fitzpatrick	Folco

Frulla
Gallant
Godfrey
Goodale
Grewal
Guarnieri
Harb
Harris
Harvey
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McGuire
McLellan
Merrifield
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murphy
O'Reilly
Owen
Pallister
Parrish
Penson
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Regan
Reynolds
Ritz
Saada
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer
St. Denis
Stewart
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Yelich— 199

Fry
Galloway
Goldring
Gouk
Grey
Hanger
Harper
Harvard
Hearn
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Hubbard
Jackson
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Minna
Moore
Nault
Obhrai
Pacetti
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Rajotte
Reed (Halton)
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Richardson
Robillard
Savoy
Schmidt
Sgro
Simard
Solberg
Speller
St-Jacques
Stekle
Strahl
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood

NAYS

Members

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bigras
Cardin
Davies
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier
Guay
Laframboise
Masse
Nystrom
Perron

Government Orders

Robinson
Wasylycia-Leis— 25

Roy

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 38, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 356)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allard
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Assadourian
Bagnell
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Benoit
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Breitkreuz
Bryden
Burton
Cadman
Cannis
Carroll
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collenette
Coppes
Cullen
Cuzner
DeVillers
Dion
Duncan
Easter
Elley
Eyking
Fitzpatrick
Frulla
Gallant
Godfrey
Goodale
Grewal
Guarnieri
Harb
Harris
Harvey
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Keys
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anders
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Bailey
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Calder
Carignan
Casson
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cummins
Day
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duplain
Efford
Epp
Finlay
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Goldring
Gouk
Grey
Hanger
Harper
Harvard
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Hubbard
Jackson
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
MacAulay

MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McGuire
McLellan
Merrifield
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murphy
O'Reilly
Owen
Pallister
Parrish
Penson
Peschosolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Regan
Reynolds
Ritz
Saada
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer
St. Denis
Stewart
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Yelich— 199

Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Minna
Moore
Nault
Obhrai
Pacetti
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Rajotte
Reed (Halton)
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Richardson
Robillard
Savoy
Schmidt
Sgro
Simard
Solberg
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood

NAYS

Members

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bigras
Cardin
Davies
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier
Guay
Laframboise
Masse
Nystrom
Perron
Roy

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

Government Orders

(The House divided on Motion No. 43, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 357)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anders
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Bailey
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	Barnes (London West)
Beaumier	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Burton	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Carignan
Carroll	Casson
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Cummins
Cuzner	Day
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duncan	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Elley	Epp
Eyking	Finlay
Fitzpatrick	Folco
Frulla	Fry
Gallant	Galloway
Godfrey	Goldring
Goodale	Gouk
Grewal	Grey
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harper
Harris	Harvard
Harvey	Hearn
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hinton	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Johnston	Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Mark
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)	Matthews
Mayfield	McCallum
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Moore
Murphy	Nault
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Owen	Pacetti
Pallister	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peschisolido	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)

Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Regan
Reynolds
Ritz
Saada
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer
St. Denis
Stewart
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Yelich— 199

Pratt
Proulx
Rajotte
Reed (Halton)
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Richardson
Robillard
Savoy
Schmidt
Sgro
Simard
Solberg
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Telegdi
Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood

NAYS

Members

Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron	Bigras
Bourgeois	Cardin
Comartin	Davies
Duceppe	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Gauthier
Godin	Guay
Guimond	Laframboise
Lanctôt	Masse
Ménard	Nystrom
Paquette	Perron
Robinson	Roy
Wasylycia-Leis— 25	

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne— 26

(The House divided on Motion No. 18, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 351)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anders
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Bailey
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	Barnes (London West)
Beaumier	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin

Boudria
Breitkreuz
Bryden
Burton
Cadman
Cannis
Carroll
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collette
Copp
Cullen
Cuzner
DeVillers
Dion
Duncan
Easter
Elley
Eyking
Fitzpatrick
Frulla
Gallant
Godfrey
Goodale
Grewal
Guarnieri
Harb
Harris
Harvey
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Keys
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McGuire
McLellan
Merrifield
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murphy
O'Reilly
Owen
Pallister
Parrish
Penson
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Regan
Reynolds
Ritz
Saada
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer
St. Denis
Stewart
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Torsney
Valeri

Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Calder
Carignan
Casson
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cummins
Day
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duplain
Eford
Epp
Finlay
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Goldring
Gouk
Grey
Hanger
Harper
Harvard
Hearn
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Hubbard
Jackson
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Minna
Moore
Nault
Obhrai
Pacetti
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Rajotte
Reed (Halton)
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Richardson
Robillard
Savoy
Schmidt
Sgro
Simard
Solberg
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vellacott

Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Yelich — 199

Asselin
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Comartin
Duceppe
Gagnon (Champlain)
Godin
Guimond
Lanctôt
Ménard
Paquette
Robinson
Wasylycia-Leis — 25

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

[English]

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 113, 38, 43 and 18 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 4. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 7, 8, 19, 30, 32, 34, 36, 68 to 71, 73, 77, 115, 119, 134 and 135.

● (2055)

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on Motion No. 4 with Liberal members voting yes.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will vote no.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote against these motions.

[English]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP will vote yes to the motion.

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party votes yes.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I vote yes on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was agreed to on the following division:)

Government Orders

Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood

NAYS

Members

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bigras
Cardin
Davies
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier
Guay
Laframboise
Masse
Nystrom
Perron
Roy

PAIRED

Members

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

*Government Orders**(Division No. 335)*

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collette
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Godin
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hearn
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comartin
Copp
Cullen
Davies
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
Nystrom
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Robinson
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Whelan
Wood — 150

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mayfield
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
Yelich — 74

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

[*English*]**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 4 carried.[*Translation*]

I therefore declare Motions Nos. 7, 8, 19, 30, 32, 34, 36, 68 to 71, 73, 77, 115, 119, 134 and 135 carried.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 66.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on Motion No. 27 with the Liberal members voting yes.**The Speaker:** We are on Motion No. 66. Does the hon. chief government whip mean that it applies to Motion No. 27?**Ms. Marlene Catterall:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The vote on Motion No. 66 will apply to Motion No. 27, but Liberal members are voting yes on Motion No. 66. Agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members would vote yea to those two motions, with the exception of the member of Dewdney—Alouette.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote yes on these motions.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP will vote against this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members vote no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I vote yes on these motions.

(The House divided on Motion No. 66, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 339*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anders
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bagnell	Bailey
Barnes (London West)	Beaumier
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bergeron	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bourgeois	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Burton	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Cardin
Carignan	Carroll
Casson	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cummins	Cuzner
Day	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Drouin	Duceppe
Duncan	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Elley	Epp
Eyking	Finlay
Fitzpatrick	Folco
Frulla	Fry
Gagnon (Québec)	Gagnon (Champlain)
Gallant	Galloway
Gauthier	Godfrey
Goldring	Goodale
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Harb

Harper
Harvard
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Hubbard
Jackson
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
Laliberte
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McGuire
McLellan
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Minna
Moore
Nault
Obhrai
Pacetti
Paquette
Parrish
Penson
Perron
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Rajotte
Reed (Halton)
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Richardson
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer
St. Denis
Stewart
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood

Government Orders

Harris
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laframboise
Lanctôt
Lee
Lincoln
Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
MacAulay
Maloney
Maloney
Marcil
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Merrifield
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murphy
O'Reilly
Owen
Pallister
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Regan
Reynolds
Ritz
Roy
Savoy
Schmidt
Sgro
Simard
Solberg
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Telegdi
Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Toews
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Yelich — 210

NAYS

Members

Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	Comartin
Davies	Godin
Hearn	Herron
Keddy (South Shore)	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark	Masse
Nystrom	Robinson
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Wasylycia-Leis — 14

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrar	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan

Government Orders

Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

McLellan
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Minna
Moore
Nault
Obhrai
Pacetti
Paquette
Parrish
Penson
Perron
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Rajotte
Reed (Halton)
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Richardson
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer
St. Denis
Stewart
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood

Ménard
Merrifield
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murphy
O'Reilly
Owen
Pallister
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Regan
Reynolds
Ritz
Roy
Savoy
Schmidt
Sgro
Simard
Solberg
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Telegdi
Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Toews
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Yelich— 210

(The House divided on Motion No. 27, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 353)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allard
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Assadourian
Augustine
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Binet
Bonin
Bourgeois
Breitkreuz
Bryden
Burton
Cadman
Cannis
Carignan
Casson
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cummins
Day
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duncan
Easter
Elley
Eyking
Fitzpatrick
Frulla
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Gauthier
Goldring
Gouk
Grey
Guay
Hanger
Harper
Harvard
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Hubbard
Jackson
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
Laliberte
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McGuire

