



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 136 • NUMBER 072 • 2nd SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, March 27, 2000

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, March 27, 2000

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

• (1100)

[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

CANADIAN ALLIANCE

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this is a very historic day for the Canadian people, for the House of Commons and for members of parliament. I would like to read into the record a letter addressed to the Hon. Gilbert Parent, effective immediately, from the Leader of the Official Opposition, dated March 27, 2000. It reads as follows:

Dear Sir:

This is to advise that effective immediately all Reform members of parliament should be recognized as members of the Canadian Alliance in accordance with the results of the referendum conducted among Reform Party members and announced on March 25, 2000, whereby the Reform Party of Canada has officially adopted the new Constitution and Policy Declaration of the Alliance.

Please also be advised that Deborah Grey will serve as Leader of the Official Opposition (interim) until such time as the leader of the Canadian Alliance is chosen by its members. This vote is expected to be concluded by June 24, 2000, or by July 8, 2000.

Mr. Chuck Strahl will serve as House leader for the Canadian Alliance members, Mr. Jay Hill as whip, Mr. Dave Chatters as deputy whip and Ms. Val Meredith as Canadian Alliance caucus chair.

Your sincerely,

Preston Manning, M.P.

The Speaker: Do you wish to table the document?

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: I congratulate the new Leader of the Opposition on her appointment to this very high post. We will follow the wishes as set forth in this letter. Henceforth, pursuant to the request

of the former leader of the Reform Party, we will call the new party the Canadian Alliance. That is how it will be referred to in the House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1105)

[*English*]

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from February 29 consideration of the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government, and of the amendment.

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a great honour to rise in the House to speak to the budget and what it means not only for the provinces and territories but for Canadians wherever they live in this great land of ours.

When we first dealt with the whole issue of the deficit, it was a huge problem in terms of what it meant for Canadians. We knew that over time great sacrifices would have to be made. Finally we are in the position where we have a surplus. As a result of that, we can start to fulfil the very important promises which we made concerning what to do with the surplus money.

I am pleased to be part of a government which recognizes that there needs to be reinvestment in things like education and, especially, health care. Health care is one of those underlying core Canadian values upon which Canadians generally expect us to act, and to do so in a meaningful way.

As chairman of the all-party Standing Committee on Health it is very gratifying to see the kind of reinvestment that is being made in this all important area.

Recently I had the opportunity to speak to a number of researchers, specifically on Bill C-13, which would establish the Canadian

The Budget

institutes of health research. It is important for them to know that the Government of Canada is there for them in terms of money. Dollars to researchers all across Canada will double over the next number of years. We hope to find cures for cancer, heart disease and other diseases.

In the budget we saw that Génome Canada was given enormous amounts of money to get up and running. It is involved in an important health area as well and is something which all Canadians applaud.

We invested in this budget \$2.5 billion in health care, on top of the \$11.5 billion that was invested in last year's budget. That underscores the commitment of the Government of Canada in this all important area, which is consistent with the values of Canadians. We know that there is still a way to go. We understand that, which is why the ministers will be meeting. The federal health minister, along with his territorial and provincial counterparts, will meet in May. The deputy ministers are meeting as we speak. Early on, as quickly as possible, they will try to carve out the kind of health care system that will take us into the 21st century.

The areas that will be looked at are primary health care, as well as community and home care, and the whole issue of accountability and making sure that Canadians get what they want in their health care system.

Those three topics will be dealt with, and hopefully dealt with effectively, knowing that it is what Canadians need and want. We certainly want to act in that appropriate way.

I spoke about the promises which we as a government had made. We know full well that in addition to the reinvestment that we are making in a number of areas we also had to cut taxes. That was very important. We were on the leading edge when it came to the reduction of taxes, unlike members of the Reform Party, who talked about balancing books and trying to get the deficit reduced two years from now. We were far ahead of them. More to the point, we were ahead of them with tax cuts as well. I think that speaks volumes about who we are as a government, what we do and how we do it. It underscores the commitment on this side of the House to give Canadians, especially lower and middle income Canadians, the kind of tax relief that is important, not only for themselves, but for their families as well.

● (1110)

My constituents in Waterloo—Wellington, as well as constituents across Ontario and elsewhere in Canada want to see us move on the national debt. I am pleased to note that we have done that and will continue to do that.

The finance minister was very clear. He said that it is important to move on all these fronts and that there be tax relief in a staged fashion. He indicated that it would be a plan over five years. I think that speaks volumes to our commitment as a government, our

commitment as Liberals, to act in an appropriate and timely way, knowing that it is the right thing to do. Canadians not only expect it and need it, but actually deserve it because of the sacrifices they have made over the last little while.

The tax cuts, coupled with debt reduction over time, coupled with reinvestment in all important areas, are simply good news for Canada. We can see the economy responding as a result. When was the last time we saw the economy soar to the extent it has over the last little while under our administration?

We have seen over time the great benefits that have taken place as a result of good fiscal and monetary management that we on the government side have been able to do. I am very proud to be part of a government that is in tune with Canadians and sees the kinds of things that need to be done, done well and done effectively. We can and do run an effective administration, and that shows. We do it in a way that is consistent with the values of Canadians. We do it in a way that makes economic, social and political sense. I am proud to be part of a government that is able to do that.

I want to indicate that I will be splitting my time. This is an important topic and other members want the ability to speak to it.

Let us go back to the time of the Conservatives for a minute. We inherited a huge deficit from the Mulroney administration. It really was a terrible thing, a great millstone that hung around the necks of all Canadians. Over time we whittled that away and took care of it in a very good way that really did not create havoc and upheaval. In a consistent, incremental and solid way we were able to take it down to zero and do so with minimal disruption.

It is interesting to note that in that sense we were able to do the right thing. It is important that we do that.

It is interesting to see the Conservatives these days and the kinds of things they are doing. I point only to the clarity bill as an example, Bill C-20, and the inability of the Conservatives and Mr. Clark to stand for Canada. I find it most distressing and I find it very shameful.

Again I want to come back and hook into health care. I find it equally and even more distressing that Mr. Clark, out of step with Canadians, has decided to support Mr. Klein's Bill 11 in Alberta. I find that outrageous and out of touch, but it is part and parcel of the Tories and their ability, it seems, to trip at every misstep. That is most upsetting.

I also note that the NDP is often on interesting ground when it comes to a number of the issues, but when it comes to health care, when it comes to employment and other major issues, the NDP always wants to throw money at them. That is just simply unacceptable. Canadians see through that. They find it unacceptable. The NDP always wants to throw money.

When it comes to the Bloc, after Bill C-20 I really have to wonder who and what it represents. It really is quite outrageous that

The Budget

its members are so out of step with their constituents and Quebecers in that wonderful province.

• (1115)

It is interesting to note that the Reform Party has transformed itself into a new alliance. We witnessed the members not so long ago in the House taking, I suppose, a modicum of pride in what they have done, trying to reinvent themselves and come out in a new metamorphosis.

My position is that a dinosaur that does Tae-Kwondo, a dinosaur that tries to be hip is still nothing but a dinosaur. It is important to note that those people opposite who want to rip Canada apart, who want to pit region against region every time they can and pit people against people, they stand for the flat tax.

Since we are talking about the budget today let us talk about the flat tax. Let us talk about what those Reformers stand for. Even their right wing NRA friends, Charlton Heston, and their televangelist friends in the United States, Jimmy Swaggart, Jim Bakker and Tammy Faye and all the other ones of that ilk, reject the flat tax. They say it is rubbish. Still those dinosaurs caterwaul away about how important it is to have a flat tax.

Canadians do not buy into that nonsense. Canadians reject it because Canadians see through whatever they call themselves. They know that the Reform Party switched into an alliance is still nothing but a Reform Party; the politics of hatred, of extremism, of division, of everything that most Canadians do not want to be a part of. That is what the Reform Party represents.

I was reading today a little about our friend Stockwell Day. Does he ever some interesting baggage that needs to see the light of day. We need to turn over the rock and take a look.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétiën (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to my colleague, the hon. member for Waterloo—Wellington, who was of course boasting about the seventh budget of this government and of the same Minister of Finance.

As is his wont, he took advantage of the opportunity to tear a strip off all parties in this House. Of course his own party was spared, a party in which there is infighting going on at the present time. We no longer know who is governing this government, if it is the Minister of Finance, if it is the clan of the Minister of Finance, if it is the Prime Minister and his backroom boys, but the result has been that the seventh budget of the Minister of Finance has totally forgotten this country's farmers.

It is not surprising that one of them has been forced to travel thousands of kilometres to get to Parliament Hill. He made use of the means available to him to raise this government's awareness and to meet with the Prime Minister in order to establish a relationship of financial assistance, after that same government

shamelessly slashed assistance to farmers. Now they are turning on the tap a bit for the health of this country's agriculture.

Another thing that displeased me in this budget is that there is nothing for people who have seasonal work or to lose their jobs. As we are well aware, close to 60% of them pay into the employment insurance fund, but when they are forced to apply for benefits, there is always one way or another to tell them "Unfortunately, you are not eligible". There is always an hour or two missing, or they are penalized for some past action. The only help there is for these workers is that contributions will drop by 15 cents per \$100 in income, for the next four years. This is a trifle.

What we are calling for is for access to employment insurance to be made more humane. When workers are in a black hole, for three weeks, sometimes three months, they find it very difficult.

• (1120)

I think that the member for Waterloo-Wellington does not know what it means for a couple not to have any money coming in for three weeks, for two or three months. This was something he glossed right over.

I happen to know very well that at the same time that workers' benefits were being cut, HRDC was handing out \$500,000 to the big company making billions in Cornwall. The CEO told us "We applied. We were sure we would not get it. They handed it to us and we took it of course".

Placeteco received \$1.2 million to create jobs. Three disappeared, none were created, and Placeteco was saved from certain bankruptcy, and we know perfectly well that some friends had a hand in it.

In the riding—

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to have to interrupt the hon. member. Only five minutes are allowed for questions and comments and the hon. member has used almost all of it. The hon. member for Waterloo—Wellington must be allowed to reply. He has one minute to reply.

[*English*]

Mr. Lynn Myers: Mr. Speaker, I think it would take a little more than one minute to respond to the hon. member opposite. The fact that he took so long to go on his little diatribe underscores the frustration of the Bloc members in the House. They do not know what to do any more. They do not know what they stand for any more.

The hon. member mentioned that we on this side of the House were in so-called disarray. I do not need to be lectured by the Bloc when it comes to those matters, because we stand as a team. We stand united behind our Prime Minister and behind the team in terms of where we go and what we do. We do it in a consistent manner, which Canadians expect from the governing party, the

The Budget

party that governs our great country. We always do it in a manner that is important and underscores our commitment to Canadian values.

The hon. member talks about disarray. He should get Mr. Parizeau and Mr. Bouchard together. He should make sure that his ideological friends, who seem to be fraying at every side of the issue when it comes to things like sovereignty and other things in Quebec, get their act together. I will repeat that I need no lecture from him when it comes to those kinds of things.

Mr. Art Hanger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I rise in direct reference to the comments made by the member for Waterloo—Wellington.

I take exception, as a member of the Canadian Alliance, to his comments that the Canadian Alliance, our new party, formerly the Reform Party, preaches the politics of hatred. I know that other opposition members here in the House would also find that very unparliamentary. In fact, I say shame on that member and his party.

I believe a retraction is due. I appeal to the Chair for that very course of action.

Mr. Lynn Myers: The hon. member is against everything. He is anti-feminist, anti-immigrant—

Mr. Roy Bailey: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I too rise in objection to the member opposite referring to this party, the Canadian Alliance Party, as being some kind of a religious bunch of nuts and yahoos. I suggest that the hon. member retract those remarks or apologize to the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair heard the comments. I am not sure that anything that was said was unparliamentary, but I certainly feel it is appropriate for hon. members to have due regard for the words they use in the House and use language that is entirely fitting with our practice.

I am not sure that the hon. member completely crossed the line. They are not necessarily words that all members would use. I hope we do not continue in this vein. I hope we can move on and perhaps raise our sights a little.

Mr. Rick Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after watching the Minister of Finance previously deliver six innovative budgets from outside the Chamber, it is an honour for me to stand here today to speak in favour of his seventh budget and to participate in the budget debate.

● (1125)

When I decided to speak in support of this budget, I thought back to a time when federal budgets focused on deficits and a ballooning national debt while Canadians had to deal with deep spending cuts; a time when the tax burden on Canadians, particularly low and middle income Canadians, was increasing at an alarming rate; a

time when the national unemployment rate was over 11%; a time when Canadians were worried about their future and the prospects for their children.

Today we have a federal budget that is able to address very different issues. Under the leadership of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, we have a budget today that allows the government to build on the foundation secured by the many sacrifices made by Canadians in Windsor—St. Clair and across Canada.

This budget, the first of the new millennium, takes decisive action to take advantage of Canada's better finances to improve our lives. The balanced approach of this budget works to return hard earned income to Canadians, improve the quality of life for Canadians, prepare the Canadian economy for the new millennium and make our workplaces more productive and competitive.

The balanced approach of this budget addresses several areas of concern and challenges facing this country. Since I only have a few minutes I cannot highlight the entire budget but one area which I would like to discuss today is that of tax relief.

Tax relief is a very important issue in my riding of Windsor—St. Clair. Since my election last April, many of my constituents have told me that tax relief is important in order to improve their quality of life. This budget goes a long way to address this concern by approaching tax relief in a fair and balanced manner.

Budget 2000 introduces a plan that will reduce taxes by at least \$58 billion over the next five years. On an annual basis, it will reduce personal income taxes by an average of 15% by 2004-05. This five year tax reduction plan delivers immediate and growing tax relief to my constituents in Windsor—St. Clair and to all Canadians. This is very much the case for middle and low income Canadians, as well as families with children.

Low and middle income Canadians will see their net personal income tax reduced by an average of 18% annually, perhaps even more if our economic circumstances permit. Families raising children will enjoy an average reduction in their net personal income tax of 21% annually because of the added assistance provided through the enrichment of the Canada child tax benefit.

The combination of tax relief measures and the government's last three budgets and the five year plan will reduce the federal portion of personal income tax for all Canadians by an average of 22% annually by 2004, even more for families raising children.

As a key element of the tax reduction plan, the budget immediately restores full inflation indexation of the personal income tax system. This will stop the hidden tax increases known as bracket creep. This means that the real value of federal benefits, such as the Canada child tax benefit, the CCTB, and the GST credit, will no longer be eroded by inflation, thus protecting the integrity of these

The Budget

programs which were designed to help low and middle income families, especially those who are struggling to raise children.

In short, the government is providing meaningful and permanent tax relief for Canadians, relief that is sustainable because it is built on a solid foundation of fiscal responsibility and not borrowed from future generations through deficit financing as we have seen with some provincial governments in this country.

In another key measure, the middle income tax rate applied to income between \$29,590 and \$59,180 will be cut. Effective July 1 this rate will be reduced to 24% from the current 26%. This middle rate will be cut another full point to 23% by 2004 or sooner, if possible. Under this plan Canadians in Windsor—St. Clair and across the country will earn more tax free income and more of their income will be taxed at lower rates. The plan also enriches the CCTB so that by 2004-05 an additional \$2.5 billion annually will be provided to low and middle income families in my riding of Windsor—St. Clair and across Canada.

As a result of these and other measures, a typical one income family of four earning \$40,000 will have its net federal personal income taxes reduced by \$1,623 a year by 2004, a reduction of 48%. A typical two income family of four earning \$60,000 will have its net federal portion of personal income taxes reduced by \$1,546 a year by 2004, a reduction of 27%.

• (1130)

The government's commitment to tax relief goes beyond tax reductions to individuals and families. The budget 2000 tax plan also helps Canada to become more competitive internationally by encouraging investment and innovation. Measures include reducing corporate tax rates by 7% for businesses in the highest tax sectors to the lasting benefit of our economy in Windsor—St. Clair and all of Canada.

Capital gains taxes which tend to freeze up vast amounts of capital are being reduced as well. Now only two-thirds of these gains are taxable instead of the previous three-quarters.

Opportunity for our young innovators will be found in Canada now that our tax system will promote creative wage and benefit packages, including incentives such as share options.

Today Canada enjoys a new economic reality. The federal deficit is history. The national debt burden is in decline. Canada's unemployment rate is at its lowest level in more than 20 years. The disposable income of Canadians in Windsor—St. Clair and across Canada is on the rise.

The balanced approach of budget 2000 continues to build on Canada's fiscal and economic success. The government has clearly recognized that tax relief is an important part of a balanced

approach to dealing with the problems of success that we are thankfully facing today and into the future.

The government is committed to taking these better finances and transforming them into better lives for all Canadians. Budget 2000 delivers just that. Budget 2000 is good for Windsor—St. Clair and it is good for Canada. I ask all hon. members of the House to give their full support because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the member and put forth a particular situation that was drawn to my attention this morning. There is a number of ongoing sales because of the economy in western Canada. When there is an auction sale the auctioneer comes, takes a list and so on. He publishes that list.

This case is a typical example of another widow who is having an auction sale. Among the goods listed are some firearms. The auctioneer, being a professional and one who used to belong to the provincial organization, did everything right until sales day and he was stopped from selling the widow's guns. Because of this government and the senseless legislation that is supported in only two provinces, we send another widow away with a loss of \$8,000. The government is totally to blame for that happening. Would the hon. member like to comment on that?

Mr. Rick Limoges: Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to respond to that question. One does not have to look too far into the headlines today in North America, both in Canada and the United States, to know that gun control is a very important issue. It is an important issue of safety for all Canadians. I make absolutely no apologies. No one in the House should take the position that gun ownership is something that we ought to be promoting in the way in which that party promotes it.

Certainly people have a right to own guns for certain purposes, hunters, for example, and so on. However we have more than a right; we have a responsibility. When we are talking about responsible gun ownership, no responsible gun owner can possibly complain about the fact that we want to put controls on these very deadly, dangerous weapons to ensure that they do not get into the wrong hands and to ensure that we know where they are and we can protect not only the children in schools but people on the streets and in their homes. I make no apology.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as I listened to two backbench Liberals speak about the budget, I was quite amused by the fact that they accuse our party, the NDP, of just throwing money at health care. In actuality, with this recent budget, for every dollar in tax cuts the government gave two cents for health.

The Liberal government has lost the moral authority to even talk about health care in the country when the Prime Minister goes to

The Budget

Alberta and literally kowtows to Mr. Ralph Klein in terms of bill 11 and the privatization of health care, the most valued and cherished program in the country.

• (1135)

We know the Liberals do not understand the concerns about health care. Another thing they do not understand is the shipbuilding policy on the east coast and elsewhere in the country. There was not a single word in the budget on shipbuilding.

This industry employs thousands of people not only in Atlantic Canada but in Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia. They sit there and completely ignored the industry, the workers and employers such as the CAW and the Irving Company when they came together with a shipbuilding policy. We are one of the few nations in the world without a comprehensive policy.

Tomorrow there will be debate at third reading on a bill proposed by one of the Bloc members. Will this member be supporting that initiative and will the government be supporting a shipbuilding policy in the country?

Mr. Rick Limoges: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the member from the NDP has brought up health care funding once again. Indeed the figures speak for themselves. This is the fourth consecutive increase in Canada health and social transfers by the government. We are now surpassing the levels of the pre-cutback years.

When the government took office in 1993-94 a total of \$37.429 billion were going to the provinces in Canada health and social transfers. This year it will be \$39.399 billion or over \$2 billion more. The \$2.5 billion we have added to this year's budget will help the provinces.

As the Minister of Health said it will take more than money. It will take innovative solutions from every province. It will take health care ministers from across Canada getting together to come up with ways in which we can better fund and deal with the health care crisis we are currently facing and the provinces are trying to manage their way out of.

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak as a member of the Canadian Alliance. As a matter of fact this is the first speech by a member of the Canadian Alliance. It is an historical moment. I am extremely proud to be part of this history. Yes, yes, yes.

What happened on Saturday night in Calgary? Canadians from coast to coast, fed up with Liberal arrogance and disregard for the wishes of the Canadians, spoke with a tremendous roar. They created a new political force that will send these Liberals packing into the Canadian wilderness. A total of 91.5% of Reformers said yes to a broader coalition. What a mandate.

Today I stand proud to be the first member of the Canadian Alliance to speak. Let me say what happened in referendum 2000.

For the record, 94.5% of Albertans said yes to this broader coalition; 93.1% said yes—

Mr. Paul Szabo: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I appreciate what went on on the weekend but the matter before the House is the budget debate. I would suggest that we keep the comments relevant.

The Deputy Speaker: I know the hon. member for Calgary East is working into the budget very quickly.

Mr. Deepak Obhrai: You are absolutely right, Mr. Speaker. It is coming. In Manitoba 80.9% of the people said yes. In New Brunswick 96.2% said yes to the alliance. In Newfoundland 94% said yes to the Canadian Alliance. In Ontario 91% said yes to the alliance. In Prince Edward Island 92.2% said yes. In Quebec 91% said yes. In Saskatchewan 82.8% said yes. In the territories 80.8% said yes. In total 91.9% said yes to the Canadian Alliance, so beware.

• (1140)

What is in the future for Canadians? Today is the budget debate so let us talk about the budget. The budget the Liberals brought forth is an election budget, an election budget in which they want to again spend, spend, spend. They want to buy the votes of Canadians with their own money as they have been doing in the past. It is a shame.

The budget ignored the pleas of Canadians for tax relief, for reducing the deficit and for fixing health care. Let us deal quickly with the tax cuts proposed in the budget. Let us see what my constituents are saying.

I recently talked with a young man living in my constituency who has a wife and two children. He earned \$17,000 last year and paid \$2,000 in taxes. Upon completing his tax return his refund came to \$97 and his wife's, \$150. His question to me was: "How does this government expect a family of four to live on this kind of an income?"

Yesterday I got a call from a senior in my riding. She is working part time. She is 67 years old. She said "I am working part time so that I can go out and earn a little income and be busy". Why is she paying \$24 in EI when she is 67 years old and has no intention of collecting EI? That was her question to me. This is how the government indirectly taxes Canadians.

My son is 15 years old. His friend went out to work in the evenings. He is a young fellow, 15 years old, working out there. His first paycheque was \$300 minus \$87 in taxes. He told my son "Tell your dad what is going on here". I said "Excuse me. It is the party on the other side that is not in touch with Canadians on taxes".

Out there on the streets of Canada there is a demand for the government to address the issue of high taxation. What do we get from the budget? A band-aid solution. It is designed to win votes.

The Budget

The Reform Party brought this out and it scared them into bringing forth some tax relief. Otherwise there would have been no tax relief. I am skeptical and apprehensive that the next budget brought forth by the government will be spend, spend, spend.

Mr. Werner Schmidt: They won't get another chance.

Mr. Deepak Ohrai: Hopefully the election is next year. Then we will see more spend, spend, spend to buy Canadian votes to try to win the election.

My colleague from Calgary—Nose Hill last week presented a motion in the House to deal with the crisis in health care. Even Liberal pollsters said that health care was the number one problem in the country that needed to be fixed. What did they do in the budget? There was a mere \$2.5 billion after the major cuts had taken place over four years since 1993.

Yet the budget increased, it is amazing, by \$1.5 billion grants and contributions, not to health care. The HRDC fiasco has shown what is happening to the grants. Grants and contributions are nothing but patronage, trying to buy votes and helping out their Liberal friends.

The same applies to EDC. The minister has been using confidentiality not to answer questions about loans. Where is the accountability of EDC to parliament? There is none. As a matter of fact today in the *Globe and Mail* it is stated quite clearly that there was influence by the government on the EDC's final report from the Gowling team. The government is using its grants and contributions to help its friends, not ordinary Canadians. What terrible mismanagement.

• (1145)

The two main things the Canadian Alliance offers are tax relief and to fix the health care system.

Let us look at our solution for tax. Our solution 17 is a flat tax rate that will take the government off the backs of taxpayers. Solution 17 will reduce the top federal-provincial tax level to roughly 29% over five years eventually freeing 1.9 million Canadians from paying taxes. Solution 17 says there will be a flat rate tax of 17%. The exemptions still remain and will rise to \$10,000 per person. Those earning \$20,000 or \$30,000 who have a family of one and \$40,000 for a family of four will not pay any taxes contrary to what people, even with small children, now pay of what they are earning.

We are talking of federal tax. My colleague over there was taking much credit for bringing unemployment down among other things. Let me tell him that it was on the backs of the provincial governments.

In closing, I say to Canadians do not be fooled by the Liberal budgets; they are designed to win your votes. At election time

clearly say no to old style politics. I tell the Liberals this is the 21st century. It is time for change. Welcome to the Canadian Alliance.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member gave an example of a family of four making \$17,000 that he alleges paid some \$2,000 in tax. For a family of four with only \$17,000 of income in one person's hands, when we take the basic personal amount plus the spousal amount, that is \$13,000 sheltered already. That leaves \$4,000. On \$4,000 the combined federal and provincial income tax is only \$1,000. That same family gets about \$4,000 of child tax benefits and GST credits which means that on a net basis the family making \$17,000 actually receives over \$3,000 in its pocket and pays no tax. I believe the member should check his numbers. Maybe he would like to table the numbers in the House.

He also made a statement about a family making \$40,000 and that under the new flat tax because there are four people and there is an exemption of \$10,000, it pays no tax. There is no exemption for children. It is for the spouses so there certainly would be tax.

He started off his speech by saying the government should have had a budget that would reduce the deficit. If the member looks carefully at the books, he will see that we have not had a deficit for four years.

Would the member like to clarify for the House why he is giving numbers which are absolutely wrong?

Mr. Deepak Ohrai: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question because it gives me an opportunity to tell him how wrong his accounting is.

Let us talk about that family. He said, and I repeat his words, that under \$17,000 the family will be charged \$1,000 but will get a GST credit. I want to tell him that over and above the \$1,000 he is talking about, that family pays GST when making purchases. If they get a credit back, it is over and above the \$1,000 that they are paid.

• (1150)

Let us go back to the GST issue the member was talking about. We can see how he is twisting numbers. It goes to show how the numbers are twisted by the government.

As for his question about the \$40,000 and what is going to be paid and no exemption, I am talking about our proposal, not what is there right now.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of Canada is very proud of the member. I congratulate his party for what it is achieving for what it believes is its view of politics in Canada, although I disagree on most issues it has talked about.

The Budget

One issue I do want to mention is that this budget clearly gave the top 6% wage earners in the country the biggest tax breaks over that period of time. That is a fact. He was talking about a 15 year old boy that had to pay a lot of taxes on his very first paycheque, yet the government gave the top 6% wage earners the highest tax breaks over the long term in the budget. It completely ignored the aspirations of health care, shipbuilding and farmers. I would like his comments on that.

Mr. Deepak Obhrai: Mr. Speaker, first of all I will take the compliment the member has given the Canadian Alliance and thank him very much. We do have a different approach on how to solve the problems.

He is absolutely right that it is the middle class Canadian taxpayer that is taking the heavy burden of paying taxes and giving money to the government for frivolous spending. I agree with him on that point.

I have some statistics. Britain recently reduced to 10% the maximum rate for low income taxpayers. Ireland is cutting its maximum corporate rate in stages to 12.5% by 2003. Australia is implementing substantial personal income tax cuts that will allow for 80% of Australian taxpayers to pay no more than 30% maximum.

We can see from this that everyone understands economics and that high taxes at the end of the day will kill productivity. Even the Minister of Industry agrees with that. I hope I have answered the question.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address the budget speech.