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anders
Anderson (Victoria)
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey
Beaumier
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Calder
Cardin
Carroll
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
Cuzner
DeVillers
Dion
Duceppe
Duplain
Efford
Epp
Finlay
Folco
Fry
Gagnon (Champlain)
Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Grewal
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harb
Harris
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laframboise
Lancôt
Lee
Lincoln
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)

Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Davies
Dion
Keddy (South Shore)
Mark
Nystrom
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

[English]

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 66 and Motion No. 27 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 72.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you seek consent of the House that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting yes.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

NAYS

Members

Comartin
Godin
Herron
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Masse
Robinson
Wasylycia-Leis— 14

PAIRED

Members

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will vote nay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote yes on the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP are voting no to this motion.

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party members vote yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I vote yes on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 72, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 345*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	Beaumier
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bourgeois
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Cardin
Carignan	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Collenette	Comuzzi
Coppes	Cotler
Cullen	Cuzner
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duceppe	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla
Fry	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Galloway
Gauthier	Godfrey
Goodale	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Hearn
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Kraft Sloan
Laframboise	Laliberte
Lanciot	LeBlanc
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Macklin	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marcil
Mark	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Ménard	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)

Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Paradis
Patry
Perron
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood— 161

Government Orders

Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paquette
Parrish
Peric
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Roy
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Benoit
Burton
Casson
Cummins
Day
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Harper
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Masse
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

PAIRED

Members

Brien
Caplan
Dalphondu-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rochelleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

Government Orders

● (2100)

[English]

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 72 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 76.

(The House divided on Motion No. 76, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 346)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)
Beaumier	Bélander
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Carignan
Carroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Drouin	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla
Fry	Godfrey
Goodale	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	LeBlanc
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Nault	O'Reilly
Owen	Pacetti
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peschisolido	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi	Tonks
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood— 134

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Bourgeois
Breitkreuz	Burton
Cadman	Cardin
Casson	Comartin
Cummins	Davies
Day	Duceppe
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Québec)	Gagnon (Champlain)
Gallant	Gauthier
Godin	Goldring
Gouk	Grewall
Grey	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harper	Harris
Hearn	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laframboise	Lanctôt
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Masse
Mayfield	Ménard
Meredith	Merrifield
Mills (Red Deer)	Moore
Nystrom	Obhrai
Pallister	Paquette
Penson	Perron
Rajotte	Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Reynolds	Ritz
Robinson	Roy
Schmidt	Skelton
Solberg	Sorenson
Spencer	Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Toews
Vellacott	Wasylycia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Yelich— 88

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphon-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne— 26

● (2105)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 76 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 114.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you would ask, you would find unanimous consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yes.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members vote yes.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois, with the exception of the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, will vote against this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP will vote against this motion.

[English]

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party vote no, but I believe that the member for Mississauga West is absent for this vote.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I vote yes on this motion.

[English]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, there are three members who should be removed from the previous vote: the member for Etobicoke North, the member for Edmonton Southeast, and the member for Mississauga West.

(The House divided on Motion No. 114, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 347)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anders
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Bailey
Barnes (London West)	Beaumier
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Burton
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Carignan	Carroll
Casson	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cummins
Cuzner	Day
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duncan	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Elley	Epp
Eyking	Finlay
Fitzpatrick	Folco
Frulla	Fry
Gallant	Godfrey
Goldring	Goodale
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harb
Harper	Harris
Harvard	Harvey
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Karetak-Lindell	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte

LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacAulay
Macklin	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	Mayfield
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Meredith	Merrifield
Mills (Red Deer)	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Moore	Murphy
Nault	O'Reilly
Obhrai	Owen
Pacetti	Pallister
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Penson
Peric	Pescholido
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proulx	Provenzano
Rajotte	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Saada
Savoy	Scherrer
Schmidt	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Skelton
Solberg	Sorenson
Speller	Spencer
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibault (West Nova)
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)	Tirabassi
Toews	Tonks
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vellacott
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wilfert	Wood
Yelich — 187	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	Bergeron
Bigras	Bourgeois
Cardin	Comartin
Davies	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Gauthier
Godin	Guay
Guimond	Hearn
Herron	Keddy (South Shore)
Laframboise	Launctôt
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mark
Masse	Ménard
Nystrom	Paquette
Perron	Robinson
Roy	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Wasylycia-Leis — 31	

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau

Government Orders

Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

• (2110)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 114 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 26.

(The House divided on Motion No. 26, which was negatived on the following division:)

*(Division No. 352)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott
Anders
Bailey
Benoit
Burton
Casson
Day
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Goldring
Grewal
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Mayfield
Merrifield
Moore
Pallister
Rajotte
Reynolds
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
Yelich— 63

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Cummins
Duncan
Epp
Gallant
Gouk
Grey
Harper
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Penson
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Guay
Harb
Harvey
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Kraft Sloan
Laliberte
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Masse
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Minna
Murphy
Nystrom
Owen
Paquette
Parrish
Peric
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Robillard
Rock
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Whelan
Wood— 157

Gauthier
Godin
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Ianno
Jennings
Keyes
Laframboise
Lanctôt
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Paradis
Patry
Perron
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robinson
Roy
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Wasylcyia-Leis
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Augustine
Bagnell
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Binet
Bonin
Bourgeois
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Cardin
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comartin
Coppes
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Gagnon (Québec)

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collenette
Comuzzi
Cotler
DeVillers
Dion
Duceppe
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Gagnon (Champlain)

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

• (2115)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): I declare Motion No. 26 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 33.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent that the vote previously taken on Motion No. 113 be applied to the vote on Motion No. 33.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 33, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 355)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anders
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Bailey
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	Barnes (London West)
Beaumier	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Burton	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Carignan
Carroll	Casson
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Cummins
Cuzner	Day
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duncan	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Elley	Epp
Eyking	Finlay
Fitzpatrick	Folco
Frulla	Fry
Gallant	Galloway
Godfrey	Goldring
Goodale	Gouk
Grewal	Grey
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harper
Harris	Harvard
Harvey	Hearn
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hinton	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Johnston	Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Mark
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
Mayfield	McCallum
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Moore
Murphy	Nault
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Owen	Pacetti
Pallister	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peschisolido	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)

Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Regan
Reynolds
Ritz
Saada
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer
St. Denis
Stewart
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Yelich — 199

Government Orders

Pratt
Proulx
Rajotte
Reed (Halton)
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Richardson
Robillard
Savoy
Schmidt
Sgro
Simard
Solberg
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Telegdi
Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood

NAYS

Members

Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron	Bigras
Bourgeois	Cardin
Comartin	Davies
Duceppe	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Gauthier
Godin	Guay
Guimond	Laframboise
Lancôt	Masse
Ménard	Nystrom
Paquette	Perron
Robinson	Roy
Wasylcyia-Leis — 25	

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne — 26

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): I declare Motion No. 33 carried.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 85.

[English]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yes. The vote would also apply to Motion No. 117.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is there agreement to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Government Orders

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members vote yes.

• (2120)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will be voting against the motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the New Democratic Party will be voting against this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada votes no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I vote in favour of the motion.

(The House divided on the Motion No. 85, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 359*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Abonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anders
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Bailey
Barnes (London West)	Beaumier
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Burton
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Carignan	Carroll
Casson	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cummins
Cuzner	Day
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duncan	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Elley	Epp
Eyking	Finlay
Fitzpatrick	Folco
Frulla	Fry
Gallant	Galloway
Godfrey	Goldring
Goodale	Gouk
Grewal	Grey
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harper
Harris	Harvard
Harvey	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hinton	Ianno
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Karetak-Lindell	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keys	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	LeBlanc
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)

MacAulay	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	Mayfield
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Meredith	Merrifield
Mills (Red Deer)	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Moore	Murphy
Nault	O'Reilly
Obhrai	Owen
Pacetti	Pallister
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Penson
Peric	Peschisolido
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proulx	Provenzano
Rajotte	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Savoy	Scherrer
Schmidt	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Skelton
Solberg	Sorenson
Speller	Spencer
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibault (West Nova)
Thibault (Saint-Lambert)	Tirabassi
Toews	Tonks
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vellacott
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wilfert	Wood
Yelich — 189	