Unfortunately I listened to the member for Waterloo—Wellington on the Liberal side when he made his presentation. I was rather disappointed in his comments. I thought they were quite inflammatory toward our party.

Before I get into the budget speech, the member for Waterloo—Wellington made reference to the background of our party, the Reform Party which is now the Canadian Alliance. I am speaking as a member of parliament from the Canadian Alliance party. I want the House and the Canadian people to know that.

The member for Waterloo—Wellington made some very damaging comments as far as I am concerned to the people of faith who trust in God and have faith in God. He made disparaging remarks toward people that built this country. I do not believe those comments should go unchallenged. I am surprised that the Speaker did not stand and put an end to what he was saying, so I am going to make reference to those comments.

He made very disparaging remarks to people of faith who trust in God and trust in Jesus Christ. I do not think that is acceptable nor

should they remain unchallenged. They are the people who built this country. Others came afterward.

• (1155)

The Liberals may snicker and smile and I see some of them doing that. It is absolutely unjustified. I will make very direct reference to the comments of the member for Waterloo—Wellington. I will certainly stand up for the people in the country who believe in God.

Turning now to my speech on the budget, the budget that was handed down certainly has had very little attention in one respect. I know the members in the front row on the government side wanted more attention to be paid to it but something which overshadowed the budget was the boondoggle in HRDC. However, that was very much directed to the budget because how are funds managed when they are allotted to a specific area? How are they managed? That is more important than setting the budget itself. HRDC is a prime example. A lot of dirt is starting to stick to members on that side of the House as a result of the HRDC boondoggle.

A new budget was tabled. The last thing the government wanted to happen was to have anybody pay attention to HRDC and how that money was being spent. Look at the new budget. Members opposite said they were even offering some tax relief. Unfortunately that was all lost in the boondoggle at HRDC and rightly so because there is a principle involving morality in how the taxpayers' money is spent.

The taxpayer is looking very carefully at what the government is doing. The new budget is not prominent in their minds but how the money is being managed certainly is very prominent in their minds. I will get to the specifics in the area of defence, for which I am the critic.

The government allotted \$1.9 billion extra to the defence department over three years. Defence has been in the news a lot over the last year and a half. It has suffered tremendously. It has been starved to death. There is a crisis in the quality of life of military personnel. There is substantial equipment rust out, so much so that one has to question just how combat capable our military really is.

The government came along and offered a \$1.9 billion increase over three years. Incrementally that could be chewed up in three years just by doing tours overseas and doing a little on the quality of life issue faced by our military personnel. The amount is not a lot when it is divided over three years. It will not stop the rust out. It just prolongs the problem. There has to be a substantial infusion of funds to make our forces what they should be, combat capable, and to give them the necessary equipment to do the job.

I stand in the House as a member of the Canadian Alliance which wants to see some changes in that area. We know that the budget is inadequate and insufficient. There has to be a long range plan.

The Budget

There is no long range plan from this side of the House. Everything is done on an ad hoc basis. The long range plan is 15 to 20 years down the road. That is how far one should look. Believe me, the Liberals would have the opposition in total agreement with a long range plan for the military.

• (1200)

Mr. Werner Schmidt: Depending on what the plan is.

Mr. Art Hanger: It would depend on what the plan is. The key point is to make our military combat capable. We ramp that up to 15 or 20 years and, as the member across the way has stated, we should include the reserves as part of that. I totally agree with that. The reserves should be factored in and should be part of the whole mobilization plan. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

Our party has recommended that the budget be approximately 2% of the GDP by the year 2015. We ramp up to the year 2015 and that is where we would see the budget factoring in around 2% of the GDP. Do hon. members across the way know what the GDP is in our country right now? It is over \$900 billion. In other words, to allow for a combat capable force, the budget should be almost double what it is right now.

Our budget is just a little over \$10 billion. Our troop numbers are still being cut down. There is still talk about mothballing equipment. There is still talk about disbanding our reserve units that live and work among us, in our cities and in our towns, the most visible part of the military. That should not happen. The funding should be at a level that keeps the reserves active within the community. Unfortunately, so much that the military does goes unnoticed. I find that very unfortunate because we have a proud military history that we should all be teaching our children, if only they knew.

That is where the Canadian Alliance is coming from. We see an opportunity to really do something positive, to really build that feeling of nationalism higher in our country and that opportunity is now.

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened intently to the second member from the Canadian Alliance today. We can dress them up but we cannot take them anywhere.

What I basically heard from the first speaker today was that we on this side of the House are just a bunch of spenders and that the tax cuts we gave in the last budget were minuscule. The very same speaker then said that \$2.5 billion more in health care was not enough and that they wanted more. Then I heard the second speaker stand and say that he wanted \$8 billion more in the defence portfolio. Those members have no idea where any of this money will come from. They must think it is some kind of magic. We will give tax reductions and increase spending at the same time. It is just wonderful.

I heard them talk about the flat taxes. I believe it was eight years ago that the former Reform Party talked about flat taxes. Just about everybody, except the province of Alberta, which wants to experiment with this, has given up on the idea of flat taxes. Everybody knows that the great wonders that the members opposite want to come up with to modernize the system and reduce the administration of the taxation system are not feasible with flat taxes. We can do that in a progressive system as well.

The issue is that a flat tax, by and of itself, is simply shifting the tax burden from the lower middle income earners and the middle income earners to the higher income earners of this country. That is what the so-called CAs envision. By the way, I also object to their name. I happen to be a chartered accountant, as are some of my colleagues. These people are now calling themselves a professional designation by stealth. I suppose we all have to call them CAs as well but they certainly do not know much about economics.

• (1205)

Would the member explain how we are to keep ramping up all this money and at the same time reduce taxes and have a responsible approach to government?

Mr. Art Hanger: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the member's question and it deserves a very direct answer.

The member is wondering where the money will come from. Why does he not ask the HRDC minister how she has such a handle on her department? One place we could certainly address as far as waste and abuse is the HRDC department. To whom does all the billions of dollars go?

I see a great need in the country for enforcement all the way around. Both the RCMP and the military have suffered greatly at the hands of the Liberal government. They barely have an identify left. The military, the RCMP and other enforcement agencies in Canada have been starved of funds and the member dares to ask what more the government can do.

Accountability and priority are the keys. What is the priority? We have a need for security. We live in a global environment with a lot more threats. Where better to spend money than on our military and our enforcement agencies in the country?

The member should look carefully at what his own cabinet is doing when it spends money. He should ask his own constituents what they think. If the member is in touch with his constituents he will come to the quick realization that the money is not being put to good use.

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I commend my colleague for some of the points he has made with regard to the Department of National Defence.

The Budget

I would also like to ask the member, in response to the hon. member opposite, for his comments on what the auditor general said about \$17 billion not being properly accounted for. We need to recognize that it involves not only the HRDC department but also EDC. What is happening here?

I wonder if my hon. colleague could briefly address that question.

Mr. Art Hanger: Madam Speaker, I could go on for some time when it comes to the issue of accountability. It has been a concern to the Canadian people for a long time.

What are the priorities on this side of the House? I do not care whether the member is looking at EDC money, HRDC money, CIDA money or any other department where money is allotted, what are the checks and balances in the system that would allow for that money to be spent in a fair and equitable way? Unfortunately that does not exist on that side of the House.

Mr. Joe Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to join in this debate. I followed it this morning and it has been very interesting. I will make a quick mention about the member who just spoke.

I probably disagree more than I agree with the policies of that member's party but certainly the issue of the reserves is tremendously important to rural communities. Any time I can sing the praises of the Brockville Rifles I will take the opportunity to do so. Had it not been for the reserves during the ice storm, we would have been in real trouble.

I will now turn my attention to what the budget says about the government's environmental agenda. Over the next four years the Government of Canada will invest \$700 million into a variety of environmental initiatives. Most of the money is earmarked for climate change and the remaining for pollution control, species at risk, habitat protection and the development of environmental and sustainable development indicators.

Let us take a closer look at some of these initiatives. The government will invest \$25 million into a green municipal enabling fund to help municipalities and communities assess their environmental needs. One hundred million dollars will go into a green municipal investment fund to encourage private sector innovation in areas like waste management and water conservation. I think this is a very important expenditure, not necessarily in terms of the amount of money, because as we can see from the debate this morning, we can always argue about the dollars and the amounts. The green municipal investment fund is a roll out of the program that was started in Toronto, the Toronto atmosphere fund. What it essentially does is make money available at competitive interest rates for retrofitting energy efficient technologies.

• (1210)

Why I think this type of expenditure is appropriate is that the current markets, if we look at the payback requirements for business, the return on investment that some of these high tech stocks are giving us in the stock market, the return on investment that businesses will require for investments is perhaps a year at the most. These environmental technologies are much longer term investments. Without some sort of parallel money that is not going against investment options that pay back in less than a year, these things would never be done.

We need to invest in these technologies because we need to demonstrate that they work. We need to demonstrate that there are economic benefits to some of these new types of technologies, otherwise we will never get them off the ground and off the drafting table.

There is also \$100 million for a sustainable development fund to develop new technologies, particularly in the areas of clean burning coal and new fuel cell development. In addition, \$210 million over three years will go to the climate change action fund, \$60 million to the Canadian Foundation for Climate and Atmospheric Science and \$100 million over the next four years to help developing countries deal with climate change.

I guess I should point out at this point that I will be splitting my time with the member for Ottawa Centre.

The government will also put in \$22 million over three years to reducing pollution, to stabilize at \$9 million per year thereafter, as well as \$8 million per year to improve the environmental health of the Great Lakes, and part of the infrastructure program is something being referred to now as green infrastructure which will go to sewer and water and the types of infrastructure projects that will result in improvements in the quality of people's lives in terms of the quality of the water that they are drinking. These investments are very timely and definitely significant.

The ministers of energy and the environment will sit down in Vancouver at the end of this month and again in the fall to hammer out the national implementation strategy on climate change. The Kyoto file is a very interesting file. If we can come up with a strategy that is effective for dealing with our greenhouse gas emissions we will go a long way to taking a different kind of look at our environmental policy, a longer term look that tries to align society's interest with the market's interest so that we are not always at odds.

Some critics have said that \$700 million falls short of what is required. I would argue that we will never have enough money if we do not spend our money wisely. Almost three-quarters of a billion dollars is certainly a good start.

The Budget

Let us take highways as an example. The transportation sector is the single largest contributor to Canada's total greenhouse gas emissions, accounting for 27%. How do we approach such a challenge? Our highways and infrastructure are fundamental to a competitive economy. The shipping of goods and services back and forth is the key to why we are enjoying such growth in our export markets. Rather than putting restrictions on the use of highways, we could make changes to the way they are built.

I had a representation from the concrete manufacturers that showed me data that said that if we made highways, especially the ones that are heavily travelled by trucks, out of concrete as opposed to asphalt that it would significantly reduce the amount of fuel that would be used. I think those kinds of creative approaches could turn this ship around. I think all of us would agree that we are headed in the wrong direction.

I now want to spend my time on something that is very near and dear to my heart. It is an item in the budget that did not get a lot of attention. It was the announcement by the Minister of Finance that \$9 million will go to the development of a set of sustainability indicators. I feel that there should have been much more fanfare associated with this announcement.

At present public policy is pretty much based on the assumption that expanding economic activity or growth is the only road to well-being. This may have been accurate at one time but things have changed.

If we measure the rate of a baby's growth it will tell us a lot about how well that baby is doing but we cannot take that measure and apply it to an adult and get useful information. We saw exchanges just now about numbers, about money, about GDP. Is anyone talking about whether Canadians are happy? I think the GDP as an indicator of well-being falls well short of what I think Canadians expect their governments to adopt.

• (1215)

It makes no distinction between money spent on education and money spent on cleaning up after automobile accidents. While GDP mixes good expenses with bad, it takes no account of the unpaid work in homes and by volunteers in our communities. If we did not have that, our well-being would be significantly affected.

GDP fails to recognize any changes in the availability of natural resources. My background is one of business. I have never hugged a tree in my life but I may start. If I could draw a business analogy, we run the country off the income statement. When I say "we" I mean governments at all levels. We do not have a balance sheet. We are assuming that we can use resources and count the economic activity that it generates. In no way are we reconciling these accounts. In no way are we keeping books for future generations. We have bought into the notion that growth is good and that the

GDP is a measure of our well-being. I really think we need to take another look at it.

Making decisions primarily on the information provided by the gross domestic product is like driving a bus and just staring at the speedometer. The GDP speedometer has its place but it does not explain some matters of consequence. The Atlantic cod is a classic example. The fisheries contribution to GDP was rising steadily, right up to the day the stocks disappeared. Another instrument on the dashboard, something that gave us some indication of the health of the stocks, could have provided information which would have stimulated action to steer clear of the disaster that followed.

The dashboard of any modern society should be equipped with a broad range of instruments to indicate changes in natural resource stocks, pollution levels, biodiversity, the durability of goods, employment satisfaction, the quality of education and health care, leisure time, unpaid work, crime and other factors of consequence. The political reality is that while for years politicians have driven the bus looking only at the speedometer, the people are looking out the windows. They are getting more and more concerned.

What we count and what we measure signifies what we value. When all we count is money, talk about the environment and social cohesion does not produce action. When we legitimize other factors by measuring and reporting on them in our core measure of progress they become visible. This visibility enables anyone to see how policies and actions affect the measures.

Increased awareness of causes and effects will naturally incline decision makers to consider how their decisions might affect the measures, and management processes will evolve to seek well-being in a broader context. Once we understand the possibilities that improved measures offer, we will never again accept a system that relies on a narrow economic perspective. It is not unlike the ISO process that businesses have gone through. It is simply accountability and transparency that the country has never seen before.

In conclusion, long after we have spent our tax cut on the public policy implications of developing and reporting on a set of sustainable indicators, we will be paying dividends for not only Canadians today but for every generation that follows us.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened with great pride to my hon. colleague and good friend from the backbenches of the Liberal Party. He took a turn in the debate on the budget and talked about initiatives and issues on the environment which are very serious to the New Democratic Party.

I know the hon. member has a private member's bill before the House now which I support. It is a great initiative. I only hope that the frontbench of his party will give the attention to that bill that someone like me might give to it.

The Budget

My question is for the hon. member. With environmental legislation and regulations going through wherein provinces and municipalities have so much of a say in how they are incorporated, how does he see working closely with provinces and municipalities on this budget or future budgets of any government?

For example, in the Halifax-Dartmouth harbour we are pumping raw sewage into the harbour. We have done that for over 200 years. How does he propose that his government would work with that municipality to keep it in public hands and to maintain the protection of our waters, harbours, bays and inlets?

Mr. Joe Jordan: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for an interesting question. When I look at the budget and the approach of the government to the whole issue of the environment, not necessarily in a partisan way, by earmarking the infrastructure program in the short term to go to green projects we are sending a very clear message that although new city halls might be nice we do not have enough money to go down that road like we did in the last one. We have to earmark for things like sewer and water.

• (1220)

I keep coming back to the larger issue. As the hon. member said I do have a private member's bill but this is certainly not my idea. I caught the wave of the indicators because I saw the inherent logic of it.

We can engage Canadians. Canadians can have a measure to find out if their well-being is increasing or decreasing in things like literacy, mortality and mobility rates. Statistics Canada already keeps track of many of these things. The first step is to look historically at the environmental movement. I say this as an outsider. It has constantly butt heads with economic factors. It must be very frustrating to be an environmentalist because money does not talk. It swears and they keep losing, losing and losing.

We have to step back and engage Canadians. Let us start reporting on the state of the environment in Canada. If we can engage Canadians then governments can be dragged along, kicking and screaming. They will follow. That is why I underscore the significance of the indicators announcement. It is a long term strategy but it will go a long way to changing our approach so that we align economics with the best interest of society and the environment.

I will give the member an example. Germany has a program called lifetime products stewardship. If one builds a washing machine, sells it and it breaks, one has to take it back. It does not go to a landfill site. Let us look at what has happened over time. If we take a look at the workings of a washing machine, a very large percentage of the parts is being recycled. The bracket that holds the motor is the same bracket that holds the compressor in a refrigerator or the picture tube in a television set.

For people watching at home, they should turn their sets around and look at how many different screws are in their televisions. That is built-in obsolescence. That all ends up in landfill sites. As a result of the law in Germany they have better products. They are cheaper to make. They last longer. They are cheaper to repair. At the end of the day the environment wins, the economy wins and society wins because consumers are paying less for goods.

We have gone far enough with the notion that the economy and the environment are at loggerheads. We need to shift the sands and take a different approach. It starts with Canadians being informed about problems and priorities. A set of indicators, not unlike what the auditor general reports on finances every year, will engage Canadians. They will demand that their politicians start making decisions that are in the best interest of not only the economy but society and the environment as well.

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am delighted to speak to the budget items before the House today. I remember when we were on the opposition side and the government of the day was running huge deficit after huge deficit, day after day. The economy was at an all time low. We had a high inflation rate, a high unemployment rate and high interest rates.

When we came to power back in 1993 we were faced with a situation where we had in excess of a \$42 billion deficit, a huge debt, very high unemployment and high interest rates. Less than five years in office we were able, with the leadership of the Prime Minister, his cabinet and his caucus, to bring things under control, turn things around and not only control the deficit but generate a surplus, not only beat down inflation but bring it to a very low level and keep it under control. For the first time in more than 30 years we were able to bring unemployment to an all time low.

We would not have been able to do that on our side alone and by ourselves. We needed the co-operation of the Canadian public. We needed the co-operation of those in the private sector, the public sector and all levels of government.

• (1225)

As the Prime Minister has always indicated, Canadians collectively, along with the government, managed to get us out of the slump and to meet the economic challenge. To do that we had to make a lot of sacrifices. We had to cut spending and get rid of many things we used to do in the past that because of the financial situation we were unable to do any more. In some cases we had to pass on responsibilities of the Government of Canada to others who may be able to do it as well as the government was doing before, and even in some cases better.

I want to talk about the areas of health care and education. Now that we have our house in order and the government has been able

to get the financial situation under control, it is time for us to start investing. I want to be frank. I am not interested in seeing the government throw a load of money at the problem to satisfy a particular premier or province. My constituents are not interested in that. They are demanding a level of accountability and a level of responsibility. The two go hand in hand every time the Government of Canada hands down transfer payments to a provincial government or other levels of government. My constituents want accountability.

When we talk about transfer payments for health care and education, my constituents do not want the federal government to pass on money to provinces that will not effectively and efficiently use the money for those purposes. They want them to use it efficiently and effectively. They want the provinces to respect the five principles of health care. They want the provincial governments to move forward, to get out of the past and into the future, to stop talking about issues such as primary care and to start talking about issues such as the way we improve and deliver services, access, and accountability to Canadians.

The way we used to deliver services is not applicable any more. In the past our population was not aging at the speed that it is aging now. By the year 2010 or 2015 we will have double the number of senior citizens as we had in the past or have in the present. We have an aging population and as such we need to move the health care system from an institutional type of setting into the community where we will have more home care support and services, more services through community centres and through frontline agencies and organizations. Then we could provide more and better services than we had in the past or what we are doing now.

If it means we have to bring the provinces, the territories and other levels of government kicking and screaming into the this century, my constituents would support the government and continue to support it 100%. The status quo is simply and purely not working any more. We have to introduce new ways to provide services to Canadians across the country in the areas of health care and education.

That is why the Prime Minister and the Minister of Health have called on the provincial ministers of health and the premiers of the provinces to come together to talk about ways to deliver the health care system in a more efficient, effective and responsive way. Then Canadians would receive a return on their investment and the appropriate service they so much deserve and need.

• (1230)

It is not a question of simply increasing the transfer payments to the provinces and that is the end of it, the problem is solved. Far from it. I bet we could fill this House and five houses on top of it with hundreds of millions of dollars, even billions, but unless the structure is changed and the way we deliver those services is

Points of Order

changed we will have the same problem 15 or 20 years from now. We could have a band-aid solution and we could buy our way out of the problem in the short term, but in the long term we have to look at the structure of the problem.

The same thing applies in the area of education. When we talk about education we talk about young children who have not yet reached the educational system, or those who were born three, four, five or ten years ago who are entering the system. If we want to reform the educational system, that is the area which must be our priority. That is the area into which we have to put our investment.

After the election of 1993 this government made an unequivocal commitment that, should the provincial governments agree, we would have a national child care program whereby all of the different partners would come together. Guess what? One province after the other stood to denounce the federal government for intruding into provincial jurisdiction, yet they turned around and said "But give us the money".

Canadians do not want it to be handed down from the federal government to the provincial governments without any accountability, without a tangible partnership that we can measure and see. To that extent, here again the Prime Minister has called on the provincial premiers to come together to develop a national strategy to deal with our children and youth, and to have a system which responds to the needs of Canadians.

Those are the two challenges facing us in the days, months and years to come. My colleagues on both sides of the House of Commons have a responsibility and a mandate to go to their provincial colleagues and stress to them the importance of working collectively as partners to respond to the needs of Canadians, not to stand in the House and say that if we spray more money on the problems the problems might go away.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

CANADIAN ALLIANCE

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand that in my absence from the Commons the Speaker ruled on a name change for the Reform Party to the Canadian Alliance.

I feel this impinges upon my privileges as an MP because I ran against the Reform Party in the last election. Even Elections Canada does not recognize the name Canadian Alliance. Those people on the other side are changing their party name in mid-stream.

I would ask you, surely the Speaker should consult the table officers to see whether or not a proper resolution of this parliament

The Budget

should be passed before this name change is authorized and recognized by the Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Very well, I will take the hon. member's point under consideration. We certainly will come back to the House with an answer.

* * *

[Translation]

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government; and of the amendment.

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ): Madam Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the member for Ottawa Centre, boasted naturally, as he should and by the book, about the latest budget of the Minister of Finance. However, formulating a budget is not the be all end all; the money still has to be well managed.

Quite randomly, the HDRC internal auditors pulled out 459 files, for a sort of Léger and Léger poll, and in 80% of them, they found malfeasance or dubious cases.

If we extrapolate, the figure mishandled by the Department of Human Resources Development could be between \$1 billion and \$3 billion.

• (1235)

Would the member for Ottawa Centre agree to have an outside inquiry examine the entire 11,000 files of the department, in order to shed light on this administration?

Doing so could reveal that amounts of \$1 billion or \$3 billion were not mismanaged, given to friends of the government as was the case in the riding of Brant, or Cornwall or Saint-Maurice, the riding of the Prime Minister.

It is very embarrassing for a government to be seen to be badly managing the Department of Human Resources Development, as it penalizes the poor workers, only 42% of whom qualify for employment insurance.

Would my colleague from Ottawa Centre agree to having a full and exhaustive inquiry—we know that 14 RCMP investigations are currently underway—so we may discover from each of the HRDC files from the past four years whether public funds have been properly managed?

Members are certainly aware that a good budget warrants having 100% of the funds well managed. The government has no right to spend public money left and right essentially to buy votes in the next election.

Mr. Mac Harb: Madam Speaker, first, we must pay careful attention to the fact that there are two issues involved here. One is the fact that the hon. member wants greater transparency.

As regards that aspect, the auditor general has already said that he was taking a close look at these files. He will submit his report by the end of the year.

As a member of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, I can assure you that, here in Canada, we manage our affairs much more effectively than anywhere else in the world. The Canadian government is very transparent, much more so than any other in the world. I am convinced that nowhere in the world, including among the provinces, territories, North American countries, African states, European nations or Asian countries, is there a more transparent government than this one.

The other issue raised in the House is that the other opposition party wants the government to do its share once and for all in terms of assistance to the Canadian regions and ridings that need such help.

I am asking the hon. member if he believes that this government should stop helping Canadians, which would deprive them of opportunities, of a bridge, of better options generally.

I can assure him that, in my riding of Ottawa Centre, people want the government to continue to take care of public money as it has been doing for the past six years. My constituents are very pleased by the way this government has been managing public finances. They also want to tell the hon. member that they would rather wait until the end of the year and read the auditor general's report.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Madam Speaker, before beginning, I must say that I was a bit surprised at the superlatives used by the member for Ottawa Centre. I urge him to tone down the hype. In the coming weeks, his government may be shown to be not as transparent and lily-white as he would like us to think.

It is a bit much to be told that things are better run here than anywhere else in the world, or in any other province, when we know that the financial difficulties the provinces are facing are largely the result of this government's budget decisions.

• (1240)

Every year, I take a certain pride in rising in the House on behalf of my constituents to speak to the Minister of Finance's budget statement. It is my duty as a parliamentarian to respect the sacred principle of responsible government for which our brave Patriotes fought more than a century and a half ago.

Once again, in his budget for 2000-01, the Minister of Finance has turned a deaf ear to the expectations and concerns of the public. Yet last fall the Bloc Québécois had taken the trouble to consult members of the public in order to find out what they thought about how the government was spending their money and to relay this back to the minister.

The Budget

I would like to take this opportunity to warmly thank all the social and economic stakeholders—members of the business community, university students, union representatives and community workers—in Verchères—Les Patriotes and throughout Quebec who were good enough to share their views on this issue during the prebudget consultations and exchanges that took place after the budget was brought down.

I would particularly like to mention the contribution made in Verchères—Les Patriotes by representatives of the Association des gens d'affaires de Boucherville, the Saint-Denis-sur-Richelieu and Montérégie Association féminine d'éducation et d'action sociale, the Carrefour jeunesse-emploi de Marguerite d'Youville and the Lajemmerais Centre local de développement. However, the fact of the matter is that the Minister of Finance paid very little attention to what they had to say.

Tax relief, particularly for the middle class; an increase in transfer payments to the provinces for health, postsecondary education and income support; lower EI premiums and an improved EI system; creation of a solid investment program, particularly with respect to municipal infrastructures; and gradual and balanced debt reduction are all approaches the public would like the government to take.

Despite the feigned focus on the objectives defined by the public as priorities, none has been attained. This government has made much of reducing taxes but has, in actual fact, done very little. With the considerable latitude available to the Minister of Finance, we might well have expected to see some response to the expectations of those who, like the Bloc Québécois, have called for a tax cut in the order of \$6 billion this year.

With anticipated surpluses of close to \$150 billion by the year 2004, federal tax reductions for Quebec will in fact total only \$3.3 billion over three years. In comparison, the tax cuts announced a few days later by the Government of Quebec are far more significant, despite the infinitely more modest resources available to Quebec.

The federal plan to reduce the tax burden focuses mainly on indexed tax tables and the progressive elimination of the 5% surtax, and these measures will not do much for the least well off and the middle class.

It needs to be pointed out particularly that the indexation of tax tables does not constitute a tax cut. It is solely intended to avoid having the taxpayer's taxes raised merely because the tax tables are not indexed. This is something we have been calling for since 1994. After pocketing close to \$17 billion too much, the government has now decided to finally act and to index the tax tables.

The situation as far as the transfer payments to the provinces are concerned is not much better. To enable them to better meet the crying needs in health and education, the provinces were expecting

a federal reinvestment of about \$4.2 billion, this year, in social transfers. Instead, the Minister of Finance chose to allocate a measly \$2.5 billion over a four-year period. That amount is not enough to make up for the \$32.5 billion approximately in cuts made by the federal government since 1994 to transfers to the provinces, including over 50% in Quebec.

The government deprived the provinces of \$32.5 billion, then gave them a measly \$2.5 billion over a four-year period. And it expects them to be grateful.

In spite of reduced budgets, partly because of the federal cuts, this year Quebec will invest 14 times more new money in health than the federal government, and eight times more in education. This is significant.

And what about the federal government's tendency to get involved in provincial jurisdictions in an increasingly insidious and underhanded fashion?

In order to cover its intrusions in education, for example, the federal government talks about knowledge economy, the development of new skills, the importance of skills and knowledge, research assistance, technological innovation, and it sprinkles millions of dollars of public money in various foundations and trusts, which it created itself and which are not subject to parliamentary scrutiny, instead of transferring the money directly to the provinces, to allow them to manage it based on their specific needs and priorities.

• (1245)

As it invests hundreds of millions of dollars in these foundations and trusts, almost guaranteed sources of dispute with the provinces, citing the sacred challenge of research and technological innovation, it forces the Tokamak project to close by withdrawing the modest \$7.2 million it had invested annually in the past.

We wonder whether the federal government has not withdrawn from the most important energy research and development project in Quebec, simply because it could not handle working in partnership with the Government of Quebec. No, really, it is distressing to watch the federal government strutting about as it has after such a disappointing budget.

Employment insurance is another case in which the federal government cuts a pitiful figure. It will continue in fact to pocket billions of dollars on the backs of the unemployed. Again this year, the government will be taking in over \$5.5 billion, thanks to the surpluses generated by the employment insurance fund. The chief actuary pointed out that, by the end of 2000, the government will have drawn off \$31.5 billion in surplus since the start of its mandate from the employment insurance fund.

This actuary also said that an amount of between \$10 billion and \$15 billion would be more than ample to meet any increase in costs

The Budget

arising from a recession. So, the Minister of Finance has taken between \$15 billion and \$20 billion too much out of the pockets of workers and employers over the past seven years, thus depriving six unemployed people in ten of the benefits of the employment insurance plan.

It is interesting to note, in this regard, that the minister acknowledged candidly in his budget speech that “these rates will keep coming down to the point where they cover just the costs of the EI program itself”. What a candid admission of guilt. The minister acknowledges that the rates are higher than those needed by the program.

What is keeping him from immediately lowering the contribution rates so that they just cover the program’s requirements and no more, starting right now? Perhaps instead he should improve the plan by increasing benefits and making eligibility criteria more flexible so that benefits will be available to more than the two young unemployed persons out of ten who can currently qualify?

When one realizes that the government has reaped more benefit out of the employment insurance plan than the unemployed have in the past six or seven years, there is good reason to ask some serious questions.

The provinces and the municipalities which have been demanding the implementation of a new infrastructure program from the federal government will also be disappointed. The Bloc Quebecois recommendation to the federal government was for an investment of \$3 billion this year into infrastructure related projects. In order to meet the numerous expectations in this area, part of this funding could have been invested in a support program for the shipbuilding industry.

The municipalities were calling for \$1 billion annually over 15 years to be invested by the federal government in infrastructures. Ottawa turned a deaf ear and plans to inject a mere \$100 million into infrastructures this year. The municipalities will get this \$1 billion from the federal government in the long run, but over six years only, not annually as they had requested. Contrary to all expectations, the federal government’s efforts seem to be equally timid and insufficient as far as reimbursement of the debt is concerned.

To conclude, this budget gives us the impression that the federal government is trying to get the public to swallow a sugar pill. They would have us believe that they have addressed the real problems and responded to the real expectations of the public by really laying into public finances.

Since 1993, close to \$80 billion have flowed into the coffers of this government, which passes itself off as a good manager, without its having to make the least effort. It leaned on others to come up with the surplus that it now has and that it is doing such a bad job of administering: \$31 billion were siphoned away from workers and

employers at the expense of the unemployed; the provinces kicked in their \$32 and a half billion as a result of cuts and have been wrestling with major problems in their health care and education systems every since; and, because the federal government refused to index the tax tables, another \$17 billion quietly built up in its coffers.

• (1250)

And how are all these groups that made it possible for the federal government to get its fiscal house in order thanked? In dribs and drabs.

By distributing its favours right and left, the Liberal government has shown that it is not yet free of its old spend-thrift demons. By handing out money all over the place, it has made the decision not to focus its efforts on a limited number of budgetary items that are felt to be priorities, with the disappointing result that none of its investments have any real impact.

Just as a tree can be identified by the fruit it bears, so can a good government be identified by its actions. There is no getting around the fact that, with this budget, Ottawa has once again put itself on the map as the capital of broken dreams and promises.

[English]

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member went over a number of items. I started to add them up and I lost track of the number of ways he wanted to spend additional money.

He talked about additional tax cuts. He said that the deindexation was not a tax break for Canadians because it had to be done. He wanted more. He said there were no real tax breaks and he wanted more tax breaks. I do not know how much he would like to add to the spending of the government in terms of reduced taxation. He talked about EI, another \$5 billion to deal with the national surplus. He talked about another \$1 billion for shipbuilding. He also talked about the need for health care spending.

The hon. member should consider that the revenues coming into the government through income taxes, payroll taxes, et cetera, all go into the same pool of funds. The funds that Canadians contribute are available to take care of programs. Right now we are presenting a balanced budget. With that balanced budget the member is saying he wants \$5 billion here, another \$5 billion there, another \$1 billion for shipbuilding and another amount, I do not know how much as he was not specific, on health care.

If those expenditures or tax reductions are to be delivered, the money has to come from somewhere. If the member is suggesting that there should have been another \$5 billion to \$15 billion expended in the budget for tax reduction, EI reduction, health care, et cetera, what would he cut year after year after year in order to fund those additional expenditures or tax reductions?

The Budget

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, obviously, the hon. member heard my speech, but he did not understand it.

He claims that I said that the government's budget does not include tax cuts. He is surprised that I would make such a statement. I did not say that the budget does not include tax cuts and I ask the member to listen to my reply, because it might help him not only hear it, but also understand it.

I never claimed that the budget does not include tax cuts. I simply said that, based on the public's expectations, these tax cuts were inadequate.

It is a fact that the indexing of tax tables is not a tax cut. This only means that taxes will not increase next year, as they otherwise would have with non-indexation. This is, for all intents and purposes, much more a freeze than a cut. In the long term, it obviously means savings for taxpayers, but it is not a tax cut.

Also, the reduction of the 5% surtax will benefit the rich much more than the middle class and the poor, who have been the primary targets of the Liberals' initiatives to put their fiscal house in order, since 1994.

The member asked where the money would come from. He seemed to be implying that I was proposing an increase in spending. I want to make it clear to him that I never suggested investing \$1 billion annually in a shipbuilding policy. What I said is that the municipalities and the provinces were asking for annual investments of about \$1 billion, over a 15 year period, in infrastructures. The government is obviously not meeting these expectations.

• (1255)

Part of this money could have been used in conjunction with a policy on shipbuilding, a policy on the shipbuilding industry, as all the premiers requested.

I come back to the member's question about where the money will come from. I say quite simply to our Liberal friends that they should not fall back into their bad old habit of sprinkling their generosity about here and there, they should focus the budget on a number of priority items, such as tax reductions and transfers to the provinces.

The government has decided to invest in foundations and trusts outside parliamentary control and appoint as members of their boards individuals over whom it has good control. These trusts will intervene in the fields of education or health care or both.

Instead of millions being invested in a given trust, we see that nearly 80 of these trusts and foundations have been created since 1994. The government should stop investing millions of dollars here and there, take all this money and consolidate it in a single

transfer payment to the provinces. They are best equipped to deal with the problems facing them in the fields of health care and education.

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support what my colleague from Verchères—Les-Patriotes said at the start of his speech about the hon. member for Ottawa Centre. I have heard some questionable praise of this government and of this country, which is "the best in the world" and which is totally without scandal or anything else negative.

This is really hiding one's head in the sand like an ostrich. The house is burning down, but "Everything's fine, just great, so worry not".

I find it almost boring to take part in this debate on the budget, because it ought to pass without any comment. The good news that has been so long awaited has been put off until later. It has been put off until the next time there is an election campaign, this fall; maybe they will make it part of their platform. This is why they have put off the tax cuts until 2001 and 2002. Taxes will be lowered later; we will have to wait. As I have already said, it will likely be announced during the election campaign.

Yet the federal government had a clearly sufficient margin of manoeuvrability by this year to step up its efforts to reduce the tax burden. They are telling the taxpayers to be patient. It will take another few years for individuals, families and businesses to really be able to profit from the tax breaks announced by the Minister of Finance.

As for the indexation of the tax tables, the Bloc Québécois has been calling for this measure ever since 1993. Since 1994 the Minister of Finance has got \$17 billion from the pockets of taxpayers. That is clear: \$17 billion.

Why did he not do it earlier? Because it was very lucrative. The federal government did not index the tax tables earlier because this was how it came up with \$17 billion.

I would point out to those listening, who are perhaps not familiar with this issue, that indexing the tax tables does not mean that taxes will go down. My colleague explained this earlier. It merely means that next year an individual's taxes will not go up. Indexing the tax tables merely means that people will not pay more.

The big losers in this budget are the provinces. In fact, the Minister of Finance refused to go along with the premiers' urgent demand for a permanent increase in the cash portion of the social transfer intended for health, social assistance and postsecondary education.

• (1300)

The provinces demanded that the Canada social transfer be restored to the 1993-94 level. I was elected in 1993, at which time I

The Budget

was the health critic. Unless I am mistaken, things have been going badly in that sector since the Canada social transfer was slashed and separate payments were combined into one smaller amount, which was handed over to the provinces with the order to find a way to make it cover health, social assistance and postsecondary education. These billions of dollars in cuts left the provinces in a very difficult situation, particularly in the health care sector, where needs are growing.

We often mention that the population is aging, that new technologies are increasingly costly, but the federal government turns a deaf ear and makes cuts to eliminate its deficit, on the backs of the poor and the sick. It passes the bill on to the provinces and then says "The problem is that the provinces do not manage their affairs properly". But the public is not stupid. It can see that, by squeezing the provinces, this government has forced them to reduce their services.

The Minister of Finance tells us that he did provide an increase. But he did not increase the Canada social transfer. He took \$2.5 billion, put it in a trust and told the provinces "You are entitled to a prorated amount, you are entitled to a few million, based on conditions set by me". This is all because of the social union. We were right when we said that the provinces sold their birthright for a pittance. This is how it happened. The provinces are now forced to beg and to implore the big boss, who has the money, and say "Please give us some money, because we have people who are dying of hunger". This is the problem.

Instead of fully restoring the Canada social transfer, which is supposed to meet the public's needs, the Minister of Finance preferred to start another legal battle by establishing this independent trust which will have, in my opinion, a totally inadequate budget.

Another problem generated by this budget is that of social housing and infrastructures. In the case of social housing, it is nothing short of outrageous. The government did not even allocate any money, except a few dollars to renovate housing units that are in a state of disrepair. But we are asking for social housing for the poor. We are asking for new units, not just minor renovations.

I heard Liberal Party colleagues boasting about the sums they supposedly invested in social housing. However, if members look at the budget, they will have a hard time finding funds for social housing. It is like looking for a needle in the haystack.

The Bloc Québécois asked the minister to inject \$3 billion into an infrastructure program, including \$1.7 billion for social housing. The request had the support of all the community groups, such as FRAPRU in Quebec, which looks after social housing for the most disadvantaged. It supported the proposal, because the need is there and to the extent of at least \$1.7 billion. When the government says it looks after the poor in this budget, well, we can forget about that.

Instead, the government announced provision for infrastructures in municipalities and urban and rural communities. In the first year, it will provide \$100 million for all the provinces. But, Quebec's share of this will be between \$20 and \$25 million. Given that five kilometres of road costs about \$1 million, does the government think we are going to go far with that?

There is worse to come—the employment insurance plan. This budget provides no improvement to the employment insurance plan. There is simply a reduction in contribution rates of 10 cents a year.

• (1305)

We must not say it too loud, because I do not think the Liberals have emphasized it much. Ten cents a year is so ridiculous. In four years, it will be 40 cents. Applause, applause, employment insurance contributions will go down a whole 40 cents. This is scandalous and unacceptable, because the Minister of Finance is using this fund as if it were his milk cow. He is using the unemployed as if they were his milk cows. The robbery continues.

According to the chief actuary, the accumulated surplus will be up to \$31.3 billion by the end of the year 2000. To think that the former Celanese employees who were involved in a massive layoff this last week, and who have paid into the EI fund for 20, 25, 30 or 35 years, will get nothing. They are not even eligible for employment insurance because they got separation pay, and that is considered income for determining eligibility for employment insurance.

The Minister of Finance had, however, given us a hint of a possibility, via the former Minister of Human Resources Development, that he would be putting into place an enhanced POWA-style program to help these former workers with 35 years of service, who have always paid into the EI fund. These workers have no prospects of help, and find themselves in a desperate situation and forced onto welfare. This is a horrible and unacceptable situation.

[English]

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my hon. colleague from the Bloc Québécois party.

The Liberal government has completely abandoned its moral obligation toward health care and has thus forced the provinces looking at other avenues for more privatization of health care in terms of user fees and everything else. In fact the premier of my province of Nova Scotia is now talking about user fees for some forms of health care and other forms of doctors appointments and so on. We hope that does not happen in the next budget. We also notice in the province of Quebec that one of the hospitals is

The Budget

initiating some sort of user fee system for some aspects of health care.

Does the hon. member think that is the way the provinces should go or should the federal government actually start to live up to its obligations to health care and to the five principles which it originally signed on to.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pauline Picard: Mr. Speaker, yes, I believe there is no room for a two tier system. If Quebec does become sovereign one day, these conditions, the five great principles the Canada Health Act incorporated, will remain. I think we have a good health insurance plan in Canada. It also covers all of the most disadvantaged. Everyone can therefore obtain treatment without cost. It is accessible, and the care is good.

However, at the moment what we are faced with—and it is of some concern—is the famous cuts by this government to the Canada social transfer, drastic cuts, when the provinces were at a very critical point because of the increase in population aging and the increased costs of new technologies. The provinces were already in a situation of having to cut themselves in their management in order to reduce their deficits.

• (1310)

The biggest problem came from this Liberal government, which put the axe to the Canada social transfer, causing the provinces to now find themselves faced with desperate needs in terms of the sick and of income security. Cuts had to be made there as well, but support must continue to be given to these people.

There is good reason then for the appearance of other means, such as private industry. It sees in this a share of the market. By wanting to restore a system with shorter waiting lists and better care, it is facing off with the governments. Private enterprise is putting enormous pressure on the governments. The governments must really make sure they can maintain all health care services by not losing sight of these five fundamental principles.

We oppose a two tiered system, but the federal government must now do its part to ensure that the provinces can keep and honour these five principles.

[*English*]

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this truly is a watershed budget for Canadians. After seven years of sacrifice, of seeing treasured programs reduced and bracket creep eat up more and more of their family incomes, Canadians finally can see the benefits of the long period of restraint which has addressed our overspending, which has produced two surplus budgets in a row. It is finally providing the kind of tax relief

and reinvestment in our social programs and the future of our economy that Canadians want to see to create a better future for their children.

I was privileged during the course of the discussions leading up to the 2000 budget to have the benefit of significant and important input from my constituents in Ottawa West—Nepean. In the fall we held a prebudget consultation meeting and I was very pleased that there was lively and well-informed discussion. The discussion focused not only on the long term and short term interests of individuals in my constituency but just as important, the long term interests of all Canadians.

We also distributed a survey during our door to door visits last summer and throughout the fall, at various meetings and in my fall householder. There was a very impressive response. I want to refer to that prebudget survey which was done in Ottawa West—Nepean and then talk about how the budget has responded to the concerns expressed by my constituents.

Very clearly the top priority of more than one-third of the respondents was personal tax reductions. The government has responded. The second most important priority was health care. The government, notwithstanding the comments of the member from the Bloc, has responded. People were also concerned about the environment and the need to invest in new environmental solutions. The government has responded.

The largest employer in this region now is not the federal government. It is the high tech sector. People were concerned about investment in research, science and technology. The government has responded.

Since we were able to start tax relief in the 1998 budget, we have focused most on low and middle income Canadians. We have focused on families with children and the deindexing of tax brackets, reducing the tax rate for the middle income bracket, raising the amount of basic income that is exempt from income tax, raising the level of the middle and top tax brackets and eliminating the 5% surtax.

• (1315)

All of this will lead to a 15% reduction, on average, for all Canadians, which does not include the benefits of the tax reductions in the last budget, 18% for low and middle income families and over 20% for families with children. All in all, more than nine million Canadians will see a reduction in their taxes just by changing the middle income tax rate.

There were some tax measures as well that were important to this region and to the high technology sector. In the telecommunications area, 75% of the activity in that sector happens in the national capital region. It will be of particular interest to that sector of the economy that the tax rate for service and high tech industries

The Budget

will drop from 28% to 21% over the next five years, with the first reduction kicking in by January 1, 2001.

The treatment of stock options, which is a major component of compensation for many in the high tech sector, has changed, so that they become taxable only when sold. That is a measure which the high tech sector has requested for some time in the interests of keeping and retaining highly qualified employees in that industry.

The other important measure to stimulate investment in small start-up companies is the rollover of \$500,000 which is now permitted. Money which has been invested can now be rolled over into a new investment without incurring any capital gains. That will be a major generator for investment in somewhat high risk but nonetheless extremely important new initiatives in the high technology sector.

We are also supporting the foundation that feeds those new and growing sectors of the economy which will be producing an increasing proportion of jobs by funding 2,000 research chairs across Canada. We are ensuring that the basic research necessary to keep our economy innovative, growing and providing new opportunities for the next generation will continue.

The investment we have made in this budget in education by allowing people to receive far more support for their education tax free, from \$500 up to \$3,000, will make it easier for more young people to get a post-secondary education.

The fact that we are putting more money into the Canada Foundation for Innovation is another important investment in the future of our economy and employment for Canadians. I should mention that one initiative of that foundation is its investment in the newly launched National Capital Institute of Telecommunications in this region.

Lest anyone think that the only concern is money, dollars and cents, it is not. Canadians are concerned about health care. Notwithstanding what the Bloc member just said, she should acknowledge that the transfers to the provinces for health, post-secondary education and social services has increased by 25% in the last two budgets. We know that is to make up for cuts which had to be made to get our finances in order, but notwithstanding what some of the provinces are saying, 33% of all public spending in health care is by the federal government. That is a fairly significant increase and a significant contribution to an area that is primarily a provincial responsibility.

I want to leave time for my colleague to speak, with whom I will be splitting my time, so I will only mention very briefly what I think is an equally important contribution, and that is the \$700 million that will be committed over the next three years for major environmental initiatives. There will be \$210 million over three years for green energy development and the climate change action

fund, and \$100 million for a new sustainable development technology fund which will help companies develop new environmental technologies and bring them to market. This will accomplish two things for Canada and the rest of the world: finding solutions to environmental problems and finding them in a way that will also benefit the Canadian economy. There will be \$100 million for a new green municipal investment fund, a revolving fund that will leverage private sector investment in such areas as waste management and water conservation at the municipal level, as well as \$90 million over three years for a national strategy on species at risk.

• (1320)

I can only conclude that this is a well balanced budget. It meets the needs of Canadians, their expectations for tax relief after a number of years of very stringent financial and economic measures, and it also invests very clearly in a better future and quality of life for all Canadians.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of the hon. member. It is obvious from all of the surveys that health care is the number one issue across Canada. It is also obvious that, no matter what province we travel in, we can pick up a newspaper and there will be horror stories about the health care that is being provided because of lack of funding.

We know that we have an aging population. We know that modern technology in health care requires a great deal more money. We also know that the premise of sharing between the federal government and the provinces with the Canada Health Act is really based on a formula which is quite simple, 50:50. That has dropped, in some cases, to only 11% from the federal government to the provincial government. Health care is in serious trouble in Canada if it is to remain universal, as we would like it to be.

What does the hon. member see having to happen if we are to preserve universal health care in Canada?

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, as one who represents the riding with the second highest proportion of seniors in the country, next only to Victoria, I am well aware of the growing need for health care services for seniors and of the demand that will be placed on our system.

Let me first correct something the member said. He may not have heard me, but the fact is that the federal government contributes 33%, not 11% but 33%, of the public funding for health care in this country.

He also should be very well aware that our first priority, our first major investment in last year's budget, after we had gotten rid of the deficit, was to health care. We place a great importance on health care and on our public health care system. In that budget we made a major investment of \$11.5 billion, plus we eliminated the

The Budget

cap that had been placed on transfers to Ontario, B.C. and Alberta. In Ontario alone that meant nearly \$1 billion extra.

The major investment in this budget again was money for health care. In the last two budgets alone we increased by 25% the amount of money going to the provinces through the Canadian health and social transfer. That is 25% in just two years.

We are now at the highest level ever of federal contributions to the provinces in those areas. We also know that we have to work very closely with the provinces to look at better primary health care, home care, community care for people, not only as they age, but when they are ill and when they are recuperating from illnesses. There is a major job for us to do together to improve our health care system. Money is not the only thing that is needed. We also need new approaches, and community based approaches, which I fully support.

• (1325)

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to the environment for a second. The hon. member mentioned the investment that the Government of Canada will make for species at risk. The legislation to address this will come forth in the next little while. All hon. members know that the government has not passed one piece of environmental legislation of its own since taking power.

Why would the government ignore the species at risk working group, which is a coalition of mining consortiums, woodlot owners, farming communities and environmental NGOs? Why would the government not accept the investment in time that those groups have made? The Minister of the Environment has chosen to ignore that particular initiative.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I do not think anything could be further from the truth. In fact, there are some groups that would argue that the legislation for the protection of species at risk is not strong enough. Given that we have not yet seen it, I am not sure how anyone could make that judgment.

The fact is that the work of that working group has concerned itself with the needs of woodlot owners, agricultural producers and so on, as well as the need to balance all of those interests to produce legislation that will work in co-operation with the federal government, the provincial governments and private property owners. The work of the working group has very much guided the development of the legislation.

Mr. Murray Calder (Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was here in 1993 when the government began to pick up the broken pieces that were left from the government we replaced.

Mr. John Herron: Be gentle.

Mr. Murray Calder: I will, but I will be honest and factual at the same time.

I am proud to be here now, when we are in an era of surpluses and we can move forward to embrace the opportunities of the 21st century.

First, I would like to talk about those early days. Many of my colleagues were also here in 1993. They could tell the House what it was like.

Seven years ago this country was at an economic low. Nine years of the Mulroney government had played havoc with our federal debt. Estimates indicated that within eight years the debt had increased by \$250 billion.

We were also left with a \$42 billion deficit and we had to pay 33 cents of every revenue dollar to the interest on the debt. This was not paying back the debt, it was just the interest on the debt.

Unemployment was at 11.4% and high deficits and the resulting pressure on interest rates had affected, adversely I may add, economic growth and job creation. If this cycle had been allowed to continue Canada would have been in very, very bad shape. It may even have hit the New Zealand wall that everybody talks about.

As a government we made some pretty tough compromises and prioritized, down to the absolute detail I might add, and thought about the sorts of things that were important to Canadians. With the economy now gaining momentum and new jobs and opportunities available to us we are optimistic and we are ready for the 21st century.

A couple of months before the budget was announced I asked my constituents what they thought these investments should look like. The informal survey which I sent out asked them to list in the order of priority where they would like to see budget dollars spent. I received approximately 200 responses. The top three priorities—

Mr. John Herron: HRDC, \$1.2 billion?

Mr. Murray Calder: No, Mr. Speaker, the member is absolutely wrong. The landslide was for tax reduction, health care investments and debt reduction. That is what the survey said.

Mr. John Herron: Where did the government put the HRDC money then?

Mr. Murray Calder: Mr. Speaker, this is typical of the Tories. They are just out of touch. That is the problem.

Important to my constituents also were environmental projects and job initiatives. These priorities were right in line with what the budget delivered. I cannot help but feel good about this budget when its top priorities were the same top priorities identified by my constituents.

The Budget

• (1330)

Budget 2000 has something for everybody. Let us take a look at the tax cuts. Personal income taxes are being cut by an average of 15%. For families with children, they are going to be cut by 21% over five years and middle class families will receive a break of 23% from 26%. Restoring full indexation of the personal income tax system, which is something that took everybody by surprise, will end bracket creep caused by inflation. This means that Canadians will be able to earn more tax free income and more of their income will be taxed at a lower rate. It is a good deal.

We are lowering taxes when the nation's finances allow us to do so. These cuts have already been paid for through three consecutive balanced budgets. I want to make perfectly clear that we are not borrowing the money to pay for these cuts like the Mike Harris government has been doing in Ontario.

To make strides in our economy it takes more than lowering personal income tax. The budget will also help small businesses in my riding and across the country by lowering their tax rates. The budget also proposes to spur investment and encourage entrepreneurship by lowering capital gains tax, by taxing stock options only when the shares are sold, and by allowing a \$500,000 tax free rollover for new ventures. It will also help by increasing resources available through the community futures program. This program delivers economic support to small and rural communities in the form of mentoring services, business counselling, training and loans.

As a sound investment the budget provides for health care and quality of life for Canadians. Building on the 1999 health care announcement, the budget increases the Canada health and social transfer payments to the provinces and the territories by \$2.5 billion for health care and education. This means that the CHST will reach an all time high of almost \$31 billion for the 2000-01 year.

In the last two years the federal cash support for health care and education in Ontario increased by 24%. The government provides transfers to health care in Ontario through cash and through tax points under the Canada health and social transfer. I want to stress a point that does not come out very often but should. All contributions taken into consideration, the federal government now provides in excess of 33 cents of every public dollar spent by governments in Canada. My constituents want us to continue our responsible fiscal management and to continue paying down the debt.

As budget 2000 reports from 1997 to 1998 when the budget was first balanced and through to 2000 to 2002, the growth in program spending will be held roughly to the growth in population and inflation. The unemployment rate is 4.5% lower than the 11.4% the government inherited shortly after taking office in October 1993.

Over 1.8 million new jobs have been created since then. The budget continues the principles under the debt repayment plan, setting aside a \$3 billion contingency reserve each year to ensure a balanced budget. If we do not need the reserve it automatically goes to debt repayment. Previous governments set aside long term deficit targets that were never met. This government's approach to budgeting is to set credible two year rolling deficit targets. This means the government is held accountable on a continuous basis.

There are many more important investments outlined in the budget to make Canada more innovative such as in new technology and leading edge research and innovation in research hospitals, universities and the private sector. There are many supports for the environmental initiatives of clean air, water and health habitats. On the community level there are \$25 million to help municipalities and communities to determine best approaches toward waste management, renewable energy, water conservation, and the list goes on. There are \$100 million in a revolving fund, the green municipal investment fund, to support projects in areas such as sustainable communities, urban transit, energy and water savings, and the list goes on.

• (1335)

People in my riding are very interested in protecting the environment. With the headwaters of three rivers, the Credit, the Humber and the Saugeen, plus the Grand River system and Nottawasaga in my riding, they are very interested in initiatives that can help in their protection. The creation of a new sustainable development technology fund will help companies develop new environmental technologies and bring them to market.

In another initiative, building on local efforts to preserve natural habitats and species, the federal government is cutting by half the capital gains tax arising from donations to ecologically sensitive lands and will be providing \$90 million over three years to protect species at risk.

Other initiatives include increasing the tax exemption for income from scholarships. That was one I pushed for. It has been increased from \$500 to \$3,000. There will be \$90 million over three years to strengthen the government's ability to regulate biotechnology products and processes, and \$160 million over two years so that federal government services will be offered to Canadians on line.

There is also a proposal to work out a multi-year agreement with the provinces and the private sector to improve highways and municipal infrastructure, including green infrastructure and affordable housing in urban and rural communities.

My constituents were happy with the budget. I have not to date received one phone call complaining about the budget. I can remember back in 1993 my fax machine going crazy. We could not keep paper in it. There were no tax increases.