NAYS

Members

Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	Bergeron
Bigras	Bourgeois
Cardin	Comartin
Duceppe	Gagnon (Québec)
Gagnon (Champlain)	Gauthier
Godin	Guay
Guimond	Hearn
Herron	Keddy (South Shore)
Laframboise	Lanctôt
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mark
Masse	Ménard
Nystrom	Paquette
Perron	Robinson
Roy	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Wasylycia-Leis — 31	

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vancielief	Venne — 26

(The House divided on the Motion No. 117, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 361)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anders
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Bailey
Barnes (London West)	Beaumier
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Burton
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Carignan	Carroll
Casson	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cummins
Cuzner	Day
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Duncan	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Elley	Epp
Eyking	Finlay
Fitzpatrick	Folco
Frulla	Fry
Gallant	Galloway
Godfrey	Goldring
Goodale	Gouk
Grewal	Grey
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harper
Harris	Harvard
Harvey	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hinton	Ianno
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Karetak-Lindell	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keys	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	LeBlanc
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacAulay	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	Mayfield
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Meredith	Merrifield
Mills (Red Deer)	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Moore	Murphy
Nault	O'Reilly
Obhrai	Owen
Pacetti	Pallister
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Penson
Peric	Peschisolido
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proulx	Provenzano
Rajotte	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan

Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Rock
Savoy
Schmidt
Sgro
Simard
Solberg
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Toews
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Yelich — 189

Reynolds
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer
St. Denis
Stewart
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood

NAYS

Members

Asselin
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bigras
Cardin
Duceppe
Gagnon (Champlain)
Godin
Guimond
Herron
Laframboise
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Masse
Nystrom
Perron
Roy
Wasylycia-Leis — 31

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Comartin
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier
Guay
Hearn
Keddy (South Shore)
Lanctôt
Mark
Ménard
Paquette
Robinson
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne — 26

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): I declare Motions Nos. 85 and 117 carried.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 116.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you ask you would find unanimous consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on Motion No. 116, with Liberal members voting yes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will vote no to Motion No. 116.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members will be voting against this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the New Democratic Party will be voting against the motion.

[English]

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party vote no.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I vote in favour of the motion.

[English]

Mr. Roy Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting yes to this motion.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting with the government.

(The House divided on Motion No. 116, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 360)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Barnes (London West)
Beaumier	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Carignan
Carroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Drouin	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Eyking	Finlay
Folco	Frulla
Fry	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Karetak-Lindell
Keys	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	LeBlanc
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marcil	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
McCallum	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Nault	O'Reilly
Owen	Pacetti
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peschisolido	Pettigrew

Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Robillard
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Rock
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood— 134

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Masse
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
Wasylycia-Leis
Yelich— 87

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Comartin
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire

St-Julien
Vancielief

Tremblay
Venne— 26

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): I declare Motion No. 116 carried. I therefore declare Motion No. 120 carried.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in with further amendments.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

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

(Division No. 366)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Guamieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi
Manley

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collenette
Coppes
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Keyes
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcel

Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Savoy
Scott
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tonks
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood— 135

Government Orders

Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Saada
Scherrer
Sgro
Simard
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Breitkreuz
Cadman
Casson
Cummins
Duceppe
Elley
Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Champlain)
Gauthier
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hinton
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lancôt
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Mark
Masse
Ménard
Merrifield
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette
Perron
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Roy
Skelton
Sorenson
Strahl
Toews
Wasylycia-Leis
Yelich— 87

Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Burton
Cardin
Comartin
Day
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant
Godin
Gouk
Grey
Guimond
Harper
Hearn
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Keddy (South Shore)
Laframboise
Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Government Orders

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphondu-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrah	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne— 26

• (2130)

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): I declare the motion carried.
(Motion agreed to)

[English]

* * *

PEST CONTROL PRODUCTS ACT

The House resumed from June 7 consideration of Bill C-53, an act to protect human health and safety and the environment by regulating products used for the control of pests, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions on the report stage of Bill C-53. The question is on Motion No. 1.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find unanimous consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on Motion No. 1, with Liberal members voting yes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members will be voting against the motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP will be voting against this motion.

[English]

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members vote no.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I vote in favour of the motion.

[English]

Mr. John Duncan: Mr. Speaker, the member from Vancouver South is absent for the present vote but was here for the previous vote.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): So recorded.