The Budget

My constituents were afraid that we were going to be like the previous government. We are not. Canadians are very comfortable and very confident in the government's management of the country.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, did the hon. member who just spoke so eloquently in the House also inform his constituents that the GST and the NAFTA, which the government was to get rid of, are still in place? Promises were made by the 1993 Liberal government the member talked about, but they were not kept.

Did the member tell his constituents that in 1993 there were approximately \$16.8 billion in health care, which in 1998 dropped to \$12.6 billion or a reduction of some \$4.2 billion from 1993 to 1998? Did the hon. member tell his constituents that the reason health care has such a problem right now is that the Liberals took the money out of the budget in the first place? Did he tell them that \$2.5 billion which the government talked about in the budget was over four years, and not \$2.5 billion this year? Did the member tell his constituents these facts before he sent out the survey?

Mr. Murray Calder: Mr. Speaker, the short answer to that question is yes, and they agreed with what we are doing.

The hon. member across the way talked about the GST. One of the first things I told my constituents in the 1993 campaign was that whatever we do with the GST it generates \$18 billion worth of revenue for the government, that the government needs that money, and that if we do away with the tax we will run an extra \$18 billion deficit.

In the last six and a half years the government has not only solved these problems but are now in the black. The previous government could not get its act together in this regard. The short answer to his question is yes, my constituents knew about all decisions the government was making and agreed with them, because I am back here for a second term.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétiën (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the member for Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey is a well known farmer, but today I think his primary allegiance is to the Liberal Party. His blinders prevent him from seeing that the Minister of Finance's most recent budget sounds a death knell for agriculture in Canada and in Quebec.

• (1340)

In the past, his government cut assistance for Western grain transportation and prices plummeted. When a country is unable to feed its population, it is poor and depends on other countries.

How is it that this member, who raises primarily poultry, has not spoken out in defence of farmers? He certainly did not hesitate to stab his leader in the back.

[English]

Mr. Murray Calder: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague across the way used to sit on the standing committee on agriculture. He has an agriculture background and should know better. Of course I stand up for the interest of farmers. I was out west at least three times last year. We worked hard to get an extra \$240 million to western farmers.

The minister of agriculture just signed an agreement with the provincial ministers on another long term program to support agriculture in Canada. I do not know where the member across the way has been living, but obviously he should sit down, read the newspapers and read *Hansard* because he is missing a lot of really good information on what is happening in agriculture.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague from the Liberal Party will have to let all of Canada decide in the next election whether or not he will be returned.

The budget completely ignores defence and the replacement of the Sea Kings, which in my riding is a very important issue. As well it ignores a very vital issue in Atlantic Canada, a shipbuilding policy which the Liberal caucus of Atlantic Canada said it wanted included in the budget. Would the member respond to those two issues, please?

Mr. Murray Calder: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the member across the way is coming from. He talks about a shipbuilding program. We just finished building a brand new fleet of Halifax class frigates. The Canadian navy is brand new again. There are contracts already let out to replace the Sea Kings. I believe that will happen next year. More money is being put into defence as a result of this budget. I am not sure where he is coming from, but he had better get his facts straight.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have an opportunity to take part in the budget debate. I should say at the start that I will be splitting my time with the member for Vancouver East.

I would like to make use of the time I have by pointing out not only what the budget does but certainly what it fails to do and how it affects my riding of Winnipeg Centre. I would like to point out missed opportunities. I would like to point out where the government has been out and out negligent and irresponsible in not doing obvious things that needed to be done and choosing as a priority to

The Budget

do things that were politically expedient and politically to its advantage. I hope by these arguments, Mr. Speaker, that you will be convinced as well that the government missed a serious opportunity.

The reason I say it is a missed opportunity is that the Minister of Finance started this process with a unique problem that we have not seen in many years: a surplus budget, a budget that could have been put to use to fix many of the social issues the country is demanding be fixed in short order.

To get the basic premise, let us look at where the surplus came from. The most obvious source from a working person's point of view is the EI surplus. People seem to have forgotten about this issue. The changes the government brought in to employment insurance made it more difficult to qualify. Claimants could collect for a shorter period of time and their weekly benefit would be reduced. Obviously the government would have a surplus.

I do not think, even in its wildest dreams, the government would have known it would enjoy a windfall of \$700 million a month in surplus, taken directly out of the pockets of unemployed workers, the most vulnerable people arguably in our whole community. That is \$700 million a month, not a year. That is staggering. We can see, as I have said before, it is a perverted sort of Robin Hood to rob from the poor and give to the rich in the form of tax cuts. We should be well aware of that before we go into the main arguments.

• (1345)

The government stumbled upon another windfall. It was a very calculated and cynical move which will have repercussions for every pension plan across the country. It took the surplus from the public service plan away from the beneficiaries of the public service pension plan. The government did not steal it, but it took it right out of that plan to use for whatever it wanted in its general revenue. I predict the government will pay the political price for taking those surplus revenues out of that pension plan.

We noticed the minister responsible for the Treasury Board had no sooner done his dastardly deed than he had to leave this place. There was no way politically he could survive taking \$30 billion of surplus out of the public service pension plan, money that should have gone to improve the pensions of those beneficiaries. That is the second source of revenue.

It was not real sound fiscal management that led to the surplus. It was the finding of these buckets of money, stumbling across these buckets of dough. Anybody could do that.

The Liberals failed to listen to Canadians in the prebudget consultation. They did tour the country to listen to Canadians. Invariably everywhere government members went, Canadians told them they wanted one thing done and one thing only. They wanted

the health care system fixed once and for all. There was no question. There was no debate about it. The number one priority was to fix our health care system.

What did we see done, even though the government had the astronomical windfall of a surplus? The government is giving \$2.5 billion, not per year but over four years. And it is not just for my province of Manitoba. It is for the whole country. My province of Manitoba's share will be about \$20 million a year, or enough to keep the hospitals open for two days.

The great renewal of spending on health care amounts to two days budgeting for the province of Manitoba. It is so small that it is almost insignificant. It is offensive frankly. It leads to greater cynicism in the electorate because they were consulted. They said what they needed and the government did not listen to them. Instead, what did the government choose to do? It chose to use the money, which as I pointed out it took from unemployed workers to a large degree, for tax cuts for the wealthy.

For every dollar in tax cuts that is given back into the system, two cents goes for health care. How is that for skewed priorities? Yet when Canadians were asked, tax cuts ranked number seven, eight or nine on their list of priorities. They wanted their health care system back. They wanted post-secondary education addressed so their kids would not have to graduate with a small mortgage. They wanted all these issues fixed.

Canadians wanted something done about child poverty. I should not have to remind members, especially those who have been here for any length of time, that in 1989 it was members of parliament who passed a unanimous resolution to eliminate child poverty by the year 2000. For the first time since 1989, we are in a financial position to that, yet no effort has been made to do so. Again, I point to a failure on the part of the government because the opportunity was there and it chose not to act.

Dante reserved a special depth of his hell for those who had the ability to prevent evil and chose not to. That was the lowest depth of Dante's inferno. Just as obnoxious and just as foul to me as those who had the ability to do something noble and honourable and elected not to is the failure of the people in this place.

I can point to another obvious shortcoming in that those people over there cut, hacked and slashed programs for many, many years without looking for other sources of revenue or for ways to preclude the need to do that, or what they thought was the need. Without being vague about it, I will point to one obvious thing they could have done.

I introduced a motion that was passed in the House of Commons a year ago to energy retrofit all of our publicly owned buildings. The federal government owns 50,000 buildings. It spends billions of dollars a year in energy costs. Many of those buildings are

The Budget

outdated, obsolete and are absolute energy hogs. They waste energy and they pollute.

If we undertook a serious initiative to energy retrofit all our publicly owned buildings, we would not only create thousands of jobs, we would reduce our operating costs by as much as \$1 billion a year. We would also reduce harmful greenhouse gas emissions as per our obligations under the Kyoto convention.

• (1350)

Again it was a missed opportunity because it seems that side of the House is devoid of ideas. That side is out of gas in terms of creative things to do.

Members on that side of the House voted in favour of that motion because they thought it was a really good idea. That was a year and a half ago. They have not done diddley-squat in that regard. They could be the example. They should set the example for the private sector to do the same. In this northern climate we should show the world how we can conserve energy and how we can use our precious energy resources in a wiser way, a way that works for us instead of being the victims of some international oil cartel. It was another missed opportunity.

The finest achievement any government can aspire to is to elevate the standard of the living conditions of the people it represents. That should be the goal. That is why we are here. If we can only keep our eyes on the ball, our job and goal should be to elevate the standard of the living conditions of the people we represent. If we did not deviate from that, we would not have so much confusion in terms of what we should do. Let us do what is right in a way that would really move society forward.

A basic tenet and truth is that society does not move forward until we all move forward together. If we leave a significant number of people behind, we do not really move forward. Freedom is only privilege extended unless it is enjoyed by all people. That is a basic tenet that we must adhere to.

The motion to eliminate child poverty by the year 2000 was one of the most significant things ever agreed upon in the House of Commons. Governments to this point through mismanagement by the Tories et cetera did find themselves in a disastrous financial situation, but in recent years money is no longer an excuse. If money is not an issue, what does that lead us to believe? That the government just does not care about that subject. Money is not a barrier. Money is not an obstacle. The government has barrels of money. It has money coming out of its ears.

I believe that a society shall be judged not by the might of its cities, not by the grandeur of its statues and not by the power of its armies. A society will be judged by how it treats its most

vulnerable people: the unemployed, the disenfranchised, the poverty stricken.

When all the dust settles and all of us are in our graves, society will judge this piece of history by what steps we took to move that part of society forward. The budget does nothing to move society forward as a whole. We do not move forward unless we all move forward together. We are not moving forward at all when the gap between the rich and the poor grows ever wider and wider.

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but be somewhat concerned when I hear the kind of talk I have just heard, things like oodles of money and scads of money.

That is exactly the kind of thinking that got us into a situation where we were dependent upon foreign borrowing to pay for our entire health care system and our entire public pension system just seven years ago. That is exactly the kind of thinking that would have destroyed those systems had something like the Asian crisis happened before we started getting our deficit under control.

I take issue with the member's statement that the government has not done what needs to be done for society. He has to acknowledge that once there was a surplus budget the first thing the government did was put money back into health care, back into post-secondary education, back into all those things to create a strong and healthy society.

These two budgets have increased spending in those areas by 25%. Health care and education are the foundations of a strong society. Those areas of spending are now higher in actual dollars than when we took office. I would like the hon. member to respond to that.

• (1355)

Mr. Pat Martin: Mr. Speaker, back in 1995 the CHST when it was created was \$19 billion a year. The Liberal government brought it down to \$11.5 billion per year and is slowly incrementally jacking it back up. It went to \$12.5 billion. In this budget it is supposed to go to \$14.5 billion and even \$15 billion. That is still \$4 billion less in actual spending than it was before.

The government cannot use smoke and mirrors forever. Canadians do not believe it and they frankly do not accept this stuff about transferring tax points. They want cash on the barrelhead. They want to see the federal government's actual participation in health, social spending and post-secondary education. Those are the priorities we heard about when we consulted with Canadians. That is what they told us. They wanted the government to use this budget to fix health care, to stop the crisis in post-secondary education tuitions and to do something about social spending to elevate the standard of living for all Canadians. If that is not our goal, I do not know what is.

S. O. 31

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre for his remarks today.

I would like him to elaborate a moment longer on his private member's motion in terms of the energy retrofit of those 50,000 government buildings. This is one of the better ideas I have ever come across in the House. Both sides of the House passed that motion. What has the government done after one year? What is it doing to create jobs and reduce our dependency on fossil fuels?

Mr. Pat Martin: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to elaborate on this subject.

Motion No. 300 passed with a great majority in the House of Commons. The concept was that we can create jobs, reduce operating costs in publicly owned buildings and reduce harmful greenhouse gas emissions, all at no cost to the taxpayer because the private sector is willing to finance those jobs and be paid back slowly out of the energy savings. In other words, it is off balance sheet financing that we could use to finance this project.

There are 50,000 federally owned public buildings in the country. Only about 100 have had significant energy retrofitting done to them. Even at a 1,000 per year, it would take 50 years to finish the project.

We want to see the government, now that the motion has passed, to exercise this and expand the program so that all federally owned public buildings are retrofitted so that they are completely energy efficient and do not belch out harmful greenhouse gas emissions as they do today.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

TOBACCO INDUSTRY

Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Brampton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in light of the damage to the health of Canadians caused by tobacco products, I have introduced in the House a motion calling upon all Canadian parliamentarians and political parties to refrain from accepting political contributions from the tobacco industry. By refraining from accepting tobacco profits as political contributions, we as politicians are setting an example for all Canadians, youth included.

I urge my fellow parliamentarians to join me in saying no to tobacco profits as political contributions.

* * *

LEADER OF THE OFFICIAL OPPOSITION

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, today is very special and humbling for me because I have been given a great opportunity to serve the House and the people of Canada as the Leader of the Official Opposition on an interim basis. Now I can fire away directly across from the Prime Minister.

I want to thank God for blessing me with so many surprises in my life and my career. I want to thank my husband Lew for his wonderful unconditional love and support. I would like to thank my family who have been there with me all along. I would like to thank my colleagues in the Reform Party and now the Canadian Alliance. I would like to thank the entire House of Commons.

Today I want to thank the man whose inspiring vision has influenced the national Canadian agenda for the last 13 years. His tireless effort and servant leadership has built a political reform movement that for the first time in history stands poised to make the transition from third party to opposition to government. I stand today in his place to say that I will do my best to carry on the work of my friend and colleague, the member for Calgary Southwest.

* * *

● (1400)

GAS PRICES

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Liberal caucus on obtaining an independent review of gas prices by the Conference Board of Canada.

The huge rise in gas, diesel and fuel prices has made us realize how dependent we are on a few countries and a few companies. Let us use this opportunity to boost public transportation. Let us give tax breaks for public transit passes. Let us assist the municipalities and the private sector in promoting public transportation.

At the same time, let us continue to assist in the development of alternatives to oil and gas. Natural gas heating should be extended. Projects, such as the Ballard fuel cell, which received support in the budget, should be encouraged in every possible way. Let us do even more to support our ethanol plants.

Let us use the crisis of high fuel prices to reduce our dependence on oil.

BLOOD DONOR MONTH

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the problem of recurring blood shortages in communities across Canada. The challenge is for Canadians to get involved by rolling up their sleeves.

March is Blood Donor Month, and I rise to ask my fellow Canadians and my colleagues in the House of Commons to give blood with generosity.

To meet the demand, Blood Services Canada needs more donors. By becoming a regular blood donor, communities would no longer be faced with critical shortfalls in blood levels and lives would be saved.

Together we can make a difference. I call on all Canadians to accept the challenge and this March become a regular blood donor and give someone else the gift of life.

* * *

[Translation]

NUNAVIK INUIT

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the president of the Makivik Corporation, Pita Aatami, was right when he said in 1998 that the solution to the problem of the Inuit in Nunavik lay more than ever in team work.

This was the approach that Mr. Aatami took with the Government of Canada in developing Nunavik along with the governors, the board of directors of Makivik Corporation, the mayors and councillors of each community, and Nunavik's organizations, in order to help the Inuit lay the foundation for a future adapted to the new realities but rooted in their own cultural values.

Since being elected president of Makivik Corporation, Mr. Aatami has made sure the Government of Canada is aware of the Inuit's real priorities: housing, marine infrastructure, health, jobs, taxation, Nav Canada rates, telecommunications, the future of young people, and air transportation.

This is how our Inuit friends in Nunavik have been working with the Government of Canada.

* * *

[English]

THE LATE HAMED NASTOH

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, on March 11, 14 year old Hamed Nastoh left a note for his parents, climbed onto the Pattullo Bridge and jumped to his death in the Fraser River; the final desperate act of a teenager who saw no other way out.

There was no escape from the constant taunting, teasing and bullying at the hands of fellow students. He was violently punched at least once, yet he said little, if anything, of his torment.

S. O. 31

Bullying usually brings to mind images of children in shoving matches. At the junior and high school levels, what is commonly referred to as bullying is nothing less than criminal harassment and assault. It must not be tolerated.

Bullies survive through intimidation. They thrive on fear, the victim's fear to come forward. When victims do muster the courage to speak out, there is usually very little by way of consequence to the perpetrator, who then feels even more empowered to escalate the harassment. The victim usually moves to another school and the bully finds a new victim.

Hamed's death was preventable. I plead with young people to speak up. I beg of parents to listen and watch for the signs. I demand of educators to identify and remove the predators.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN FILM INDUSTRY

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian film industry is a key player on the international scene.

We have every reason to be proud of our creative energy, which is used to show the Canadian heritage on screens all over the world.

The federal government supports Canadian talent. It has established various audiovisual support programs to promote growth in that sector.

Among others, the Canadian television fund allocates \$200 million annually for the production of Canadian television programs. As for Telefilm Canada, it provides in excess of \$35 million for feature film production.

Canadian artists can also get tax credits to help them complete audio-visual projects. In 1997-98, these credits totalled \$21 million.

These are all means by which the Canadian government contributes to the quality of the cultural life in Canada and in Quebec.

* * *

[English]

DRAMA AWARDS

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, three Oxford county community theatres took home honours in the Western Ontario Drama League pre-festival awards earlier this month.

The Thistle Theatre in Embro brought home three prizes. These recognized the work of Terry Todd for outstanding direction, Jocelyn Rioux for best actress and Jim Harrison for best supporting actor in the Thistle Theatre's production of *1949*.

S. O. 31

● (1405)

The W.O.D.L. also recognized the outstanding performance of Tony Harding as Phil Moss in the Woodstock Little Theatre's *The Motor Trade*.

Two special awards of merit were given to Theatre Tillsonburg in recognition of Penny Durst's set and costume execution and Stacey Trickett's research design of women's hair.

In one of my past lives I was a member of the Woodstock Little Theatre and know the value of community theatre. The hard work and commitment of everyone involved with these productions is to be commended, especially those recognized by their colleagues for outstanding work.

* * *

[Translation]

WORLD THEATRE DAY

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today is World Theatre Day.

After Jean Cocteau, Arthur Miller, Pablo Neruda and Vaclav Havel, it is now Quebec playwright and fiction writer Michel Tremblay's turn to write the international message marking World Theatre Day.

In his text, Michel Tremblay ponders on the role of theatre in this era of globalization by saying:

For the universality of a dramatic text is not to be found in the place in which it was written, but in its humanity, in the relevance of its statements and in the beauty of its structure. Writers are not more universal because they are writing in Paris or New York rather than in Chicoutimi or Port-au-Prince.

The message written by Michel Tremblay will be read in thousands of theatres all over the world. For those who will not have the chance to be in a theatre this evening or tomorrow, the text of the declaration is available in some 20 languages on the site of the International Theatre Institute, which is under the aegis of UNESCO.

Happy World Theatre Day.

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN ALLIANCE

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the race is on. It is an exciting time to be in Canadian politics. The people of Canada are saying that they are ready for a clear alternative to the ruling Liberals. They want fiscal responsibility, social responsibility, democratic accountability and new federalism.

I believe the Canadian Alliance, which became a reality on March 25, reflects that desire. We will know for sure when the

people oust the unprincipled Liberals and vote for the Canadian Alliance at the next federal election.

The leadership candidates of the Canadian Alliance listen to the people. They understand and accept what Canadians are saying. They understand and accept the Alliance's constitution and declaration of policy as the voice of the people.

With the Canadian Alliance as an alternative, voters will be ready to deliver a fatal blow to the status quo and embrace a new vital democracy.

* * *

[Translation]

ARTS AND CULTURE

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last night was the time for cultural awards.

First of all, I must congratulate the artists receiving awards and honourable mentions at the Métrostar gala. During the gala, a touching and well-deserved tribute was paid to Gilles Latulippe, who has made the decision to retire after 33 years.

There was another memorable event, the film Oscars, where Canada was honoured. A Canadian production by the National Film Board, "The Old Man and the Sea", and Quebecer François Girard's "The Red Violin", also received awards.

Although all of this recognition and presentation of awards takes place in glamorous surroundings, let us remember that anyone wishing to make artistic and creative endeavours his or her career often faces a huge struggle.

Culture transcends borders. Each artistic endeavour is one more manifestation of the freedom of expression and creativity whose objective is the full realization of a society.

* * *

[English]

HEPATITIS C

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it has been two years since the government promised compensation to some of the victims who contracted hepatitis C through tainted blood. Not a penny of that money has even been received. More victims have died and others have seen their expenses and worries rise as their illness has worsened.

Any relief felt two years ago has turned into bitter disappointment and cynicism. Lawyers are getting paid. Bureaucrats are being hired. One victim has said that settling this issue has become a growth industry.

Meanwhile, some innocent victims must live without even the promise of compensation because the government chose the path of least compassion two years ago and excluded them from the settlement.

Before the health minister heads off to start a new project with health ministers this week, he has some unfinished business to deal with. Canadians want to see full and equal compensation for all those who acquired hepatitis C from tainted blood.

Will the health minister not retrace his steps—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore.

* * *

• (1410)

WORLD TUBERCULOSIS DAY

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 24 was World Tuberculosis Day. The World Health Organization has declared tuberculosis to be a global emergency.

Tuberculosis is killing more people today than ever before. It knows no borders and no one is immune from being afflicted with TB. One-third of the world's population, that is 2 billion people, is estimated to be infected by tuberculosis. The yearly deaths attributed to TB are 2 million. It is greatest among young women and individuals with AIDS, Canada's aboriginal community, the homeless and others who have come into contact with TB through various ways.

TB can be controlled and prevented with the use of Directly Observed Treatment.

I call upon all of us to work with our international partners in health to support the DOTS program and make the prevention of TB a high priority on the public health agenda.

* * *

[Translation]

HEPATITIS C

Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Shefford, PC): Mr. Speaker, today is the second anniversary of the announcement of the agreement concluded between the government and the victims of Hepatitis C. It is discouraging to realize that two years have passed and the government has still not paid these sick people.

The people of this country are fed up. They want the government to act and to pay out the promised compensation. The lawyers have had their money, but the victims are still waiting.

Victims continue to die without ever laying their hands on a single compensation cheque, and their numbers are ever increasing.

It is obvious that Canadians find this government's inertia shocking. I am therefore demanding that it face up to its responsibilities, respect its commitments, and get the cheques out immediately to the Hepatitis C victims.

[English]

CANADIAN AID FOR CHERNOBYL

Mr. Joe Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian Aid for Chernobyl, a foundation based in Brockville, Ontario, is currently working on the logistics of shipping over \$1.4 million worth of medical supplies to Belarus. The shipment will include a refurbished ambulance that will be driven by Dan Smith and Jeff Earle from the British Isles to Belarus. Their exploits will be closely followed by about 20 schools in the riding that will track the vehicle through a satellite linkage through the Internet.

This ongoing endeavour is locally funded and supported by individuals and businesses throughout Leeds—Grenville and is one more reason I am so proud to represent and serve these people in the Parliament of Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

QUIET REVOLUTION

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this coming weekend, the University of Quebec in Montreal will be organizing a major forum on the quiet revolution, forty years on.

Many researchers and political players will be analyzing the various aspects of what are now being called the achievements of the quiet revolution. A revolution described by Frère Untel as "an enormous collective and largely positive adventure".

The achievements include, according to economist Pierre Fortin, of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, faster improvement in the standard of living in Quebec than in Ontario over the past 40 years. It pays to be "maîtres chez nous".

A more striking and important element is that "young Quebecers are", according to Professor Fortin, "among the world's most educated. International investigations—confirm that the quality of Quebec's system of education puts it among the world leaders as well".

It seems obvious to me that it pays to be "maîtres chez nous". I believe that sovereignty will provide even greater rewards.

* * *

[English]

HEPATITIS C

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today is the second anniversary of the decision of the Government of Canada to ram through a compensation package for hepatitis C victims that was mean, non-inclusive and just plain wrong.

Oral Questions

Here we are today and the tragedy continues. Thousands of hepatitis C victims were excluded from compensation. Tragically, even those Canadians who were meant to receive compensation are still waiting. Not one penny has gone to those victims. In my community of Vancouver East in the downtown east side, people are dying with hepatitis C because they are still waiting for help.

We all want to know from this government and from this Minister of Health how many people have died since that decision? Does the health minister even care about what has happened? How can this government, in all good conscience, live with its terrible decision? Will it do the right thing now and extend compensation to all victims with hepatitis C? Will it do that?

* * *

HEROISM

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the House to applaud the bravery and remember the young lives of two Calgary students who are now assumed dead after trying to save a drowning woman off the coast of California.

David Elton and Brodi McDonald, both 17, jumped into the ocean off Black Sands Beach about 200 kilometres north of San Francisco to save Barbara Clement. The Calgary woman had been swept into the sea by a large wave.

• (1415)

David and Brodi both attended William Aberhart School. These youths represent the courage and desire to help others in need, which has been a longstanding national characteristic of Canadians.

Our hearts go out this afternoon to the families of the loved ones of everyone affected by this tragedy. May the selfless determination and heroism of these young men be remembered.

* * *

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC): Mr. Speaker, the federal Liberals say that money is not the main problem behind the health care crisis in Canada. Money may not be the only problem, but it is certainly the biggest problem.

In 1994-95 my province of Newfoundland received \$425 million in cash transfers for health and post-secondary education. In this year's federal budget it will receive only \$271 million. Twenty years ago federal transfers paid 50% of Newfoundland's health care costs. Today the federal government pays less than 15%. That sounds like a money problem to me.

It is time for the Liberals to stop playing politics with health care and start using their budget surplus to pay for the health care system that Canadians need and want.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Miss Deborah Grey (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce a new birth. The Canadian Alliance was born this weekend. It weighed in at 91.9. The new extended family is very excited and mama is back at work already.

During this birth three more internal audits were uncovered, this time at the Canada Economic Development Agency. It sounds like a rerun of the HRD minister's list of greatest hits; favourites like lack of compliance, flexibility and insufficient management.

Is it that this government has no idea of how to manage tax dollars, or is it that it just cannot resist a good old fashion boondoggle?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, some days I cannot resist offering my congratulations to my fifth Leader of the Opposition in six years. With respect to the changing of the name, as I said, Coca Cola tried that some years ago, without much success. It might be that the job of the Leader of the Opposition will be quite temporary if there is to be a sixth one by June.

The last time we changed our name was in 1867. We would not need that sort of thing to remain in opposition.

I want to reply to the question of the hon. member by saying that the auditor general has been asked to report four times a year to make sure that if we have problems of that nature they can be corrected immediately.

Miss Deborah Grey (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it could be that the next Leader of the Opposition might be him, but it is hard to say.

There was an internal audit done and the results were damning. It stated "Our audit revealed a lack of compliance with criteria and with departmental policies". The number one recommendation was "The minister should define the terms that leave room for interpretation". In other words, close the loopholes so the Liberals cannot get their paws on it and dish out the cash.

A follow-up audit was done nearly a year later. No matter how many audits come out, the results seem to be the same. The response is "insufficient". Was the prospect of millions more in slush money just too easy to keep their hands off?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have debated these problems and this issue for a long time. I want to report that on the TJF/CJF allocation of money, more money went to opposition ridings than to government ridings.

We are applying the criteria. When there are opposition ridings that have more unemployment than the average of the nation we treat them exactly the same as we treat members' ridings on this side.

Miss Deborah Grey (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is talking about HRDC. Certainly there are problems there. But we are talking about problems today in CEDA. Even after the government got caught, even after it was told to clean up its act, it continued, without a care in the world.