(The House divided on the Motion No. 1, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 367)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anders
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Bailey
Barnes (London West)	Beaumont
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitreuz
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Burton
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Carignan	Carroll
Casson	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cotler	Cullen
Cummins	Cuzner
Day	DeVillers
Dion	Drouin
Duncan	Duplain
Easter	Efford
Elley	Epp
Eyking	Finlay
Fitzpatrick	Folco
Frulla	Fry
Gallant	Galloway
Godfrey	Goldring
Goodale	Gouk
Grewal	Grey
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harper
Harris	Harvard
Harvey	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hinton	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Johnston	Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Keys
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacAulay
Macklin	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marcil
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Mathews
Mayfield	McCallum
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Moore
Murphy	Nault
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Owen	Pacetti
Pallister	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peschisolido	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Rajotte
Redman	Reed (Halton)

Government Orders

Regan
Reynolds
Ritz
Saada
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer
St. Denis
Stewart
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood

Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Richardson
Robillard
Savoy
Schmidt
Sgro
Simard
Solberg
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Strahl
Telegdi
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Toews
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Yelich— 190

NAYS

Members

Asselin
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Bigras
Cardin
Duceppe
Gagnon (Champlain)
Godin
Guimond
Herron
Laframboise
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Masse
Nystrom
Perron
Roy
Wasylucia-Leis— 31

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Bourgeois
Comartin
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier
Guay
Hearn
Keddy (South Shore)
Lancôt
Mark
Ménard
Paquette
Robinson
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick
Byrne
Charbonneau
Desrochers
Farrah
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Julien
Vanclief

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): I declare Motion No. 1 carried.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 7.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on this motion with Liberal members voting yes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this way?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

• (2135)

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, members of the Canadian Alliance will vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members will be voting against the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP vote no to this motion.

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative Party members vote yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I vote in favour of the motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 368*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allard
Assadourian
Bagnell
Barnes (London West)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carignan
Castonguay
Cauchon
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Drouin
Easter
Eyking
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hearn
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Laliberte
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Nault
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peschisolido
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano

Alcock
Anderson (Victoria)
Augustine
Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cuzner
Dion
Duplain
Efford
Finlay
Frulla
Galloway
Goodale
Harb
Harvey
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Keddy (South Shore)
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Marcil
Marleau
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan
Minna
Murphy
O'Reilly
Pacetti
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman

Government Orders

Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Saada	Savoy
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Simard	Speller
St-Jacques	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tirabassi
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Völpe	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood— 141	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Benoit
Bergeron	Bigras
Bourgeois	Breitkreuz
Burton	Cadman
Cardin	Casson
Comartin	Cummins
Day	Duceppe
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Fitzpatrick
Gagnon (Québec)	Gagnon (Champlain)
Gallant	Gauthier
Godin	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harper	Harris
Hill (MacLeod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hinton
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laframboise
Lancôt	Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Masse	Mayfield
Ménard	Meredith
Merrifield	Mills (Red Deer)
Moore	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pallister
Paquette	Penson
Perron	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Robinson
Roy	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
Strahl	Toews
Vellacott	Wasylycia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Yelich— 80

PAIRED

Members

Bonwick	Brien
Byrne	Caplan
Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers	Dromisky
Farrar	Fournier
Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Marceau	Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Tremblay
Vanclief	Venne— 26

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): I declare Motion No. 7 carried.

[Translation]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in at report stage.

[English]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that you would find unanimous consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with the Liberal members voting yes.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this manner?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[English]

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will be voting yes to concurrence.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members will be voting in favour of the motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the New Democratic Party will vote against the motion.

[English]

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Guy Carignan: Mr. Speaker, I vote in favour of the motion.

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

(Division No. 369)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allard	Anders
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)	Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bagnell	Bailey
Barnes (London West)	Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)
Beaumier	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bergeron
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bourgeois
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Burton
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Cardin	Carignan
Carroll	Casson
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Cummins
Cuzner	Day