• (1420)

The final audit was released in March 1999. Its findings stated "The overall file management situation has been appreciably the same". That is not going, no matter how many audits they come up with.

There is only one conclusion to come to, and that is that the Liberals like it this way. Why will they not fix the problem that sees millions of taxpayer dollars being wasted every year?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if there are problems of this nature I know that the minister will make sure the problems are corrected immediately.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we see another coincidence here. Once again the government waited until the official opposition made an access request before it released the results of this damning internal audit. It sat on the latest one for over a year.

CEDA spends more than \$300 million a year, so I can see why it wanted to keep those audits hidden. But audits are supposed to cause the government and the department to act. They are supposed to cause the government to fix the problems. But after three audits the quote in the document once again is "The situation has been—the same".

If the results of these audits are so bad that they have to be hidden, why are they not bad enough for the government to fix them?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we simply do not know if they are talking about the Economic Development Agency of Canada, but if that is the case, I am pleased to report that since 1994 we have modified our program. We are managing two programs in economic development and we are getting involved in

the economic development of all regions of the province of Quebec.

I am also pleased to report that we are working in close co-operation with the auditor general. We have internal audits on a yearly basis. We are monitoring the situation properly.

As well, I would like to focus on the fact that our programs are now ISO-9002.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is exactly these audits, this monitoring, that we are talking about. Three successive audits in a row have come to the same conclusion. The problem is still systemic and it is still in this department. They have not fixed a thing.

This raises the questions: Why does it take access to information requests to get the government to release audits to begin with? Why has the Minister of Human Resources Development withheld 30 separate access to information requests from the official opposition, in contravention of the access act? Why has the minister in charge of the Canada Economic Development Agency ignored his own internal audits which say that he has lost control of departmental spending under his control?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I simply do not know exactly where the members are going. I guess it must be part of their dream.

On a yearly basis the Economic Development Agency has internal audits. We keep focusing on the reports. We are monitoring the situation in a very proper manner.

We have been involved in economic development for quite some time. We are pleased with the results we have provided people. We will keep working on the economic development of the region. We will keep working to ensure that we continue to create jobs across Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since we started asking questions about Placetec, the Minister of Human Resources Development has been unable to respond.

Furthermore, the auditor general tells us that only a police investigation will reveal any political interference. Finally, the papers are talking about corruption in connection with what has been going on at Department of Human Resources Development.

Oral Questions

With a situation of such disastrous proportions, is it not time the Prime Minister understood that he must call a police investigation, ask the police to act as quickly as possible to bring this situation fully to light?

[English]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are having a display of people taking items out of context in what the auditor general said. He actually said that he believed the six point plan was a very thorough plan for corrective action. As we conduct our own audit in HRDC we intend to assess the department's progress in implementing this plan.

As for the police, he did not say that was the only way to get to the bottom of the problem. They are misquoting him again.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think she should have read the report, but that is too much to ask of her.

In the case of CITEC, a police investigation was initiated within 24 hours of the facts' coming to light. Despite the many revelations in the Placeteco matter, no investigation has been called.

• (1425)

Are we to understand that the reticence of the Prime Minister to initiate a police investigation into the Placeteco matter is directly related to the fact that too many of his friends are involved, very intimately so, and very closely to the Prime Minister?

The Speaker: We are very close to ascribing motives. I will ask members to choose their words very carefully.

[English]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

The reason we have not called for a police investigation is because there would be preliminary steps taken before that. The first one would be the need to establish an overpayment. We have been through the invoices and the receipts. They match the funds we have given. Therefore there is no need to establish an overpayment.

Without an overpayment we would not even order a forensic audit, much less call the police. The idea is nonsense.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the whole scandal at Human Resources Development Canada, the Prime Minister told us that there were problems with

only 37 files, that the moneys involved did not exceed \$250 and that this really was a minor issue.

Today, we realize, particularly as regards Placeteco, that the amounts involved are much larger than that.

Can the Prime Minister tell us why he still refuses to order an investigation into this file? Is it because the people involved are close friends of the Prime Minister? Is he concerned about his leadership? What is the problem?

[English]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many times we have to repeat the same thing.

There has to be a basis upon which to call for a police investigation. Our review of this file suggests there is no basis. We cannot go out on a limb, calling for police for no reason. That would be ridiculous.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how can the parliamentary secretary say there is no basis for calling for an investigation, considering that some people are involved in a number of capacities, that we are talking about an amount of \$1.2 million, that no one in the government can explain where that money went and that there were privileged contacts between certain people and the National Bank?

This file does not make sense. The more we get answers, the less clear things become. An investigation would be in order for much less than that. The Prime Minister was quicker on the draw in the case of CITEC.

[English]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again the member is making allegations. If he wants to make allegations he should bring them forward.

Our evidence suggests that there is absolutely no basis for a police investigation. If he wants to make allegations, let him do that and we will investigate.

* * *

HEALTH

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister went to Calgary. He met with the premier, and he blinked.

According to the auditor general, even before the federal government cash transfers for health, the government has never taken action to protect the five principles of medicare.

Let me quote: "Health Canada does not have the information it needs to monitor compliance with the act. The only departmental

evaluation undertaken was limited, and it was five years before its results were reported to parliament”.

How can this government protect the five principles of the Canada Health Act with its eyes wide shut?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was extremely clear with the premier. I said that he would have to respect the five conditions of medicare. He said that he would like to respect them and he does not want to break them. We will see how he operates, but we have done it to him once and we will have to do it twice if he does not respect them.

We had a problem of the same nature with the NDP government of B.C. It blinked, not us, because it had to accept our conditions. Otherwise money would have been cut in the transfer for social programs.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, first the federal government cut the cash transfers for health. Then it is a wink and a nod with Ralph Klein and everything is supposed to be fine. Everything is not fine. Everything is not fine for patients who find they have to pay up to \$4,000 for routine eye surgery.

• (1430)

Why should Canadians believe that the government will protect the five principles of the Canada Health Act when the auditor general says that it will not?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have done it once. In one of the big arguments of Premier Klein he gave me the list and said he would like to do in Alberta what the socialist governments of B.C., Saskatchewan and Manitoba are doing.

I said to him that if they break the five conditions they will have to comply the same way as anybody. If anyone breaks the five conditions of medicare, we will cut the cash transfers to them.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, we have received information indicating that the RCMP have been contacted and may be investigating an organization called Advanced Career Training Institute, a computer school, for alleged misuse of HRDC money.

The minister spoke of the basis for investigation. Will the minister for HRDC now confirm that ACTI has received government money and is currently being investigated for potentially criminal acts?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it surprises me that a former crown attorney would ask questions of this sort. It

is totally inappropriate for us to comment on details of any particular case because it is up to the police to comment on their own investigations.

As part of the six point action plan all project files are being reviewed by officials, overpayments will be collected, and any wrongdoings will be referred to the police. Certainly I do not want to be a party to getting in the way of the police.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, it surprises me that a former teacher could not give a straight answer to a straight question.

In December 1998 students of ACTI complained to a Liberal member from Kitchener Centre that there were no graduates, no qualified instructors and no classes at that school. In a letter to that member the student was told that there was no problem, the school was exemplary and it served its participants and taxpayers well. Was the complaint to the minister acted upon, or was it even forwarded to the minister?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House that the number of ongoing police investigations this year is consistent with the number of investigations over past years.

Several of the current investigations have been ongoing for quite some time, certainly prior to the release of the audit. As soon as any irregularities are identified, appropriate action is taken in accordance with guidelines.

In many of the cases HRDC initiated the referrals to the RCMP, but not in all cases. I would suggest that if the member has questions about police investigations he ask the police.

* * *

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, an internal audit faulted Economic Development Canada's management of its small business program on the same broken rules that we have come to expect from the Liberal government.

What did the auditors find? They found that the program was too flexible. It was not applied uniformly across the province. There was a lack of compliance with eligibility requirements and a deficient economic analysis of the firms and regions receiving funding. Do we now have Industry Canada adopting HRDC's management style?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that with program review we have decided to establish in

Oral Questions

Canadian Economic Development two main programs to get involved in the economic development of the regions.

I am pleased to report as well that on a yearly basis we are working with internal audits. We are monitoring the situation and so far it goes very well because of the experience and expertise we have within the department.

Members on the other side must not be very pleased with that because based on their platform in 1993 they would have destroyed all the tools given to the Canadian government in order to get involved in the economic development of the regions. They are Reformers, former Reformers. Let me tell—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister is monitoring but he has not read any of the audits. What kind of monitoring is that?

What is clear is that the sloppy management style of the Liberal government does not stop at HRDC. It is across all government departments. Despite two years for Industry Canada to clean up this mess, a follow-up audit in 1999 said that it still lacked compliance. Why is that? Will the minister tell us how many more audits exist within his department that deal with mismanagement in grants and contributions?

• (1435)

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, whenever an internal audit or the auditor general himself has something, we sit with him and have a look at the situation. We make sure we make improvements as well because we care about the management of the public funds we are managing.

The main concern of members on the other side is not the question of management. Their main problem is that in 1993 they would have destroyed all the industry department. They would have destroyed all economic development area agencies.

Now what they dislike very much is the results we have from getting involved and working with the regions, in partnership with the regions. The results are amazing. I am going to keep—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans.

* * *

[Translation]

BILLBOARDS

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the very controversial issue of Mediacom billboards in the Montreal region, the Minister of Transport has stated that he will proceed and that the advertising will comply with the law.

How can the minister go against the advice of the Quebec Ministry of Transport, of the City of Montreal and of the Government of Quebec on highway safety?

[English]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we believe that the paramount issue here is road safety. These signs were erected to assist drivers in the Montreal area coming across very crowded bridges each day.

There were consultations with provincial authorities before the signs were erected. We believe they fully comply with the spirit of the law. Certainly we believe they will be of great benefit to motorists in the Montreal area.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister refers to consultations. This government constantly talks about flexible federalism, a system able to co-operate with the provinces.

How can the minister convince us of the so-called flexibility of the federal system when it cannot even agree along on an issue as simple as billboards?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the federal government has exclusive jurisdiction over building billboards on bridges. Decisions were made in the best interests of motorists in the Montreal region.

* * *

[English]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we now know that mismanagement of public funds is not isolated to the HRDC department. In fact similar vote creation schemes were reported in Economic Development Canada audits as far back as 1997. The same litany of incompetence as HRDC, only three years earlier. Why is it that every time we uncover an internal audit we find more examples of Liberal incompetence?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report again that we have internal audits on a yearly basis. As well the auditor general gets involved.

I am pleased to report as well that back in 1997, if we look at the report of the auditor general, he told us that indeed there was major improvement in our programming and the management of the funds. I am also pleased to report that we make the difference in all the regions across the province of Quebec.

Oral Questions

I am pleased to say as well that as long as I am there, I will do my work, my job, and get involved in the economic development of the regions. Of course members on the other side do not believe in economic development of the regions, but this is Liberal—

The Speaker: The hon. opposition whip.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, what we believe in on this side is ministerial accountability for tax dollars.

The internal EDC audits further illustrate the government's practice of cutting cheques first and asking questions second. In three successive audits the minister was rebuked for handing over money for economic diversification with no record of the economic benefit of the dollars spent.

The Minister of Industry is responsible for the spending of hundreds of millions of taxpayers dollars. Why then is he more concerned with the political benefit for Liberals than with economic accountability for taxpayers?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the question of mismanagement they are raising must be part of their dream. All the elements of the report I have in my hand show that the department is acting properly and is monitoring the situation properly. We make the difference in all the regions.

• (1440)

If they do not want to play cheap politics and they have specific concerns regarding the management of Canadian Economic Development, I just ask the hon. member to come over and tell me exactly what he is referring to. What I have shows that we are doing good work in the regions as Liberals.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Order, please. I am sure we want to hear both the questions and the answers.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GASOLINE PRICING

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Canada has special problems in the petroleum industry.

Even Liberal members who have examined the issue admit that the high degree of concentration in the industry is the reason for the volatility in retail prices.

How can the Minister of Industry settle for a Conference Board study when the problems of the petroleum industry are well known—too high a concentration in the industry and the Conference Board's inability to serve as a true watchdog for consumers?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a study was announced and it is, I believe, a very important one.

First of all, it was suggested by Liberal members. Second, it is a fundamental study in terms of helping us fully understand the problems that exist. Third, if the member truly wants to understand the situation in this sector, he should thank the government for having announced this study.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that it was his own colleagues that concluded, after an in-depth study, that part of the reason for high gas prices was the absence of real competition in the petroleum industry?

Why is he hiding behind the Conference Board study in an attempt to buy time unless he is trying to protect the petroleum industry and continue to rake in tax revenues from industry profits?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was Liberal members who proposed the study. And a study will be done.

But if his understanding of the situation is so good, perhaps he can explain to his constituents that, first, the price of oil on world markets has been higher for more than a year and, second, that if someone can regulate retail sales prices, it is the provincial governments.

* * *

[*English*]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, last week the auditor general reported that the lax controls at HRDC had made it “difficult to know whether the funds were used as intended, spent wisely and produced the desired result”.

HRDC is not alone. Three years ago a Canadian Economic Development Quebec region audit showed mismanagement of public funds by the Department of Industry. Two subsequent audits showed that little was done to correct these problems. Why does the government wait until the official opposition reveals a scandal before it does anything?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said back in 1995, we changed our mission. We have developed brand new programming. Actually we are dealing with and getting involved in the regions with two main programs.

Oral Questions

I would just like to tell the House that of course we are managing public funds. Of course we are getting involved in the economic development of the regions. That is why on a yearly basis we are dealing with internal audits as well as the auditor general's reports.

Let me tell the House that I am pleased to report that now the main programs of the department are ISO 9002, which means that we do care about what we are doing and the management of public funds. As well we are going to—

The Speaker: The hon. member for South Surrey—White Rock—Langley.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the minister actually read the audit. The auditor general has pointed out that problems in HRDC have been going on for a quarter of a century and that there is no indication that the programs have delivered the desired results.

Now we learn of similar problems with the Department of Industry. How long has the Department of Industry been mismanaging taxpayer dollars?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. member to explain where she thinks the Department of Industry is mispending taxpayer dollars. So far today all the questions of members opposite have related to a totally different department.

* * *

• (1445)

[Translation]

AÉROPORTS DE MONTRÉAL

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, everyone is now aware of the big problems facing the ADM, a body created by federal legislation.

In light of the federal government's responsibility in this matter, is the Minister of Transport prepared to ask the Standing Committee on Transport to ask Ms. Pageau-Goyette and all the socio-economic stakeholders to appear and shed some light on the problems faced by the ADM?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, reports on the management of Aéroports de Montréal in the papers are troubling. However, I must say that it is functioning well.

As members know, the administration of the Montreal airports is the responsibility of a committee in the region. I have spoken with my officials and hope to have more details shortly.

[English]

TORONTO WATERFRONT

Ms. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last November the federal government formed the Toronto waterfront revitalization task force in co-operation with the Government of Ontario and the city of Toronto. Today the task force issued its report "Gateway to Canada". In response to this report, can the Minister of Transport tell the House what steps the government plans to take to enhance and revitalize Toronto's waterfront?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a very good day for Toronto and for Canada. We have a report that will transform the port lands and the entire shore in the greater Toronto area into a world class commercial, residential and recreational facility. If this goes ahead, this will be the largest urban redevelopment in world history, twice as large as Canary Wharf.

The Government of Canada will want to work with the local authorities to realize this dream. If we do realize this dream, I am sure that it will assist Toronto in being awarded the 2008 Summer and Para Olympics.

* * *

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the CED audits are a mirror image of the mess at HRDC. If the minister does not have a copy, it would be my pleasure to give him the audit report. There is too much flexibility, insufficient monitoring and lack of compliance. After three audits the problems remain. Why?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I guess it must be part of those members' dream. What I would like to tell the House is like any other regional development agency, we face audits on a yearly basis. I am pleased to report that the department is able to cope with the situation and that there is good management of public funds in my department and in regional agencies.

The problem is that back in 1993 they on the other side of the House would have destroyed all the tools that the Canadian government has to get involved in economic development of the regions. However, our Liberal values make sure that we are going to keep being involved in order to make a difference in all communities across Canada.

The Speaker: I remind the hon. member to please not use any props.

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is a taxpayer's nightmare the way this government spends taxpayers' money. He still does not get it. Even after three

audits the problems and I quote what it says “have remained appreciably the same”. Do these audits not show that the bungle at HRDC was just the tip of the iceberg?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, if they have a specific point they would like to raise, I ask them to come over.

I am pleased to report that we are working on a yearly basis with the auditor general and the internal audit as well. I have all the reports—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. I know that we do things sometimes that come up pretty fast but that type of action in the House is not acceptable. I would ask that this type of thing not occur again in the House. The hon. minister may answer the question.

• (1450)

Hon. Martin Cauchon: Mr. Speaker, you have seen what they just did. To keep up such behaviour has to be seen as a lack of judgment. If they keep acting like that, I guess they are going to have change their name one more time.

I would like to tell the House that we are working with the auditor general. We are doing fine. We make a difference in the regions across the province of Quebec and we are going to keep helping the regions not only in the province of Quebec but across Canada, even if they do not like it.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, over a year ago the House of Commons passed a motion that directed the government to energy retrofit all of its 50,000 publicly owned buildings. Given our obligation under Kyoto to reduce harmful greenhouse gas emissions and given the obvious cost savings benefits associated with the demand side management of our energy resources, I would like the Minister of Public Works and Government Services to answer one simple question. How many of these 50,000 buildings has the government energy retrofitted since it was directed to do so by a motion in the House over a year ago?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, many buildings have already been retrofitted and we continue to do so. We work with the agencies and all the departments involved. We have a problem and we intend to achieve all our objectives and have all government buildings retrofitted to meet the energy requirements.

Oral Questions

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. minister how many. Fewer than 100 have been done since 1993. Of 50,000 buildings, 100 have been completed. It will be a 500 year program to energy retrofit its buildings. The government is devoid of ideas. It is a government that is out of gas, except for greenhouse gases it would seem.

We have an opportunity to save billions of dollars a year in operating costs, create thousands of jobs and reduce harmful greenhouse gas emissions by hundreds of millions of tonnes, yet the government refuses to act.

The demand side management of our energy resources is an idea whose time has come. Why will the government not get on with it?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me assure the hon. member and the House that we have a schedule. We are working diligently with industry and all the departments. We will meet the requirements as scheduled.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question again is for the parliamentary secretary and former teacher. I think she doth protest too much.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. I am sure it is interesting what we all did in our former lives, but perhaps we could just call ourselves by our present titles.

Mr. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary knows there is nothing improper in asking about ongoing investigations. The minister has referred many times to the 19 that are currently under way. We would like to know about more.

In February 1998 the member for Kitchener Centre replied to a letter to an ACTI complaint that she had contacted HRDC and that everything was fine. Was the complaint passed on to the department and did the department act on that investigation?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I actually do not know the answer, but I will be happy to check on this project with the officials and get back to the member opposite.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern that part of the six point plan is to call in the police. I would like to know if the hon. parliamentary secretary would be willing to table documents and correspondence with respect to this ongoing problem that appears to exist with ACTI. Will she undertake to table those documents in the House?

Oral Questions

• (1455)

Hon. George S. Baker (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the majority of these 19 investigations which the hon. member referred to actually involve ACOA in the eastern region. Three of them concern only the applications because no money was spent. Separate from that, three of them involve investigations into provincial involvement. With four of them the grants were given out when the Tories were in power. We are still trying to clean up the mess left by the hon. member's government.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence.

A recent report states that national defence plans to eliminate some of its historic combat regiments. Would the parliamentary secretary give members of the House a more current report of the national defence report being studied at national defence headquarters?

[Translation]

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, before answering my colleague's question, I would like to point out the excellent work done by our reservists, whether in Bosnia, Kosovo or other hot spots.

Returning to the specific question of my colleague, I can tell you that no specific decision has been reached. The document to which hon. member refers is only a reference document. It is one of several on the minister's desk for consideration in due course.

* * *

*[English]***ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General of Canada pointed out that HRDC's disregard for rules and proper controls is embedded in its culture and showed that lax administration was an ongoing problem since at least 1977. That is 23 years, nearly a quarter of a century.

Here in these latest audits we see the same problems at Canadian Economic Development. How many more audits need to be uncovered before the government cleans up its shocking, scandalous mismanagement of taxpayers' money?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, we have had a new mission at Canadian Economic Development since 1995. We are dealing basically with—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. We will hear the response from the minister.

Hon. Martin Cauchon: Mr. Speaker, basically we are dealing with small and medium size enterprises across the province of Quebec.

I would like to add again that we are working with an internal audit on a yearly basis. We proceed with improvements on a yearly basis. I am proud of the work which is done by the agency. We are going to keep working with the regions. Let me repeat that for some years, the main program of the department has been ISO 9002.

[Translation]

I suspect my English is not up to the task, so I shall say it again in French: ISO 9002.

* * *

SHIPBUILDING

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in January, after months of representations by employers and workers at Canada's main ship yards, the Minister of Industry admitted that new measures were needed and that he intended to set up a consultative committee to look into ways of helping the shipbuilding industry. Two months later, there is still no action.

Given the importance of this issue, will the Minister of Industry finally get going and deliver on his promises, before other ship yards close down and workers are laid off?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are meeting with the interested parties, including union representatives. We are continuing to consider the information they are providing.

It is important to understand that the problem facing this sector is an international one, as overcapacity in this industry throughout the world stands at 40%.

* * *

*[English]***HEPATITIS C**

Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, very few Canadians have any faith in the health minister's promise to protect universal health care. Is it any wonder? Two years ago the same minister made another promise. Two years ago today was the anniversary of the health minister's promise to compensate some of the victims of the hepatitis C tainted blood scandal. Two years have past and the victims are still waiting; not a penny for victims but big bucks for lawyers. Is this the action of a caring government?

• (1500)

When will the health minister get the money to the dying people who desperately need it?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was two years ago that the government persuaded the provincial governments for the first time to take part with us in the compensation scheme for hepatitis C victims in the blood tragedy.

Every NDP government in the country supported us in that and continue to support us. Every government went before the courts and had the agreement approved. The court has now approved the administrator and I understand cheques will be sent shortly.

If this government had not acted the case would be before the courts for many years to come.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, over the last seven years the Liberal government has not passed one piece of environmental legislation of its own despite the fact that Canadians are still working toward improving environmental legislation.

The Species at Risk Working Group, a consortium of mining, pulp and paper, woodlot owners, farmers and environmental groups, have laid out a specific recommendation on what we should see in species at risk legislation. However, the government has chosen to ignore it. This is another circumstance where a borrowed par record on the green is not acceptable.

Why will the Minister of the Environment not accept the recommendations of SARWG?

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure where the hon. member has been but perhaps he has been dreaming in technicolour in the interim.

We passed environmental assessment legislation and environmental protection legislation. We are doing a lot of things in this government, whether it be the budget or it be legislation, to ensure that we are meeting the challenges of the new millennium.

The reality is that the minister will introduce species at risk legislation. He has been working very hard on it and it will be a good bill.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

CANADIAN ALLIANCE—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: This morning the hon. member for Hamilton—Wentworth raised a point of order and I would like to make a ruling on it.

First, I thank the hon. member for bringing this matter dealing with the recognition of political parties in the House to the attention of the Chair. I wish to inform all members that the procedures followed in recognizing the new Canadian Alliance are

Privilege

entirely in keeping with our traditions and practices. No further requirement exists either for action by the House or by the members directly involved.

I would take this opportunity to point out that our practices here are entirely separate from and independent of any stipulation set out in the Canada Elections Act. Hon. members interested in this topic may consult a very helpful ruling by Speaker Fraser and this can be found in the *Debates* for December 13, 1990, at pages 16705 and 16706.

* * *

• (1505)

PRIVILEGE

BILL C-206

The Speaker: Last Friday the hon. member for Prince George—Peace River raised a question of privilege concerning Bill C-206 which is under the name of the hon. member for Wentworth—Burlington. As I recall, it had to do with the amount of time given to the member for Wentworth—Burlington to get 100 signatures for his bill. On Friday the hon. member simply could not be here and therefore his motion was dropped to the bottom of the list.

The hon. member for Wentworth—Burlington is in his seat. Is he aware of the question of privilege which was brought up? He signals to me that he is. Would the hon. member like to make an intervention? The hon. member for Wentworth—Burlington.

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised by the attack made by the Canadian Alliance Party. You will forgive me if I reply at some length.

Basically what the whip for the former party said was that I was absent from the House on Friday because he felt that I was unable to get the 100 signatures that I was expected to get in order for Bill C-206 to remain on the order paper. He was making the assumption that I had to get those signatures by that Friday in order for my bill to remain on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take you through exactly what the whip for the Reform Party did say. I would like you to compare it with the evidential record. The member was referring to the procedure and House affairs committee discussions of March 2 in which the status of my signatures and Bill C-206 were discussed in the context of a point of privilege that you ruled on, Mr. Speaker.

He said on Friday that during the discussions at committee it was suggested that the member for Wentworth—Burlington be apprised of the intentions of the committee before the committee actually finalized its report in order to allow him time to seek the recom-

Privilege

mended support for his bill. The reason for this urgency was because the committee intended the deadline to be the first opportunity for the bill to be considered for its first hour of debate.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hands—not as a prop—the committee record of that discussion of March 2. In it you will find no such reference. There was no such discussion by anyone in that committee about whether I should be apprised to get my signatures in advance of the final report.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I received no official communication from the committee before the finalized 19th report. No one said anything to me about the decision to require me to get the signatures again for my Bill C-206.

It might interest you to know, Mr. Speaker, that the timing was interesting as well because the deputy whip tabled the 19th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs on March 17, the Friday before March 20, which was the first day that the committee record became available. The records were not even available before the report was finalized and I received no communication whatsoever. I suggest to you that what was said by the hon. member for Prince George—Peace River is completely at odds with the facts.

Mr. Speaker, while I was aware of the recommendation that was contemplated by the committee, even before the report was finalized, I, quite honestly, never expected you to rule the way you did. I did not expect you to uphold the recommendation that came from that committee much less the recommendation as contained in the finalized report that was only available to me on the Friday before the Tuesday on which you ruled.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I took your ruling in good spirits because I respect the Chair. I might find it uncomfortable sometimes when you rule in ways that take me by surprise but nevertheless I respect that any time you do approach a ruling you approach it with the kind of dispassionate impartiality that we expect of you.

● (1510)

Last Friday the whip for the Reform Party went on to say:

The member for Wentworth—Burlington rose after the Speaker's ruling and sought further clarification. He clarified with the Chair that if he could secure 100 signatures by Friday, March 24, 2000, today, his bill could remain on the order paper.

What is it that I actually said following your ruling on March 21? Mr. Speaker, for your benefit, I will quote what I actually said. I said:

What I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, is, if I can get the signatures in the next day or so that perhaps Bill C-206 could remain where it is on the order of precedence rather than being dropped to the very bottom and perhaps not being debated for some months to come.

Just to be doubly sure, I repeated it and said:

What I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, is, if I can get the hundred signatures in the next day or two—and I would hope to have the co-operation of the opposition parties in this—can my bill remain on the order of precedence and come up on Friday—

Mr. Speaker, as you can see from what I just said, the assumption was that I would have the opportunity to collect those signatures so long as the bill remained on the order of precedence, whether it was on the order of precedence for Friday or dropped in the order of precedence at the time, it did not matter. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in your own words, you said:

I believe the question the hon. member is asking is whether this bill will come up in the normal course of events. The answer is, yes. Is that what the question is?

I said “Yes”. So, Mr. Speaker, that is clear. You can see, if you go back to what the whip for the Reform Party said, he has distorted the record. He was suggesting that for some reason there was a ruling on your part that prevented my bill from dropping to the bottom of the order of precedence and not being valid as a result of having done so.

The most wounding and injurious thing of all that the member for Prince George—I can never remember where it is.

An hon. member: Prince George—Peace River.

Mr. John Bryden: Prince George—Peace River. Well, yes, some peace.

The Speaker: I am sure that we do want to make fun of any member's riding. It is Prince George—Peace River, I would remind the hon. member.

Mr. John Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but I am suffering. I have been ill all weekend and you can tell by my voice. I am coming to that as well.

The last wounding charge was the suggestion that I was deliberately absent from the House on that Friday because I could not get my 100 signatures.

I have to tell the hon. member opposite something. I was sick. I was very ill. On Wednesday I had a sore throat and was afraid I had strep throat. On Thursday I carefully backed off going around trying to collect my 100 signatures because I was afraid I was contagious. I have to admit that I would have been delighted to sit behind the member for Athabasca and maybe make him a little sicker, but I did not.

I will point out to you that the member for New Brunswick Southwest will recall that I came over and sat in those chairs where the pages are right now. He called me over because he wanted to talk to me about Bill C-206. I sat there in those chairs and I said “I am sorry, I cannot come any closer to you because I am afraid I

Routine Proceedings

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

have something. I do not want you to become ill". If I did not pursue my signatures on Wednesday and Thursday it was for the very good reason that I did not want to risk the members of the House getting the illness that I had.

If there is any doubt whatsoever from that party opposite that I was sick on that particular day, I have here—and I can give it to a page—the actual doctor's prescription that I received at the very moment that the member was making those charges against me. I deliberately did not fill this prescription so that I could present it in the House as evidence that I was indeed sick at the time that we are speaking of. If I can get a page to come up, this will show you, Mr. Speaker, that it is an actual document. It is a prescription.

The Speaker: In the House a member's word is enough when it comes to matters such as these. I invite the hon. member to bring it to a close.

• (1515)

Mr. John Bryden: I do bring it to a close. If a doctor's letter is required or even the lab tests are required, these will be made available to you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to conclude by saying one thing, that the Reform Party ended its life last Friday. I have to say that for me it ended its life suitably as showing an example of the kind of mean-spiritedness, the lack of respect for—

The Speaker: I think we are getting the picture. I do not want to get into more debate. Of course I hope the hon. member will recover soon. I think the sooner he gets out of the House the better it will be for all of us who are here.

I see the hon. whip of the Canadian Alliance is on his feet now. I do not want to get into debate, but I will hear him for just a short while.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say in defence that I stand by what I said on Friday. I believe this is a very serious issue, despite what the hon. member for Wentworth—Burlington has said. If there is ever an example of mean-spiritedness, we have certainly witnessed some of it just now.

The Speaker: I intervened on the term mean-spiritedness on this side and I am sure that in the spirit of good-spiritedness the hon. member will make his point.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, I just conclude by saying that I stand by my statement on Friday and I do ask that you rule, as you always do, in a spirit of impartiality.

The Speaker: That is one thing that all members can be sure of. In that spirit of impartiality I will take a day or so to think about what was said now that I have heard both sides of the story.

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-462, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Firearms Act (exemption of long guns from registration).

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed with pleasure that I have the opportunity to introduce my bill, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Firearms Act, to ensure that there is an exemption from the need to register long guns.

The purpose of this enactment is to exempt ordinary long guns, meaning firearms that are neither prohibited nor restricted from registration. The criminal code is amended to remove the provision that makes it an offence to possess a long gun that is not registered. The Firearms Act is amended to remove the requirement to register long guns.

In addition, there are a number of consequential amendments to both acts removing references to registration with respect to long guns. This enactment does not affect the law respecting prohibited weapons or restricted weapons. Essentially, to paraphrase the bill, it is to remove the need to register long guns which are commonly used by deer hunters, duck hunters and farmers. It is a very important piece of legislation that we believe wastes taxpayer money, so it is my pleasure to table the bill at this time.

• (1520)

To conclude, a number of individuals share the same sentiments and I am looking forward to having signatures from all parties that would participate in that way.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

BREAST CANCER

Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I present a petition that draws the attention of the House to the fact

Routine Proceedings

that Canada has the second highest incident rate of breast cancer in the world, second only to the United States, and the fact that the United States has had a mandatory mammography quality assurance standard since October 1994.

Therefore the petitioners request and call upon parliament to establish legislation and an independent governing body to develop, implement and enforce uniform and mandatory mammography quality assurance and quality control standards in Canada.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions I would like to present today. The first one deals with concerns that constituents expressed regarding the failure of the government to deal effectively with the child pornography issue.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the second petition deals with the failure of the government to deal effectively with illegal immigration to this country.

The petitioners are calling on the government to allow quickly for the deportation of individuals in obvious and blatant abuse of the system when it occurs.

GENETICALLY ALTERED FOODS

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions to the House.

In the first one, more than 300 constituents in my riding of Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford and adjacent ridings have signed a petition that calls upon parliament to legislate clear labelling on all genetically altered seeds, foods and their byproducts available in Canada.

It further requests that these products be banned from the market until they have been rigorously tested to prove their safety when consumed by humans and come into contact with all other species with whom we share the planet.

CHILD POVERTY

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a second petition signed by 89 constituents in my riding of Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford. They ask parliament to fulfil the promise made in the 1989 House of Commons resolution to end child poverty by the year 2000.

MINING

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in keeping with Standing Order 36, I am proud to stand in my place today to present a petition on an issue that is very timely, topical and urgent.

These thousands of signators from Yellowknife, Northwest Territories, and the surrounding area remind the government of the tragic history of the Royal Oak and Giant mines and the urgent situation of the many laid off workers and the pensioners who continue to be disadvantaged by this situation today.

These citizens of Yellowknife point out that the government played a role in negotiating away the severance package and the pension benefits of these workers and that it has an obligation at this time to make these workers whole once and for all.

These citizens call upon government to amend the Bankruptcy Act, the Pension Benefit Act and any other legislation that needs to be amended to put the rights of workers first in the case of a bankruptcy and not down the line after the corporate interests.

There is a hunger strike under way dealing with this issue. The government has the ability to act and these many thousands of Yellowknifers are demanding the government takes action today to end the tragic history of the Royal Oak and Giant mines in Yellowknife.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Lou Sekora (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I have two petitions to present. One is from the Canada Family Action Coalition. The petition calls upon parliament to make sure that the possession of child pornography remains a serious criminal offence.

• (1525)

CANADA POST CORPORATION

Mr. Lou Sekora (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from the Organization of Rural Route Mail Couriers. The petitioners call upon the parliament to repeal subsection 13(5) of the Canada Post Corporation Act.

EQUALITY

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in presenting a petition that has been put forward by over 1,000 concerned Canadians, mostly from the province of Quebec.

The petitioners ask the government to affirm that all Canadians are equal under all circumstances, including linguistically, without exception in the province of Quebec and throughout Canada. They wish to remind the government to enact only legislation that affirms the equality of each and every individual under the laws of Canada.

BREAST CANCER

Mr. John O'Reilly (Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, Lib.): Pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am presenting a petition from the people of the Kingston area who will be in your thoughts, Mr. Speaker.

The Budget

The petitioners call upon parliament to enact legislation to establish an independent governing body to develop, implement and enforce uniform and mandatory mammography quality assurance and quality control standards in Canada.

THE CONSTITUTION

Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am privileged on behalf of citizens from my home community of Thompson to add this list of petitioners to those that I have already presented.

They call upon parliament to preserve the reference to God in the Constitution of Canada. They recognize that it honours the faith of millions of Canadians, symbolizes an important part of our heritage, and reflects the diversity and plurality of the religions in Canada.

CHILD POVERTY

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present pursuant to Standing Order 36. It is signed by 119 people in my riding who petition parliament to fulfil the promise in the 1989 House of Commons resolution to end child poverty by the year 2000.

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by constituents of mine and of the neighbouring riding of Nepean—Carleton.

They remind the House of Commons of the unanimous resolution to end child poverty by this year and that, rather, the number of poor children in Canada has increased by 60% since then. They call upon parliament to fulfil the promise in the 1989 House of Commons resolution to end child poverty this year.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Question No. 64 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 64—**Mr. John Williams:**

Regarding the recent Conference of Spouses of heads of State and Government of the Americas held in Ottawa from September 29 to October 1, 1999: (a) what was the total cost of the conference, including all breakdowns for accommodation; (b) how many spouses had their travel to, from and while in Canada subsidized, by the federal government; (c) if a spouse's travel was subsidized, how much was spent on her personal travel, including any travel for assistants and/or staff; and (d) how much was spent on security by the federal government for the conference?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Regarding the recent Conference of Spouses of Heads of State and Government of the Americas held in Ottawa from September 29 to October 1, 1999:

(a) Although all of the costs have not yet been tallied, Canada expects that the total cost will be in the vicinity of \$3,439,000. Accommodation costs total \$291,520, \$87,235 of which is attributable to visiting delegations. The balance of \$204,285 is accommodation costs associated with the members of the staff and contractors needed—conference co-ordinators, liaison officers, translators.

(b) None of the delegations had any travel to or from Ottawa subsidized by the federal government.

(c) See (b) above.

(d) Canada's security costs for the conference were \$281,063.

[English]

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On October 15, 1999 I asked Question No. 28. That was first asked on the March 23 as Question No. 226 and never answered. On October 18, 1999 I asked Question No. 29. That was first asked on March 24, 1999 as Question No. 227 and was never answered.

These questions go to the heart of the misuse by the Department of National Defence of the anti-malarial drug Mefloquine and its misleading of the Somalia inquiry during that particular investigation. I would like those questions answered.

Mr. Derek Lee: Mr. Speaker, the member's inquiry on this issue is quite appropriate. I would commit to him to take note of his representations on these outstanding questions, to get back to him at the earliest possible date, and to get answers to the questions he has tabled.

I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

THE BUDGET

The House resumed consideration of the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government; and of the amendment.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one way to judge the budget is not just by the debate that takes place in the House. It is also by what kind of response there is in the community from the various organizations that monitor what the government is doing and are involved in various programs and campaigns, for example, Campaign 2000 or the campaigns around housing.

The Budget

• (1530)

On the day of the budget one of those organizations, a group of poor tenants from a Quebec social housing coalition called FRA-PRU, occupied the offices of the Canadian Human Rights Commission in Ottawa. They sat in the offices of the Canadian Human Rights Commission because they wanted to hear what was in the budget. They were very worried that the government would turn its back on the needs of poor tenants and the homeless.

After they heard the budget they continued their occupation of the Canadian Human Rights Commission offices. It carried over 24 hours into the next day. I visited to speak to them about their concerns. They were pretty disappointed. More than that, they were outraged that the \$100 billion surplus which had been built, as we have heard from our member for Winnipeg Centre, on the backs of the unemployed, the surplus from the unemployment insurance commission and the public pension plan, did not contain any money for a national housing program.

The budget basically reannounced the \$753 million that had been announced by the minister responsible for homelessness prior to Christmas. Anyone who for a minute has been fooled into thinking that announcement will mean the construction of affordable, safe, secure and appropriate housing for families, children, seniors, unemployed people and low income people has made a big mistake.

I had a meeting in my riding with the HRDC officials who are responsible for carrying out this initiative and with community groups who wanted to find out whether the \$750 million which was reannounced in the budget actually would build social housing, and the answer was no. It is basically a program that will institutionalize shelters. It deals with training programs, youth at risk and aboriginal programs, all of which are good measures, but the budget failed on the fundamental issue that needed to be addressed in terms of a housing strategy. It was completely absent.

It is no wonder that a group like FRAPRU and the organizations which it represents felt the need to take demonstrative action.

A few weeks later representatives from housing organizations came to Ottawa to bear witness to yet another death of a homeless person. Several homeless people died in the city of Toronto. Representatives of those organizations came to the Canadian Human Rights Commission, called on the government and demanded to know why in the budget, when there were such opportunities with the surplus that existed, the poor, the homeless and people who are underhoused in the country were completely forgotten.

I have been working closely with people concerned about the so-called children's agenda. I wanted to know their reaction to the budget. How many times have we heard government members talk about the children's agenda? How many times have we heard

government members talk about the platitudes of wanting to end child poverty? Even today in the House there were three petitions presented by government members from their constituents in Liberal ridings who want the government to end child poverty.

There was a lot of expectation that the budget would be a children's budget, but it failed on that score. There was no money in the budget for a national child care program or an early childhood development program. There were no funds announced to ensure that the child tax benefit would be passed on to children and families on welfare.

Is it any wonder that a group like the Canadian Teachers' Federation in its analysis of the budget said that it falls short of fulfilling the federal government's promise of implementing a national children's agenda as outlined in the recent throne speech. It goes on to say that the budget repeats the same promises that appeared in the Speech from the Throne and in statements made by first ministers in 1997 when they agreed to accelerate work on a national children's agenda.

There are no dollars allocated for this purpose. Canada's children deserve more than rhetoric. That is what the Canadian Teachers' Federation had to say.

• (1535)

If we go back to the October 1999 throne speech, the commitment made by the Prime Minister was to take the action necessary as a country so that every Canadian child could have the best possible start in life. The government has failed miserably on that score. Not only has it not taken action to ensure that all children have a good start in the early years of their lives, the situation has deteriorated considerably since the resolution which was passed unanimously by the House in 1989, introduced by the then leader of the NDP, Ed Broadbent, to eliminate child poverty. There are now 50% more children than there were in 1989 living in poverty. Why did this \$100 billion surplus not address the needs of those kids?

We have a very credible organization, the National Anti-Poverty Organization, headquartered in Ottawa. It works at the grassroots level in social justice and anti-poverty right across the country. What did its analysis say? That the budget would widen the gap between rich and poor. It pointed out that while the finance minister spoke about the gap between the rich and the poor, the measures in his budget not only failed to reduce the problem but would actually make it worse.

The real proof is in the numbers. As NAPO has pointed out, if we compare the situations of two single people, one who has an income of \$10,000 and another with an income of \$100,000, the gap between those incomes will actually increase by \$2,377 because of this budget. It begs the questions: Is this a budget that is based on any sort of principle of equality? Is it a budget that deals with the horror of what poor children, families and the unemployed have to deal with? The answer is no. As we can see clearly, this

The Budget

budget actually increases the gap between those who are wealthy and those who are poor.

I also have information that was provided by groups like the Canadian Federation of Students. One of the things I was really interested in seeing in the budget was whether there would be any real relief for students who are facing crushing debt loads because of their post-secondary education. Let us make no mistake, student debt in the country has increased threefold, from about \$8,000 to about \$25,000. That has been the average student debt since the Liberal government came to power.

There are no two ways about it, the reason is because of the massive retreat in public funding of more than \$3 billion which has been cut from post-secondary education and training. Is it any wonder that the Canadian Federation Students came out with its analysis which said that the federal 2000 budget did nothing to fix the funding crisis in post-secondary education. In fact, the \$600 million in additional annual funding for health care and education falls far short of the \$3.7 billion which the premiers have publicly stated is immediately required for post-secondary education. It will not even cover inflation.

This is particularly offensive. In the throne speech we heard various platitudes and commitments to a knowledge based economy and to helping young people in the future. If we look at the reality, young people are facing debt loads and increasing inaccessibility to our schools.

Finally, it is no better on the health care front. I am proud to say that the NDP has campaigned rigorously day after day in the House to point out the shortcomings of the budget when it comes to health care. We have made it quite clear, and the numbers tell the truth, that even with the so-called increase in health care we will still be short \$3.3 billion more than when the Liberals came to power in 1993.

One of my constituents, Mr. Harvey Dueck, wrote to the finance minister. He said: "I am writing to add my voice to those who are asking you to favour funding health care and other social programs above tax cuts in this and future budgets". He continued: "I am in an income tax bracket where I would benefit more than most from any proposed tax cut, but I beg you not to tread that path until social programs are once again secure and the debt, not merely the deficit, has been vastly reduced or limited".

• (1540)

He went on to tell of the difficulties that he had when he visited the emergency room because there were not enough nurses, there were not enough doctors and there were not enough records management people to provide the information that was needed.

The budget fails on that score as well. I want to say that we in the NDP believe that the government missed the opportunity it had to deal with poverty and to deal with growing inequality. Instead it

decided to implement tax cuts, which basically favour the rich over the poor. For us, that is simply appalling.

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the member's remarks and I would like to respond to her remarks concerning higher education.

In the recent budget scholarship income was made tax free up to \$3,000. In previous budgets there was the RESP, the registered educational savings plan program, which included not only tax breaks but actually a grant for each child in a family, up to a considerable amount. These were the first new grants in higher education for many years.

Also in this budget there were the 2,000 funded research chairs, funded research professorships, which will have a direct affect on students. There will be junior and senior professorships. Students will be employed.

The granting councils over the last several years have received considerable additional funds. This year, for example, the social sciences council alone received an additional \$10 million. All of those grants go to help students on the campuses to get jobs working with professors and that kind of thing.

As well, the government put all colleges, universities, high schools and elementary schools on the Internet, which is a very important step.

I have not even mentioned the millennium scholarships.

The member said that the government has not done much to help higher education. I know that more must be done, but this time university groups, students and others, have said to us that we should increase transfers to the provinces so that core funding for universities, not more scholarships or research help, which is supplied by the provinces, could be strengthened.

If the member reads the budget, this time the transfers to the provinces were referred to as higher education and health. Our concern on the government side was that if we transferred this money for higher education and health, how would we know, in either of those fields, what the provinces would do?

Has she heard of any province which has used the increase in the block transfer this year for higher education purposes? If she has, I would be glad to hear it. If she has not, could she suggest to us ways in which we could be sure that the money we transfer to the provinces will be used for the purposes for which it was intended, higher education and health?

Ms. Libby Davies: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his question. It is a very good question and it gives me an opportunity to say a bit more about the concerns we have with post-secondary education.

The Budget

It is fair to raise the question that if there is an increase in the Canada health and social transfer, how could we provide an assurance that the money would actually be used for education. I know that is the case in my own province of British Columbia. Our government has put a freeze on tuition fees and has made sure that accessibility to post-secondary education will not be eroded.

I would suggest that if the member is concerned about where the dollars are going for health care, social programs or post-secondary education, he should be supporting the initiative which the federal New Democrats put forward both at the HRDC committee and in the House to say that the federal government should bring in a new national standard based on accessibility to post-secondary education.

We believe very much that there must be federal dollars. The measures that the member outlined do not even come close to making up for the billions of dollars that have been stripped away and gutted from our colleges and universities.

Whatever increase there is, the government should be implementing a standard based on accessibility precisely to ensure that students across the country, whether they are in Ontario, New Brunswick or British Columbia, have access based on affordability to post-secondary education. Unfortunately that does not exist.

• (1545)

I remind the member that it was his government that brought in the CHST. It was his government that cut the strings and said to the provinces, "Do whatever the hell you want". That is why we are in a mess now.

Perhaps I could throw the question back and ask the member to support the initiatives from our party to make sure that there is accessibility based on a national standard.

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am splitting my time with my hon. colleague the secretary of state for parks and rural development. I should not forget rural development. We know how important that issue is to all the rural regions of Canada, my constituency being one of them.

Budget 2000 is an achievement of historic proportions. The third successive balanced budget of this government is a feat not seen since the days of C. D. Howe. We have tackled the burdensome and ballooning deficit left by the previous government. We have increased job creation. We have launched a strategy to invest in Canadians.

Canadians now have every reason to feel confident and secure about the economy. A bright future lies ahead for all thanks to the sound fiscal management of this government.

In relation to my riding, it has been an extremely interesting time in the Northwest Territories. We have a new government. We have a new premier, Premier Kakfwi who is of aboriginal descent. We have a cabinet the majority of whom I believe are aboriginal, as well as the MLAs from the various parts of the territory.

The new commissioner is to be sworn in at 3.30 p.m. this coming Friday. This Inuvialuit woman is a widow who has been very much a community activist on health and social issues and educational issues. She is raising four daughters on her own. She was a very steady companion of her husband who passed away from cancer a couple of years ago. It was a very long and tough journey for both of them.

This is the way through which I have become familiar with the circumstances of these individuals who take the lead in our territory.

We also have a new senator, the first ever to make the history books for the Northwest Territories, Senator Nick Sibbeston. He also is of aboriginal descent and is a Dene speaking individual from the Deh Cho region.

We have many unsung heroes in the north who work toward the development in the most exciting time in the north.

This budget is not separate from that. We look to a strong partnership with the federal government. We have major issues to bring together for the benefit of all of Canada including the north.

The national unemployment rate is at its lowest level in 24 years. Inflation remains in check. The debt burden is dropping. The Canadian economy is growing. These are facts that not even the opposition can deny.

[*Translation*]

It is precisely in the hope of achieving such impressive results that Canadians elected us to office. Our government followed up on its commitments and will pursue its efforts to continue to improve the tax situation of all Canadians.

[*English*]

This record of achievement is what Canadians elected us to do.

Under this budget Canadians will reap the rewards of sound fiscal management through tax savings and investments in our children through increased investments in health care and education.

The government is committed to invest in social and economic development for all Canadians. We recognize regional inequities in opportunities. We will not leave anyone behind as we move forward in this new century. We do not believe in leaving the most vulnerable in our society to fend for themselves. We believe in access of opportunity.

The Budget

• (1550)

We do not believe in setting one Canadian against another. We believe in pulling together as Canadians by investing in all Canadians. Above all, investing in our children will secure a better future for all Canadians.

The government is committed to work with our provincial and territorial partners to develop an action plan by December 2000 to support early childhood development. We have identified six priority areas: strengthening the family; early childhood development; economic security; readiness to learn; adolescent development; and support of communities. These speak loudly to my constituents.

In the Northwest Territories we are in the midst of the biggest development my territory has realized in the last number of decades. Two diamond mines are in operation. Within six years the exponential rate of return to the federal government from those mines including the others that are potentially to come onstream is going to be very high. Presently we get \$19,000 per capita for the individuals in my riding.

With the generation of revenue from these various industries, including the development of a major pipeline down the Mackenzie Valley which is now being studied, a number of options are being proposed. The potential performance of that major pipeline perhaps will make us a have territory some day. We will be able to carry our own weight by virtue of the fact that we will be taking these resources out of our own area.

We hope to develop a partnership with the federal government on devolution. That means a sharing of the revenues, a sharing of the authorities, powers and responsibilities. This is what the government in my territory is proposing to do. This partnership is a sound approach for prosperity, for participation and for equity.

The aboriginal people at one point many decades ago were opposed to building the pipeline for their own reasons. Now the aboriginal people are saying they want this development. Not only do they want to build it, they want to own it. They want equity ownership. That means a great deal of self-sustainability for our community.

The budget is not separate from that. This all comes together. We do not pretend we are a region onto ourselves, that we can do it on our own. We believe we can do best in partnership.

In addition, the budget will increase the Canada child tax benefit by \$2.5 billion a year by 2004. This is a significant investment. We cannot separate those things that are child specific from the other fiscal issues and say they do not have an impact. That is not the way in which governments or economies work.

Our five year tax reduction plan will ease the tax burden for low and middle income families with children beginning with the current fiscal year. The maximum leave period for employment insurance maternity and parental leave will be doubled to one year. There will be \$29 million allocated for family law related services to support parenting information programs.

This budget will increase support and tax initiatives for persons with disabilities and their families. That is of particular concern to me. I have a great deal of concern for young people with disabilities, those young people who are the most vulnerable, those who need that hand up.

This budget also speaks to an issue of great importance to the north, the environment. Global environmental changes have a special impact in the western Arctic and northerners have a special relationship to that land. This budget will now support new environmental initiatives.

I have a delegation in town from the community of Deline who are seized with the issue of uranium contamination from the mine at Port Radium. There is contamination of the community and its environment through the waterways all the way down the Mackenzie through the Great Bear Lake and the Bear River.

These people are looking at the incidence of deaths related to cancer. They are concerned not only about the people but also the environment, the fish, the animals, the caribou, all of these issues combined. They have a deep and abiding concern about the wellness and the health of their people. This working group and others have shown a great deal of concern and initiative.

• (1555)

In Yellowknife 270,000 tonnes of arsenic is sitting under the city in silos from a mine that is still plagued with labour issues as well as other things.

An hon. member from the other side presented a petition today. I support that petition. I cannot put forward a petition as a minister, but I agree that those people's views should be heard. I support that.

In future when people who have worked under the condition of being guaranteed a pension, I hope we can create the conditions so that their pensions are protected and their conditions of employment are respected.

There is much more I could say but I am sharing my time with my colleague. In light of that I want to say that we are in an exciting period in the area which I come from. We do not separate ourselves from this budget. This budget is very relevant to the things we want to do. We are proud to be part of the government and in partnership with it to do what has to be done to make a better country and a better community for our people.

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I always like to listen to the hon. member when she speaks

The Budget

about her part of the world. She makes eminently good sense. I commend her for the enthusiasm with which she supports her constituents and in particular on some of the natural resources development like the proposed pipeline and the diamond mines. That is perfectly legitimate. It is the kind of thing I would expect any member of parliament to do.

I would like to ask the hon. member opposite whether she has thought about other parts of the budget and in particular the increase in Human Resources Development Canada. In this area there is roughly \$1 billion and economists have done some estimates as to how much it really costs in terms of the output. If we put a number of dollars into the job creation scheme the assumption is that jobs are actually created. What is not said is how many jobs are lost or what output costs are attributed to each of these job creation schemes.

The job creation schemes have to be paid for through tax increases to someone. People are paying additional taxes to pay for these job schemes. Where does it come from? Economists have estimated that the \$1 billion has cost Canadians \$520 million, over half of the \$1 billion.

Could the hon. member address this issue? It has been addressed by people like Jim Mirrlees for example who won a Nobel prize recently in developing the optimum taxation theory. I wonder if she could comment on that.

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew: Mr. Speaker, I do not profess to be a specialist in taxation but I can say that I come from an area of very high need. Unemployment is very high. I am very pleased we have made the investment in HRDC, putting aside all of the other administrative difficulties that have befallen the programs. I stand by the initiatives that we have undertaken in my riding and across Canada that have created two million jobs. They are two million jobs for two million Canadians who needed good permanent jobs.

I also applaud the fact that we went from 11.5% to 6.8% unemployment. Youth unemployment is going down but we are still seized with that.

I come from an area where we must diversify the economy. We do not need a hand out; we need a hand up. Northerners take good advantage. I know there are other hon. members in the Chamber who live in areas that are not as well served as those on the industrial grid. We do not have huge industries. Jobs have to be devised and opportunities have to be created for these people, such as in tourism and the mining industry. We have to invest in training and development.

As it is today, the majority of our workers are coming from outside the territories. It is good for the hon. member's riding and others as well, for Manitoba, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and as far as the Atlantic. Workers are coming to the north to work at

these mines because we have invested in the opportunities for them to do so. On the other hand, we have to train people and we need the funds to do that.

● (1600)

I will not deal with all the other issues because we would need more time. However, I want the hon. member to know that I stand by the funding that my riding in particular has received. This was much needed funding and it was used very well. It has created opportunities where there would be none.

Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member made reference to the pensioners in the area. She has highly supported the petition that came in. I am sure she recognizes that it was her Indian affairs minister who made an agreement that literally wiped away the benefits for those pensioners with no consideration for them. Obviously that is the approach the government has taken in a number of areas that reflect on ordinary Canadians. In this case it was workers who in a lot of situations gave their lives. Those who are left are now having their pensions wiped out.