Government Orders

DeVillers	Dion	Reed (Halton)	Regan
Drouin	Duceppe	Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Duncan	Duplain	Richardson	Ritz
Easter	Efford	Robillard	Roy
Elley	Epp	Saada	Savoy
Eyking	Finlay	Scherrer	Schmidt
Fitzpatrick	Folco	Scott	Sgro
Frulla	Fry	Shepherd	Simard
Gagnon (Québec)	Gagnon (Champlain)	Skelton	Solberg
Gallant	Galloway	Sorenson	Speller
Gauthier	Godfrey	Spencer	St-Jacques
Goldring	Goodale	St. Denis	Steckle
Gouk	Grewal	Stewart	Strahl
Grey	Guarnieri	Szabo	Telegdi
Guay	Guimond	Thibault (West Nova)	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Hanger	Harb	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tirabassi
Harper	Harris	Toews	Tonks
Harvard	Harvey	Torsney	Ur
Hearn	Herron	Valeri	Vellacott
Hill (MacLeod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Volpe	Wappel
Hilstrom	Hinton	Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Hubbard	Ianno	Wilfert	Wood
Jackson	Jaffer	Yelich— 215	
Jennings	Johnston		
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore)		
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Keyes		
Kraft Sloan	Laframboise		
Laliberte	Lanctôt		
LeBlanc	Lee	Comartin	Godin
Leung	Lincoln	Masse	Nystrom
Longfield	Lunn (Saanic—Gulf Islands)	Robinson	Wasylycia-Leis— 6
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacAulay		
MackKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Macklin		
Mahoney	Malhi		
Maloney	Manley		
Marcil	Mark		
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Bonwick	Brien
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews	Byrne	Caplan
Mayfield	McCallum	Charbonneau	Dalphond-Guiral
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)	Desrochers	Dromisky
McLellan	Ménard	Farrah	Fournier
Meredith	Merrifield	Girard-Bujold	Jordan
Mills (Red Deer)	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Marceau	Myers
Minna	Mitchell	O'Brien (Labrador)	Owen
Moore	Murphy	Pagtakhan	Picard (Drummond)
Nault	O'Reilly	Plamondon	Rocheleau
Obhrai	Owen	Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Pacetti	Pallister	St-Julien	Tremblay
Paquette	Paradis	Vancielief	Venne— 26
Parrish	Patry		
Penson	Peric		
Perron	Peschisolido		
Pettigrew	Phinney		
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri		
Pratt	Price		
Proulx	Provenzano		
Rajotte	Redman		

NAYS

Members

Godin
Nystrom
Wasylycia-Leis— 6

PAIRED

Members

Brien
Caplan
Dalphond-Guiral
Dromisky
Fournier
Jordan
Myers
Owen
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay
Venne— 26

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

It being 9.37 p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 9.37 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, June 10, 2002

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Species at Risk Act

Bill C-5. Report stage	12431
Motion No. 1 negatived	12432
Motions Nos. 28, 104 and 67 negatived	12435
Motions Nos. 12, 13, 105, 106, 121, 95, 5, 15, 79 and 129 negatived	12443
Motion No. 103 negatived	12444
Motions Nos. 107, 108, 111, 128 and 127 negatived	12448
Motion No. 2 negatived	12450
Motions Nos. 49, 23 and 29 agreed to	12452
Motion No. 94 negatived	12454
Motion No. 96 agreed to	12455
Motion No. 35 agreed to	12456
Motion No. 131 agreed to	12457
Motion No. 39 negatived	12458
Motions Nos. 3, 14 and 31 negatived	12460
Motions Nos. 56, 6, 16, 17, 126, 130 and 75 carried	12467
Motion No. 78 agreed to	12468
Motion No. 84 agreed to	12468
Motions Nos. 112, 132 and 133 agreed to	12471
Motions Nos. 113, 38, 43 and 18 agreed to	12475

Motion No. 4 agreed to	12476
Motions Nos. 66 and 27 agreed to	12478
Motion No. 72 agreed to	12480
Motion No. 76 agreed to	12480
Ms. Catterall	12481
Motion No. 114 agreed to	12482
Motion No. 26 negatived	12482
Motion No. 33 agreed to	12483
Motions Nos. 85 and 117 agreed to	12485
Motion No. 116 agreed to	12487
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	12487
Motion for concurrence	12487
Motion agreed to	12488
(Motion agreed to)	12488

Pest Control Products Act

Bill C-53. Report Stage	12488
Motion No. 1 agreed to	12489
Motion No. 7 agreed to	12490
Ms. McLellan	12490
Motion for concurrence	12490

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Communication Canada - Publishing
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :

Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) 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://www.parl.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 Communication Canada - Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Ontario 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 : Communication Canada - Édition, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9**