If she truly supports this, how does she feel about her Indian affairs minister signing the agreement that wiped away those pensions?

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague, the Minister for Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and I have worked together for almost 12 years. I have the utmost respect for his judgment and thinking.

With regard to this situation, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is seized with his officials and officials of another department in finding a solution and not looking at blame. We are trying to find a solution so that these people do not have the gap that will be created and will receive full pensions. We are working on that. We are not looking to blame someone. If we do that we could do an historical chronology and many fingers could be pointed elsewhere. We are not into that. We want to find solutions.

I am from that riding and I not only support those workers but I support the workers across the country who may be in the same situation. I feel that their story has to be told. Most of the workers are older workers and I support them wholeheartedly in their attempts to get a full pension.

[Translation]

Hon. Andy Mitchell (Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address the February 28 budget, a budget full of good news for all Canadians, including those who live in rural areas.

The Budget

[English]

I know Canadians have responded well to the budget put forward by the finance minister on February 28. That has been evident in the House in the weeks since the budget was tabled as we have seen very few actual questions from the opposition. In fact people who have been around this place a lot longer than I have expressed absolute astonishment on the general acceptance of the budget by the opposition and, indeed, the general acceptance by Canadians.

I believe that has occurred because the budget, in essence, dealt with the priorities of Canadians. It dealt with the issue of tax reductions. The budget put forward a plan of tax reduction of some \$54 billion. Canadians had indicated that one of the objectives that needed to be addressed in this budget was tax reduction.

It also dealt with the issue of debt reduction. At the high point a couple of years ago, as a percentage of our GDP, the debt in the country, thanks to the mismanagement of the Tory government for years and years, had risen to a little over 71%. As we follow through on the budget plan, the debt to GDP ratio will drop to below 50%. In fact, over the last three years close to \$20 billion in marketable debt has been repaid. This is a far cry from what we saw from the Mulroney Tories.

This budget has also gained general acceptance among Canadians because of the types of investments it has made and will continue to make. We saw \$2.5 billion being invested in health care, adding to the \$14.5 billion the year before. Transfers to the provinces went up this year to the highest level, to some \$43 billion over two or three years.

• (1605)

We saw the commitment of \$2.6 billion to the infrastructure program to partner with other levels of government, \$1 billion for the federal government to deal with its own infrastructure and, as we have heard from some of the previous comments made in the House, some \$700 million being invested into items to do with the environment.

I am very pleased and most importantly I would like to talk today about this budget in terms of rural Canada. I will quote a piece of the speech that the Minister of Finance made. He said:

—there are major differences between urban and rural communities.

The concerns of rural Canadians are those shared by all Canadians—quality health care, the best education for their children, a good job. The difference is that, in the case of rural Canada, a hospital closing, a school cutback or the loss of a major employer threatens the very life of the community.

Therefore, we must expand economic development in smaller communities right across the country, north and south, east and west. We must recognize that in the years ahead, all orders of government have to come together, as never before, to broaden opportunities right across the country.

With those words, I think the Minister of Finance spoke clearly to the needs, concerns and issues of rural Canada. What the budget does is it recognizes, as this government began to recognize and first enunciated in the Speech from the Throne in 1996, that the realities faced by rural Canadians are indeed different than those faced by urban Canadians.

We simply have to take a look at some of those issues. Let us take the issue of geography. If people live in a rural area there is so much more geography. Let us take a look at the distance from markets. If people are operating in a rural marketplace, they often have added transportation costs and added issues because of the distance from the market.

Let us look at the whole issue of population density. If one is looking at investing in a rural area, often times there is not the same potential market size that may exist in an urban area.

Let us look at the economy of rural Canada. When people operate in rural Canada, it is, in most cases, a natural resource based economy that is normally cyclical in nature. It is very different from an urbanized, diversified, manufacturing based economy.

The fact that urban and rural Canada are different, the fact that the challenges are different and the fact that the circumstances on the ground are different, requires the government to respond differently in both areas. One of the great strengths of this budget is that it realizes that we do need to respond differently. The budget puts forward very clearly what is a basic debate in this country: Does government have a role to partner with communities, to partner with individuals and to partner with businesses where circumstances call for an improvement in the quality of life of, in this case, rural Canadians? I believe it does.

Members across the way have stood in the House day after day enunciating that the government does not have a role when it comes to dealing with the regions. In question period today we heard criticism after criticism piled on the minister responsible for regional development in Quebec. Day after day we hear criticisms when HRDC partners with rural communities and rural citizens to help improve the quality of their lives.

The budget has clearly stated that we recognize there are differences in rural Canada. We recognize there are different challenges faced by rural Canadians. We are going to work as a partner with those institutions, with those communities and with those people to help improve the quality of life.

If we look at some of the specific points made in the budget, some of the specific measures, we can see that the budget does deal with some of those differences I talked about.

If we look at the issue of geography, we see an initiative there of \$160 million to ensure that we will be able to deliver all government services on line. Those who live in a rural or remote

The Budget

community often do not have the ability to access government services in the traditional way of going to a particular office or some place made of bricks and mortar. Here we have a government understanding that specific issue in rural Canada, understanding that rural Canadians need to have access to their government, and we see an initiative of \$160 million to provide that type of access to them.

• (1610)

When we look at distance from markets we look at the \$2.6 billion infrastructure program that we will roll out in conjunction with other levels of government. This is our own billion dollar program. Something which is very important and which rural Canadians saw clearly is that a component of the infrastructure program has been specifically directed to rural Canada, to the needs, the criteria and the challenges facing rural Canadians in terms of developing their infrastructure.

Not only is the program there but it is being designed in a way that will address the needs of rural Canadians and deal with the difference in distance from markets.

The whole issue of population density is important to those who live in rural Canada. The private sector often goes to an urban setting, where it has a very vast market, and makes an investment on its own because it can get a quick return on its investment. Trying to make that same investment, for example, in telecommunications infrastructure or in energy distribution, in a rural area where we do not have that population density, requires another partner. Often times that partner can and should be a level of government. Sometimes it is the federal government, sometimes the provincial government and sometimes even the municipal government, but it is an appropriate role to play.

We see in the budget a \$54 million commitment to community futures which can take an innovative approach to assisting communities. It takes an approach that I like to call a bottom up and not a top down approach. Community futures are run and operated by local boards of directors, selected from local individuals who make decisions on how they will go about community development, not based on some decision that may be made in Ottawa, Toronto, Edmonton or Victoria, but based on the needs of that rural community.

We also see the government dealing with the cyclical nature of our resource based economies with assistance to agriculture, forestry and mining. This is a budget that demonstrates clearly that this government understands the needs of rural Canadians, that it is addressing those needs and that it cares about rural Canadians. That is why I believe this budget deserves the support of all members of the House, and particularly those members who represent rural constituencies.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak very passionately about my

constituency, as the Secretary of State for Children and Youth just did. I particularly want to address the minister in charge of rural development.

I want to tell the last speaker that if he wants to see rural development in a rural area going into collapse, he should look at what is happening with the amount of money that this government has put into my constituency. Of the \$1.7 billion announced across Manitoba and Saskatchewan, only 26% of the money has been paid to the farmers as of March 12. Some 60% of all Manitoba and Saskatchewan farmers had their AIDA forms rejected.

This is what I have as of today: First, the highest debt ever in my constituency; second, more paved roads having to be returned to gravel; and third, the worst fallout of people leaving the constituency with the abandonment of towns all because this government did not treat the number one industry in western Canada in the same way it treated the west during the national energy crisis.

I do not know how the member can stand and brag about rural development when I am facing rural decline.

Hon. Andy Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the hon. member is very concerned with his riding, as are all hon. members in the House.

On the four occasions in the last four months that I have been to Saskatchewan I have had an opportunity to talk to a wide range of individuals. I am a little surprised that the hon. member speaks that way. When his party was campaigning it talked about taking money out of the agricultural budget but now that it seems to be politically expedient it encourages it.

The reality is that not only did we put a billion dollars into a farm aid disaster package in 1998-99, but the minister of agriculture announced another billion dollars for 2000 and 2001. Then we announced another \$240 million specifically for Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Just last week the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, along with his 10 colleagues from all the provinces including the minister from Saskatchewan, signed an agreement on how to deal with the basic safety net package.

• (1615)

This is a government that cares about the farmers of western Canada, cares about farmers right across Canada and is taking concrete action.

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, I was quite interested to hear the Secretary of State for Rural Development speak about rural Canada. My riding of West Nova is very rural. On January 21 a severe storm affected five or six wharves along the coastline of Nova Scotia from Port Lorne down to Delaps Cove and areas in between. Because of the severe cuts the federal government had already done to the provinces and to various programs,

The Budget

these wharves were in a state of some disrepair and the storm severely damaged them.

I heard the secretary of state talk about supporting our rural communities. Would he be prepared to encourage the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to put the proper funding in place to repair the wharves, instead of just using the existing budget that is taking away from the ongoing repair that needs to be done? Would he encourage him to put in place some emergency relief by possibly taking some of the millions and millions of dollars wasted on the gun registry and putting it toward the repair of those wharves and, as my colleague mentioned, helping farmers? What does my hon. colleague think of that?

Hon. Andy Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to hear from the member for West Nova. I have had an opportunity to travel to his riding and to work with him there. He makes a very good point. There are different challenges in rural Canada than exist in urban Canada which require the participation of the government to deal with them. I send a very clear message to the former Reform Party, the Canadian Alliance Party, that government has a role to play in dealing with rural Canada.

I was pleased to see as part of the criteria for the government's own billion dollar infrastructure program, that is the infrastructure under its own auspices, that wharves was one of the items listed as an example of things the particular funding could deal with.

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have an opportunity to speak to this debate. We all know that the budget debate is one of the most critical ones we have each year. I will be splitting my time with the learned member from the riding of West Nova. I know we are all looking forward to his speech.

Budgets are more than just about numbers. Budgets are essentially what I consider to be a blueprint that illustrates the values of the government. It is a blueprint to discovering what kind of vision the government has not only for today but well into the future. It is also very much a blueprint to ensure that we put forth the necessary initiatives so we can be competitive not only today but into the future, so we can have a vibrant economy to pay for all the programs or initiatives that we hold dear as Canadians.

I want to talk about what the government is not doing in the budget. In 1988 Canada went to the polls on the initiative of free trade. We all know that election came down to one public policy issue. At that time our trade with the Americans was essentially around \$90 billion each and every year. Today I am very proud to say that through the FTA and NAFTA our trade with the Americans is well over \$260 billion annually.

We have had an enormous amount of economic growth over the last seven years. From where has that enormous growth come? It

has largely come from our trade relationship with the American economy, which we all know is white hot. Without that initiative, without that vision, without that blueprint, we would not be able to compete in the economy and pay for the programs that we hold so very dear.

• (1620)

We are now at another milestone in the country's development. The rest of the industrialized world, our trading partners, the Americans and the Europeans, are now taking leaps in tax reduction, giant steps to ensure that their economies are more affluent. I call this an amazing coincidence. Maybe it is just a coincidence, but I would argue that it makes economic sense.

The Irish exponentially lowered taxes both in the corporate tax regime and in the personal tax regime, combined with investments in terms of education. The Celtic tiger as it has come to be known in Europe, Ireland, now leads Europe in the amount of its economic growth with 98% growth in its GDP over the last 15 years.

Over the last number of years we have seen an exponential amount of growth by the Germans of 18%, by the British of 18% and by the Americans as well. It is a similar number. Meanwhile growth in Canada has only been 7%. We are lagging behind our trading partners. The reason for it is that we cannot keep wealth in this country.

Time and time again it has been proven, and I call it the amazing coincidence, that if we lower taxes we grow an economy to create more wealth to pay for the programs that define us as a society.

It happened in Ireland. It happened in Finland. Finland was essentially a Soviet bloc country. Now it has a very growth oriented economy. It happened when John Kennedy lowered taxes in the 1960s. It happened when Progressive Conservative Premier Ralph Klein made it a mandate to ensure that the Alberta economic fundamentals were put in order and to pay down debt.

It happened with the economy of Ontario. The low tax regime that Michael Harris brought forth, I would argue quite sensibly, is responsible for the record amount of growth in our economy over the last number of years. If Michael Harris and the economy were not as vibrant we simply would not be collecting the revenues in Ottawa to pay for the programs we have right now.

This is the blueprint. Our trade regime has done well, but to retain our economic competitiveness into the future we need first and foremost to get our economic fundamentals in order. This means paying down our national debt. We have a moral obligation to all future generations to pay down the \$587 billion national debt.

We have an obligation to ensure that our best, our brightest and most adventurous can grow and prosper in this country. They should be provided with a tax regime by which they can profit and participate in our Canadian economy. We are losing all too fast our

The Budget

best and brightest to the United States and other jurisdictions as they seek opportunities in other countries.

The government is trying to take accolades for its one time initiative of \$2.5 billion for health care and post-secondary education over four years. That is only a very small portion of the large amount of money that has been taken away from our provincial partners over the last five to six years. Before we have any more grandiose programs, before we give any more money to HRDC in grants and contributions, before we start reinvesting in new made in Ottawa solutions, let us do the fundamentals first. Let us pay down the debt. Let us make sure that we lower the taxes. Let us make sure that we put money in our priority spending programs, our health care system and our post-secondary education system in particular.

• (1625)

I know you are of Celtic heritage as well, Mr. Speaker. I spoke a few moments ago about the Celtic tiger. People talk about the fact that they have lowered income taxes both corporately and from a personal income perspective. However they have also made it an objective, a mandate of their society, to ensure that anybody who has the aptitude to attend university, to seek post-secondary education, to seek training at a higher level, has the economic capacity to do so. By that I mean post-secondary education in their country is accessible to everyone.

Today that is simply not the case. I believe we need to make it a common objective as a society so that every individual who wants to can participate in this economy. I want to create a culture of opportunity so that we can provide the necessary skills to those individuals who want to provide for themselves by helping them to get educated, by helping them reach the highest level they can with respect to the economy and make the best contribution they can. In order for us to do that we need to make post-secondary education and training more accessible and more affordable.

I finished school just over a decade ago. It may be a bit more than that; I am starting to age. At that time a student debt level of about \$6,000 or \$7,000 was considered extremely high. As many members of the House know, the average student debt level now is \$25,000 to \$30,000 annually. For that to quadruple in this period of growth is a national shame.

There is one solid thing on which I would like to compliment the finance minister. Reindexing the income tax brackets for inflation was a very solid initiative and I applaud the government on it.

In conclusion, I want to talk about the blueprint the country needs, the vision that we need. Let us get our economic fundamentals in order so that we can participate in the upcoming century by making sure that Canada has a low tax regime, both corporately

and from a personal income perspective; that we pay down our debt; and that we put money in the priority spending areas of health care and post-secondary education.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the member's speech and I want to ask him a question because he talked about reduction of debt. This is the biggest thorn in my side with respect to the budget. In so-called good times with surpluses there is no meaningful plan on the part of the government or the finance minister to reduce our debt and thereby reduce the interest payments and free up more money for actual program spending or for further tax reductions, which would be a huge boost to the economy.

The member admitted that he is young, and compared to me he is just a child. He may not know the answer to my question because he was only a babe in diapers when the Conservatives were running the country. They pretty well doubled the debt they inherited, mostly by doing nothing about it. They continued to add to it with deficits every year.

Why does he suppose that the Progressive Conservative Party, with nine years of majority government, never did anything about stopping the huge deficits it had every year during its term of office?

• (1630)

Mr. John Herron: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question was intended to be constructive and he will get a constructive reply.

These are the facts. Quite simply during the 1984 to 1993 era the Progressive Conservative government could have and should have done more in terms of paring down our deficit and heading toward balancing the budget.

To put that in perspective, in 1984 the deficit was approximately \$40 billion. The Progressive Conservative government of the day pared down the deficit to just under \$20 billion. At that time the government was clearly headed in the right direction over the first three years. The Progressive Conservatives were heading toward an era of actually paying down the debt during a boom economy. I have said before that it should have and could have done more.

During that era the Reform Party actually took flight. It would be very wrong for Reform members to say they came about because they were upset with the direction in which the country was going with respect to fiscal responsibility. During that same era from a historical perspective we were on a better track.

In 1988 and 1989 the government missed an opportunity to continue on that track. It walked into a cold recession, one of international magnitude which affected many economies. In the United States the U.S. debt doubled by \$2 trillion during the Reagan and Bush administrations. It doubled in a number of

The Budget

economies. One exception was the U.K. under Maggie Thatcher which actually had a more aggressive approach during that era.

To blame only Brian Mulroney for why we had a huge deficit is the same as blaming the whole western economy. It is the same as blaming George Bush and Ronald Reagan for the deficits and combined debt in the U.S. When we put it in that perspective, deficit permissibility was in our psyche. I applaud the Progressive Conservative government for bringing the issue to the table and actually venting it but it missed the opportunity to do more, I must say.

That is the context in which this debate should always be phrased. To blame the Conservatives for the deficit, they were heading in the right direction. They got caught up in an international recession. It was part of the western world. It happened in Germany under Chancellor Kohl as well. History will speak for itself in that regard.

I thank the member for his constructive question.

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the budget debate. I do so with a deep sense of regret and disappointment. I say disappointment because like most Canadians I believe the Liberal government missed a great opportunity to provide all Canadians with the significant tax relief they so richly deserve after years of suffering and making concessions to bring the country's deficit under control.

Over the past couple of years the finance minister has told Canadians that the country is now in a surplus position when it comes to its finances. In normal circumstances this would be reason to celebrate if Canadians were allowed to reap some of those benefits. Instead they are provided with very modest tax relief which in many ways will be felt somewhere down the road in three or four years from now.

Canadians can no longer afford to wait much longer. They deserve significant tax relief now. All Canadians are aware of the billions of dollars of surplus in the EI program. The PC party has consistently called for a significant reduction in the EI premiums. We have suggested lowering the premiums down to \$2 which is the level for long term stability recommended by the fund's chief actuary.

Although the government would have us believe that Canadian workers are beneficiaries of some EI premium reductions since it took power, it seems to forget that any decreases in the EI premium were basically washed away by the increase in CPP premiums. That is not acceptable.

• (1635)

The finance minister knows that high payroll taxes kill jobs, as my hon. colleague just mentioned. We saw it and history shows it,

yet we are not doing anything about it. The Minister of Finance once referred to high unemployment insurance premiums as a cancer killing tax on jobs. What has happened to suddenly change the finance minister's way of thinking? Why does he maintain these artificially high EI premiums rather than immediately reduce them to \$2? That was recommended by the chief actuary.

Canada has the highest personal income taxes among the G-7 and the second highest corporate tax rate in the OECD. Naturally, Canadians expected to hear about significant tax breaks in the finance minister's budget. When the smoke and mirrors cleared away, Canadians still found themselves with the highest personal income tax rate in the G-7 and the second highest corporate tax rate in the OECD. As a member of parliament representing a part of the country in this hallowed institution, I do not feel proud of that.

The Canadian Chamber of Commerce has criticized the budget for failing to narrow the income tax gap between Canada and the U.S. The huge gap is already responsible for the tremendous brain drain which has and will continue to affect Canadian productivity. We cannot continue to lose our most educated and brightest minds to our American competitors.

A recent study by a senior researcher at the Conference Board of Canada confirmed that there was a significant increase in the number of permanent and non-permanent skilled emigrants to the U.S. It went from 17,000 in 1986 to 98,000 in 1997. Many of the emigrants are in the high tech and health care fields. There is nothing in the budget that is going to stay the exodus of our brightest minds in the future.

Why should Canadians celebrate this budget? The budget will do very little to alleviate the problem facing most of Canada's university students. Already the average debt for an undergraduate degree from a Canadian university is approximately \$25,000 and when we tack on interest it gets to \$40,000. That is a mortgage on a young person's life which is not acceptable. It will restrict that young person's ability to go ahead in the future and do something worthwhile. Instead of putting something back into the economy, he or she will be repaying that huge debt and will be burdened by it for a long time. That is not acceptable.

Michael Conlon of the Canadian Federation of Students said that the finance minister's budget all but ensured that tuition fees for post-secondary education in Canada would continue to rise. In Nova Scotia our students already pay some of the highest fees in the country. It is time for action before we lose more of our most valuable minds and well-educated people.

As my hon. colleague said, the decision to provide a one time \$2.5 billion supplement to the Canada health and social transfer payment for education and health care over four years falls far short of what was expected by those institutions and what is required to help maintain them. Following the budget announce-

The Budget

ment, the Canadian Medical Association said that the one time \$2.5 billion amount was insufficient to deal with the growing crisis in medicare. With an aging society and rising technological costs, the small cash infusion will not address our health care needs.

• (1640)

According to the CMA, Canada loses approximately 400 doctors a year to the U.S. Calls for a \$6 billion increase in transfer payments over a four year period to help fund much needed new medical technology have been ignored by the government in lieu of the \$2.5 billion announced in the recent budget. The government's failure to address the immediate needs of an ailing health care system simply provides further reasons for doctors to seek better opportunities elsewhere.

We have heard a lot recently about the possibility of having a two tier health care system in Canada. We certainly do not want to see such a system. The federal government is slowly trying to push our provincial governments in that direction because of its serious lack of commitment to the funding of Canada's health care system.

At one time the federal government was contributing to health care at the rate of 50%. Now only 13 cents of every dollar spent on health care in Canada comes from the federal government. Health care in the country is declining and the \$2.5 billion over the next four years will do nothing or very little to rectify this serious situation. Canadians demand a far greater financial commitment to health care than what they have seen thus far from the Liberal government.

Just a few minutes ago I listened to my hon. colleague the secretary of state for rural development talk about rural communities. I represent West Nova which is predominantly a rural community.

On January 21 a severe winter storm hit a stretch of coastline and affected some five wharves between Port Lorne and Delaps Cove. These wharves were severely damaged, wharves that had been neglected over the years by the federal government. They did not have adequate upkeep because of lack of funding. Some of these wharves were damaged beyond repair.

What was the answer to the repair question? When it was asked for emergency relief the government said it was going to repair the wharves within the existing budget instead of providing the needed emergency relief. Wharves that should have been repaired this year and which were on a priority list will now not be repaired because the funds will be diverted to those wharves that were severely damaged.

The government is neglecting our rural communities. I find it difficult when I hear my hon. colleague stand and say he supports

rural communities. It is not so. The Liberals' words say one thing and their actions say something else.

I could go on for days and days about how serious this budget is and how little it does for Canadians, for some of the hardest hit, the poor. The government said it would increase the personal exemption by \$100 from \$7,200 to \$7,300 in one year. In this country those who cannot feed, clothe and house themselves should not be paying tax. That is how I see it.

I could go on but I know my time has expired.

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to the budget today. I would like to speak not of past successes but of opportunity.

The government is poised between this year and next, into the next budget, to make changes that will fundamentally alter the way government operates in its spending practices which will make Canada's civil service one of the most efficient bureaucracies in the world and indeed our spending practices the most efficient in the world.

We are in a difficult time right now as a federal parliament because the winds of change in the provinces are such that cutting spending is all the rage and cutting taxes is all the rage. It puts the Liberals particularly in a dilemma insofar as we continue to believe that there is a role for government in making things better for people in the country.

• (1645)

Canadians have been rightly suspicious over the years, whether it is a Liberal government, a Tory government or an NDP government, whether it is provincial or federal, that often taxpayers' money is not used very efficiently. The answer in the provinces all too often has been simply to cut spending. In my own province of Ontario that has been the typical attitude. The Harris government began with that principle.

I have just had a note passed to me. I would say that I am sharing my time with the hon. member for Halton, Mr. Speaker, in case you were not aware of that.

I remember very clearly that one of the mantras of the provincial Tories was that they would cut spending by 20%. When one talks about hospitals, health care and all that kind of thing, or all kinds of social service NGOs, if spending was cut by 10% across the board it would not be the inefficient ones that would suffer, it would be the efficient ones that would suffer. I know of an NGO in my riding that survived the 20% cut simply by eliminating all of its staff. It retained its administrators.

The answer is not simply to cut spending; the answer is to spend wisely and well. I think that is where we are headed or can be headed as a government.

The Budget

I do not speak for the government. I speak as a member of parliament. My interests are the interests of the country, not simply the interests of my party or my government.

I believe that there is an opportunity now.

I know, for example, that the Standing Committee on Public Accounts has been examining for some time a whole new way of doing accounting. I know and I support this catastrophe of the Minister of Human Resources Development. She wanted to release all of these documents to the public and, naturally, some of the documents were found to be wanting.

The opportunity that presents itself to governments today, and to this government in particular, has been created by the Internet. For the first time ever it is absolutely possible to put all of the documents generated by the bureaucracy on grants and contributions, bidding processes or purchases on the Internet so that the new auditor general is not some official but can be the people of Canada themselves.

I come into this equation in two areas because I have been very interested in trying to bring accountability to non-profit organizations and charities. I have been trying to get legislation which would provide standards of transparency, accountability and reporting. The theme behind that was simply that when organizations send in their tax and financial information forms to Revenue Canada, if the information could be guaranteed to be good, then Revenue Canada could put it on the Internet. Then, when a person came to decide whether they should donate to one charity or another, they could call it up on the Internet and see for themselves how efficiently that organization was running.

I have to say that it was a great disappointment to me that the government did not announce in this budget some movement toward bringing legislated transparency and accountability to charities. However, this principle of getting that information, making sure it is good information and then making it available through the Internet is precisely what we should be doing with all government data that is not of a secret or confidential nature or is not an invasion of privacy. That is enormous.

For instance, in the Department of Human Resources Development every time an organization applies for a grant it should be required to sign a form authorizing the government to release the application form by which it made that grant. Then the people in the community could see who these individuals were and the people in the community would know fast enough whether they were charlatans or people who were responsible and who should be receiving government funds.

I think there is an enormous opportunity, if government seized the opportunity. In a way, I would like to think that I am part of that equation. As a matter of fact, I would like to think that all private

members in the House, the backbenchers and the opposition members, could be part of that equation because I have before the House now, Mr. Speaker, a private member's bill that would complement this whole principle of transparency and making government documents available.

• (1650)

I do not want to digress and advertise my own private member's bill, but it is part of this entire equation of making all government documents which should be reasonably accessible to the public available and then put them on the Internet. What a marvellous, marvellous move that would be.

I have to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I admire what the Minister of Human Resources Development tried to do. She just sort of jumped the gun a bit. What she did was, she said "All right, you can have all of these documents". It is the first time this has ever occurred in which a minister has disclosed everything from a program of grants and contributions.

Inevitably, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be problems. That is inevitable. I do not argue that the opposition should not be pointing out those problems, but it should not just be the Department of Human Resources Development, it should not just be a minister doing it one time, it should happen all the time. It should be constant.

Every time there is a grant or contribution or the government makes a purchase, so long as it is not necessarily secret because of national security or privacy, then it should be available on the Internet. I think that is entirely possible.

I look to the future and I think that if we bring in that type of transparency to government it will create the most efficient bureaucracy in the world and the most efficient spending bureaucracy in the world. Because in the end the quarrel is not that money has been spent on social programs; the quarrel is whether that money is actually getting to the social programs it is supposed to get to and whether it is doing the job it is supposed to do.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that this House of Commons, my colleagues opposite, should join me in trying to bring this to pass, instead of, as has been occurring in the last week or so, blocking a private member's initiative which would benefit all Canadians, which would bring transparency on a scale that is unheard of anywhere in the world.

I have read the American freedom of information act. It is nowhere near as transparent as what would occur with our access to information act if I could get the reforms I proposed in my Bill C-206 forward.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to use my time to advertise what is my own initiative. It is just that I urge on my companions that it is good legislation and I would wish that they, as backbench

The Budget

MPs, would support it. Actually, I have 60 backbench MPs on the Liberal side who support it. We could all take advantage of this opportunity as MPs to change the way government operates, to make it transparent, accountable and effective when it uses taxpayers' dollars.

I say this not only to members of the opposition, but I say it to my own government. The opportunity is in this next year. If we can spend well we can save well.

I believe it is absolutely possible to spend effectively, to do the things we have to do as a government in the economy to make the lives of people better, but we can also save enough to make sure that the debt goes down and we can even save on the taxes. Because in the end it is only Ontario, British Columbia and Newfoundland which have created this incredible example of cutting taxes when they still have a deficit. The key thing, Mr. Speaker, is to cut taxes when you have saved and when you know how to spend, and spend well.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to what my colleague across the way had to say. I want to reflect on what he had to say about transparency and putting all of these things on the Internet. I think that he misses a key point when he makes that suggestion. I have no problem with being transparent. No one would argue with that, but there is a much bigger question that underlies all of this.

If we were to give Canadians the opportunity to look at all of these programs and all of the grants and contributions that are made by government, I wonder whether they would not say "I think I am going to keep my money".

• (1655)

I ask the member, why should money be transferred from people who are running a business efficiently to those who are not?

The government talks about creating jobs, so many jobs with this particular project and so many jobs with that project, but it never says how many jobs are destroyed by taking that money away from Canadians who have worked hard to earn it and transferring it to those who cannot do something properly and efficiently. That is the key question that needs to be answered by the government.

It talks about creating jobs but it never tells us how many are being destroyed by high taxes. I think it is a given that high taxes destroy jobs. What is the hon. member's response to that?

Mr. John Bryden: Mr. Speaker, there are thousands upon thousands of grants and contributions which are made. There are tens of thousands of purchases made by government.

The way the system works now, there are internal checks, but they are not very good because we cannot check internally as effectively as we can check from outside. The only outside checks are done by the auditor general and the occasional media person or MP who makes an access to information request. We have to acknowledge that the access to information law, as it exists now, is not very effective in getting the kind of information we need.

There are thousands and thousands of grants and contributions out there. If a bureaucrat decides to be sleepy at his task, or fails to send a piece of paper, or fails to do anything, the chances of him or her being discovered are absolutely minimal. The Access to Information Act is inadequate and the number of people who are actually looking are few.

However, if every time that bureaucrat had to pass a piece of paper, and that piece of paper became available on the Internet, and somebody could check it, then we would see efficiency. We would see efficiency in the government, in the bureaucracy, that would be unheard of in comparison to any corporation and in comparison to any bureaucracy in the world.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my Alliance colleague was right. When the government takes money away from a taxpayer and gives it to a profitable corporation all of Canada should question that.

Why would the government, in any way, shape or form, give half a million dollars of taxpayers' money to the Wal-Mart corporation to set up so-called jobs in the whip's riding? Why would the government give half a million dollars to an American run corporation that is already, by its own standards, very successful in the commercial market?

Mr. John Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I should say at the beginning that I am no fan of this particular type of program that gives money to corporations of that nature.

However, I should say to the member opposite that the reason he knows about that is because the minister disclosed all of that documentation. That is precisely my argument.

We need to know that, not just as MPs, but the people need to see it as it happens so they can react and say "No, not in my riding, not in my town. Do not give the money to Wal-Mart. Do not give it to the corporations. Give it to my small business". But we cannot see that.

I have had spending in my riding that has taken me completely by surprise. I did not know about it. The only reason I could find out about it was because the minister made those documents available.

What I suggest we need to have happen is that we need to reform the Access to Information Act. We need to make sure that

The Budget

information is produced and is available on the Internet so that every Canadian can become his or her own auditor general.

Mr. Julian Reed (Halton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour to rise to debate the budget. It has been an honour to rise to debate every budget we have had since 1993, since this government came to office.

• (1700)

The House will recall that when the government changed in 1993 we encountered a deficit situation which amounted to \$42 billion. What a difference seven years makes. I am no fan of deficit budgeting. There was a deficit when the Tories took over. In half the time they doubled the debt. It was becoming a travesty. Had the situation not been turned around, there is no doubt the International Monetary Fund would have been looking over our shoulder. I remember one of the first tasks the Minister of Finance was required to perform. He went to New York to calm the fears of Wall Street.

Over that seven years we have succeeded in overcoming the deficits and now, for the third year, are into a surplus situation. I am told it is only the third time since Confederation that there has been a three year run of surplus budgeting. It has changed the whole complexion of governance. It has changed the way we do business, and we have had to learn to do it from an entirely different perspective.

This last budget consisted of an initial thrust into comprehensive tax cutting. We had done a bit in some of the years before for people with lower incomes and so on as we could do it, and rightly so. Now the Minister of Finance has been able to come in with a far broader based tax cut. He has also said that as the country can afford it those tax cuts will increase with the years.

The remarkable thing about it is that unlike our friends in the province of Ontario it was done without maintaining a deficit situation. We have maintained the surplus and we have built a very strong base that will reflect very positively in the immediate years to come.

We are into a new world, a new experience. It is expected that in the next year we will have the second highest growth in the G-7. The prediction is something like 3.8% and that is remarkable because it is not accompanied by inflation. It is not accompanied by those ghosts that sit behind us when we move forward with a strong economy.

Mr. Art Hanger: What ghosts? The ghosts of abuse?

Mr. Julian Reed: I say to my hon. friend the ghost of inflation is probably one of the worst ones. I also want to tell my friend that we have been able to do something else. I am going to defend HRDC because all members need to do is to talk to some of the people who

have been recipients of that money about what it has done for them. Letters of thanks have come in to the offices of members. I would say to members across the way that they have all received money from HRDC.

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Julian Reed: None at all?

An hon. member: None.

Mr. Julian Reed: Fine, I can accept that gentleman's comments, but the other comments are a bit hypocritical because they have been recipients of HRDC funds. I invite them all to go to those recipients. They have a list of whom they are. They should go to those organizations and ask them what the money was used for, where it went.

• (1705)

How many people who are physically handicapped were able to be employed because of the distribution of that money? How many young people were able to experience their first job because of that money? How many people were able to take retraining and move from a very marginal existence into a well paying, permanent job? That is what that money was intended for, and that is where it went.

As the next few months come along that evidence will be falling into place. I am proud to be part of that. Although I must say that the riding of Halton, which is a contributory riding and not a recipient riding, did not receive very much money. We did not qualify for the transitional jobs fund in Halton because we had an unemployment rate that was too low to do so. However, other funding came in to Halton for other kinds of purposes. As the months go on I think all members will receive communications from their ridings and from the recipients saying thanks very much.

I should also remind members who are so critical of the government that their offices spent a lot of time contacting the minister's office at HRDC, pleading with her to speed up the transfer of money. I am rendered speechless when I see members, who were recipients of HRDC money and wanted as much as they could get, stand in the House week after week criticizing the program, all 26 programs or however many there are.

I hope those programs continue, incidentally, and I hope that the less fortunate, the people who sincerely deserve it, are able to get a leg up so that they can enter into the workforce full time and with a decent income.

The budget also did some other things that are not talked about as much and have not been talked about in the debate. There have been \$700 million invested to develop environmental technologies and sustainable practices. Coupled with that there are increases for the Canada Foundation for Innovation by another \$900 million to \$1.9 billion. There are also \$900 million over five years to fund and sustain 2,000 chairs for research excellence at the universities. All

The Budget

these things dovetail together so that the investment in sustainability and in sustainable technologies for the future has really received a boost.

We are in a situation now where I think there is a general acceptance that global warming is a reality. We all see evidence that comes to us every now and again. The most recent one last week was when we learned that the oceans in the last 50 years have risen in temperature by half a degree. We also saw the satellite shot where the big ice shelf in the Antarctic has now broken away. It is twice the size of Prince Edward Island.

These things are cause for great concern, for if the oceans rise one metre hundreds of millions of souls will be displaced and will have to move away. In China the figure is something like 95 million should the oceans rise.

• (1710)

We are looking forward into a new era, and I am pleased to be part of the team that has brought Canada from the brink.

Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the hon. member. He was praising what was in the budget for education. I am wondering if a more substantial approach in the budget for education might have been to give students who are in debt up to their eyeballs a break and maybe allow them to deduct their student loans.

However, the government says it will make it a little easier for those who are getting scholarships or bursaries. That is very commendable, but why not put something in the budget that gets to the core of the problem and allows students who are in debt up to their eyeballs because of the government's approach to cutting education dollars to claim that as a tax deduction?

Mr. Julian Reed: Madam Speaker, I remind my hon. friend about the millennium scholarship fund which is designed to assist students to go to university, especially those who come from families with lower incomes. I am very sympathetic to the real problem the member raised. We are certainly doing everything we can within the limits of the available funding. As the Minister of Finance said, as soon as we can do more we will.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, the hon. member made a comment. He told us to talk to the recipients of grants. Obviously if people are receiving a lot of money they will say it is just great.

I have a question. Why not talk to all the people who are donating the money? What about all the people who have to donate money to that project? Why not talk to them? They are the taxpayers of the entire country. He tells us to talk to the people who

are getting jobs because of it. What about all the people who are having their jobs destroyed because of it?

In my province of Saskatchewan farmers have to move off the land. Their livelihood, their jobs are being destroyed because of high taxation. They have to donate money to these billion dollar boondoggles and they are getting fed up. How about talking to the people donating money and losing their jobs because of mismanagement?

Mr. Julian Reed: Madam Speaker, the citizens of the great riding of Halton are the people who donate the money. We have the honour of having one of the highest per household incomes and therefore the highest levels of taxation in Canada. I talk to the people every election time.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I want to ask the member a question along the same lines. I think my colleague was overly kind when he said the people who are donating. The fact of the matter is that the taxman reaches into our pockets and takes the money. We are considered very bad citizens if we do not fully comply with his request.

I am not against taxation per se. Farmers in western Canada are going bankrupt partially because of the huge tax load and now the added high fuel costs with huge federal taxes. Taxes are killing farmers and this is the money that is being used to presumably create jobs. It is killing thousands of jobs across the country and killing the small business of farming in Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Mr. Julian Reed: Madam Speaker, I was a farmer. It was a non-profit business but it did not start out that way. I have great sympathy for farmers in western Canada and what they are going through. I am not an accountant, but if I were an accountant at tax time, it would seem to me that the taxes farmers pay are input costs that are deductible.

• (1715)

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: No they are not. They are built right in.

Mr. Julian Reed: Which ones are not deductible?

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: Excise tax on fuel.

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I find this debate very interesting and enjoyable. The only thing that confuses me every once and a while is how far away from the facts the hon. members across the way seem to be from time to time.

I wish to address the budget from a principled point of view. It has to do with what exactly is a budget. A budget reveals the values and the priorities of the government. It also reveals, indirectly and directly, the character of the people who wrote or constructed it.

The Budget

I wish to present four very elementary principles of what a budget should do. First, it should be achievable. Second, it should be sustainable. Third, it should help Canadians achieve their goals and objectives. Finally, it should help Canadians realize their dreams.

How did budget 2000 fair on those principles? First, is it achievable? I suppose if interest rates do not rise very much, it is achievable. We will grant that one. Is it sustainable? I would suggest that, no, it is not sustainable unless Canadians are prepared to stop loading onto future generations the expenditures on programs that they enjoy. It may also be achievable if it stops the brain drain by reducing taxes. The way it stands now it will not do that. The taxation regimes are so burdensome that people are taking their money out of Canada and investing it elsewhere. So it is not sustainable.

It will not allow Canadians to achieve their goals and objectives either. I know that more than 50% of the money we earn should be discretionary. If I am to achieve my goals and objectives, I should have discretion over how that money is spent. When the government takes 55% of that then I have lost 55% of my discretion over my money. I cannot achieve the goals and objectives that I want. I cannot own my own home, I cannot give my children the post-secondary education that I want them to have and I cannot have the entrepreneurial application of capital so that businesses can be developed. It will not help Canadians realize their dreams of their children and grandchildren having a better life than the one they enjoy.

The budget fails on at least three of the four principles we talked about.

I asked myself the question: What is the vision of the government? Is it to pay down the debt? A little while ago, the hon. member opposite said that the government was paying down the debt. That is such a nominal amount that if we divide the amount of money that it is putting toward paying down the debt, which is roughly \$3 billion a year, it will take 200 years to pay down the debt. That is a 200 year vision to pay down the debt.

The other question I have is: Is the government's vision to reduce taxes? I looked at it and it sounded really good. Over five years we will have a reduction of \$58 billion in tax cuts. Notice that it is not a reduction in taxes. It is a cut in taxes. What it did not say was what the increase would be in taxes over that same time period.

Let me give members a specific example. EI premiums will go down but CPP premiums will go up. Guess what? The EI premiums went down less than the CPP premiums went up. The end result is that the individual pays more in taxes than before the cuts took place. That is some cut.

What would the Canadian Alliance do? I could criticize the budget in some many different ways but I will not do that. The

Canadian Alliance is committed to principled and substantive fiscal responsibility, in particular tax relief. How do I know that? I know it by solution 17.

Solution 17 is a single rate tax. I will not go through all the particular features and specifics of that but I will deal with a few of them and some of the benefits.

What hon. members opposite and what we as colleagues in the Canadian Alliance are saying is that we want specifics but we also want to know why we have those characteristics. The first of those is to increase the base tax exemption to \$10,000. That would take some 1.9 million taxpayers off the tax roll. We would have a single marginal tax rate of 17% and we would eliminate the 5% surtax. What would that do for Canadians? Right off the top, it would eliminate the discrimination of single income families versus dual income families. Why should a single income family be penalized and the advantage given to a dual income family? It is unfair, it is inequitable and it does not build strong families.

• (1720)

There is another part to this. It will also help to reduce the brain drain. It will probably not stop it, because taxes are still too high, but it will at least help to discourage the brain drain. It will also encourage the entrepreneurial spirit of young people. It will allow individuals to apply their capital to build enterprises here in this country and develop the skill and talent that will make more money and increase the economy.

We will have a universal child care deduction of \$3,000 per child. What will this do? It will support the freedom of choice. If there was one thing that democracy did it was to give us freedom of choice. We want that. Here is a tax plan that will do that. It will leave the money in the hands of the parents so that they can choose the kind of child care that they believe is best for their children, not some kind of state run system where the government tells them this is where they should send their kids.

That particular tax plan also suggests that the RRSP contributions should be increased to \$16,500. What is the benefit of that? The benefit of that is that it improves the incentive for individuals to look after their own retirement. What is the great benefit of this? It makes it totally and completely transferable and we do not have all of these complications of succession duties or of transfer of funds from one generation to another.

It has all the advantages for which we could possibly dream. It has the general corporate tax reduced from 28% to 21%, seven percentage points. That is a tremendous increase and allows these businesses to hire more people. That is the kind of job creation scheme we should have. We should not be doling out money. We should be giving it to entrepreneurs so they can develop the kind of expansion in their business and hire the people that they need. That is the kind of tax plan we need. The small business tax was reduced from 12% to 10%. It is a similar set of arguments, only this time for

The Budget

small business. That is what the Canadian Alliance would do, and it is solution 17.

How does it differ from budget 2000? First, it differs remarkably by being specific, clear and sustainable. That is the big difference. It will give to Canadians the tools whereby they can achieve the goals and objectives they have for themselves and for their children and grandchildren. It will allow them to build and to realize some of the dreams that they have.

Some people say that we are dreaming in technicolour and that it cannot possibly ever be because solution 17 is not that good of a plan. Let me read to the House the conclusion by the people who put together the examination of that plan. This was not a group of Reformers who are now Canadian Alliance. It was not our people who did it. This was an independent group, the same group that does the numbers for the Government of Canada, the Liberal government. The conclusion reads:

The tax reduction proposals... are well focused on the needs of Canadians today. They expand the economy, and most powerfully: personal disposable income, consumption and our standard of living. They create jobs. By lowering the marginal tax rates they are particularly effective in stimulating work effort, and stemming the brain drain and other productivity enhancing features. By powerfully reducing the level of personal income tax, particularly for Canadians of average and above average income, they are well directed at providing a more competitive tax environment in Canada relative to the U.S.

These are not my words and they are not the words of the Canadian Alliance. These are the words of an independent group that looked at that plan and said that it will work. We should listen.

The tax reduction proposals of the Reform Party, now the Canadian Alliance, are affordable. If all the tax reduction proposals are introduced as a combined package over the 2001 to 2004 or 2005 period, there would still be a fiscal surplus in each and every year. That is very significant and we should pay very careful attention to it.

It is time for a change. It is necessary to recognize that there is an alternative to the Government of Canada today, a government that is there to build an achievable and sustainable budget that will indeed reduce taxes and leave in the hands of the taxpayers the disposition of their disposable income so that they can achieve the goals and objectives for themselves and for their children.

• (1725)

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Madam Speaker, I agree with many of the comments my hon. colleague made in his speech.

We do not see the division that we had perhaps in 1988 that actually created the growth in our economy with respect to the free trade agreement. As I mentioned earlier in my speech, our trade with the Americans was around \$90 billion and it is now \$260 billion.

If we had any kind of a downturn in the economy, particularly in the American economy, does the hon. member think our economic fundamentals are in order now? Do we really have a plan to actually reduce taxes so that we can ensure that we are still competitive here in Canada? Is there a plan for us to actually pay down the debt?

Mr. Werner Schmidt: Mr. Speaker, there is as far as the Canadian Alliance is concerned. I think the underlying assumption that the hon. member has made is a very significant one. He is almost implying that the Canadian economy could exist independent of the American economy or independent of any other nation in the world.

The world has changed dramatically in the last while. It is now a global economy. A major part of our economic benefit comes from trade with other nations. The major part of that is of course the American economy, the United States, our excellent neighbours to the south. We benefit from them and they benefit from us. It is a mutual and beautiful symbiotic relationship.

If there was a downturn in the American economy would it affect us? Of course it would. It is simply nonsensical to suggest that it would not affect us. Do we have a plan to deal with that situation? I wish I had an hour to tell the hon. member about that, but I will tell him how much the output costs are of every job creating scheme that has been created by his government the Conservative Party, when it was in power, or when the Liberals were in power. Does he realize that for every tax dollar that is given away in the form of job creation schemes, there is an output cost? For payroll taxes, it is 27 cents. For every dollar that is put out in a job creation scheme, 27 cents is lost in output costs. For the sales tax it is roughly 17 cents. For capital costs it is \$1.15 for every \$1.

Is it any wonder that people are discouraged when they see all these millions of dollars going there? In fact, Jim Mirrlees, who developed the optimum tax theory, has clearly indicated that by applying that to the Canadian billion dollar HRDC system it actually costs the Canadian economy \$529 million in order to give away \$1 billion.

What is the net gain? It is not nearly as much as what the government is suggesting. It kills jobs in other places. It kills expansion and it does not last.

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened to the member's speech and I disagreed with it almost from the beginning to the end.

I believe very strongly in the balanced approach. He knows well that the economy depends on all sorts of things. I believe in paying down the debt. We have paid down \$20 billion in market debt and almost \$10 billion in internal debt. I believe in tax cuts. We have made tax cuts once we had balanced the books.

The Budget

I do strongly believe in reinvestment. Government has a tremendous role which Canadians support in our society. This government is reinvesting in Canadians, both Canadians who are making money and in Canadians who are at risk, are having great difficulties or are in ill health. It is a balanced approach.

The member keeps using a term that I do not understand. What is this Canadian Alliance he keeps speaking about?

Mr. Werner Schmidt: Madam Speaker, that is absolutely tremendous. I would love to enlighten the hon. member as to what this Canadian Alliance is. I will tell him what the Canadian Alliance is. The Canadian Alliance is the alternative to the Liberal government. This is a brand new party that has just been created. It received 91.9% support in Calgary last Saturday night, March 25, if the hon. member needs to know the date. That is the Canadian Alliance.

With regard to the balanced approach, yes, I am totally involved in the balanced approach. Let us pay down the debt so we have a balanced budget.

• (1730)

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to speak to the budgetary policy of the government.

I note that many members today have said that Canada's growth in regard to the other G-7 countries is very good, in the neighbourhood of the third best I believe. I certainly agree that the economy is doing well. I would probably disagree with the government as to how much is a direct result of its actions. Let us look at this growth and what the government does with the money that comes to it which is to be used for programs and other things in Canada.

Let us start with health care. It is my understanding that health care is funded at about a 1994-95 level. Thousands and thousands of Canadians are left standing in waiting lines because there is no MRI machine, bed or some other facility for them to receive the medical treatment they need. Education also seems to be underfunded. Why?

On a first nations reserve in my riding of Selkirk—Interlake, the Fairford Indian reserve, why are hundreds of people living in construction trailers? We could fly out there today and see people living in construction trailers with no bathrooms, at eight or ten degrees below zero. If there is money in the government and it is running massive surpluses, why are people living in construction trailers? I do not understand it.

This may be part of the answer to my second question. The Corbière decision referred to off reserve aboriginal people having the right to vote in reserve elections. Why is the money going to the

assembly of chiefs to look at this issue instead of the very people that are off the reserves and need the funding in order to exercise that franchise on the reserves?

It shows that the spending is wasteful and the government has its priorities wrong. That first nation which I spoke of is a real sad situation. Church services are currently being held in a small building because the original church burned down.

Those are sad commentaries on how the government is handling its budget. I will now go on with some straightforward suggestions and programs it could be utilizing.

Agriculture has some real bright spots but it also has some problems. It is the government's responsibility in dealing with the budget to deal with problems. The 2000 budget certainly did not offer any long term plan for the future of farming in Canada. There was an announcement of \$400 million between the federal government and the provinces for Manitoba and Saskatchewan. That had been announced previous to the budget but it was announced again so the government could get double mileage out of it.

The government left out every other province and farmers are hurting in the other provinces as well. At least Alberta had the backbone and common sense to say that it could not leave its farmers unprotected from foreign subsidies. In place of the federal government taking some action regarding the farmers, the Alberta government said it was going to pay out \$4.29 an acre and give the farmers some help. This was done in time for spring seeding. The money is already on the way.

The budget failed to do a number of things. It failed to provide meaningful or timely emergency compensation to farmers that were suffering from other countries' trade distorting subsidies. That is something that could have been done.

• (1735)

Of the previous money the government had already made out under AIDA, that was a fine, good program in the that it had money in it but the delivery has been a disaster. Around 25% or 26% of that money has been delivered when the promise was that for 1998-99 it would all be delivered in time for seeding in the previous year and this spring. We still have not seen that.

The ongoing scandal at the federal human resources department is another example that the government does not know how to deliver program money. When it wants to use money for political purposes, it can simply shovel the money out the door.

The government has an opportunity in a budget to reduce taxes. In regard to agriculture, the federal excise tax on gasoline could have been reduced. It is four cents. Farms particularly in western Canada but also in other parts of the country have large fuel bills. Fuel is one of their major expenses.

The Budget

In Ontario just south of here the Oxford County Federation of Agriculture has estimated that farmers will pay between 48% and 50% more on their fuel costs than they did a year ago. In my riding of Selkirk—Interlake we were buying fuel at approximately 28 cents to 29 cents a litre. When I last looked at a bill a few weeks ago it is up in the range of 40 cents to 45 cents. The hurt that is being felt in Oxford county is being felt right across the country.

The Liberal government does not quite get it and its individual members of parliament do not understand. Last Sunday the member for Oxford was quoted as saying that a reduction in fuel taxes would do little to help farmers so just leave the taxes on. I do not know how that rationale applies, “We cannot help you very much so we will not help you at all”. It is time to say give me a break because the government should be doing everything possible, even the little things, to help farmers, aboriginal people and people with low incomes. There are thousands of places where the government could be doing a much better job.

The government continues to charge user fees. The auditor general has indicated time and time again that he is not sure who the beneficiary is or who should actually be charged a user fee. In the cases of the ones being applied against agriculture, they are not being reduced. They are continuing to be applied and that further reduces the income of farmers who are having a tough time.

Fighting high foreign subsidies is also something the government could be doing. In our trade with France for instance, it has a surplus of about \$2.5 billion over what Canada exports to that country. It would seem to me that is a fairly strong negotiating tool that we could use in our negotiations with the European Union and France to get them to lower their subsidies.

The standing committee on agriculture had an interesting presentation from the National Farmers Union. Its economic theory sounded a lot like that of the New Democratic Party. It does not believe that subsidies have any effect on the amount of grain that would be produced by a farmer. I do not think even Liberal members believe that economic theory. It was a pretty interesting presentation.

I can only sum up by saying that the government does not seem to be listening to farmers. I will conclude by saying what farmers do want. They want a voluntary Canadian Wheat Board. They want a commercial contracts based grain transportation system. They want simple, predictable long term safety net disaster programs. They want good health care and good education. They want a future for their children in agriculture.

● (1740)

Farmers do not want the Firearms Act, Bill C-68 of years ago. They do not want the Canadian Wheat Board allocating rail cars causing inefficiencies. They do not want the Liberal government ruining trade relations with the United States thereby driving down their incomes even further.

As a Canadian Alliance member, I am really pleased to be in the House serving the constituents of Selkirk—Interlake.

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member mentioned taxes on gasoline and I know he did not mean the GST because farmers get it back as a rebate. Excise tax on diesel is four cents a litre, the lowest in the G-8 countries. It is 10 cents a litre on gasoline. Because this is a business cost, farmers get some of that back. I would support lowering these taxes.

The member misquoted one of my colleagues. I see the problem this way. Frank McKenna took three cents a litre off gasoline a few years ago resulting in the price going down for a day or two. The following week it was back up at the same level. The three cents which had been taken off was not going to the consumers but it was going to the oil companies which were already making too much money.

I wonder if the member would ask his provincial government to regulate the price of gasoline in his province in such a way that the taxes that were cut by the federal government would genuinely flow not to the oil companies but to the farmers whom he claims to represent.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom: Madam Speaker, certainly the federal excise tax of four cents is on Canadian farm fuel. The hon. member asked about the G-8 countries. The farm subsidies in the G-8 countries are much higher and as a result, the cost of their fuel is incorporated into those subsidies whereas ours is not. We need to eliminate the four cents.

In regard to regulating fuel, I think the member is going back to the old days of Pierre Trudeau and the wage and price controls. We remember the fiasco that caused. The big government of the Pierre Trudeau era is not the kind of regulation we want in this country, a controlled economy which does not work.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Madam Speaker, does the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake and his new party believe that the dismantling of the Crow rate was a good thing or a bad thing for farmers?

Mr. Howard Hilstrom: Madam Speaker, the dismantling of the Crow rate has been a good thing for farmers. What was bad was the Liberal government reduced subsidies after getting rid of the Crow rate in other areas much faster than our competitors did. The reduction in the subsidies was a big problem.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I have in my office a photocopy of a cheque stub belonging to a young farmer who lives just north of me. This young man took off some grain during damp weather. Two semi trucks arrived from the grain terminal and he received 61 cents a bushel cash advance. By the time the trucking and the

The Budget

freight was paid this individual picked up a cheque for \$1.47. That is as true as I am standing here.

I ask my colleague from Selkirk—Interlake, if this present trend continues in the west, what will it take to save it from complete abandonment of the agriculture industry?

• (1745)

Mr. Howard Hilstrom: Madam Speaker, part of the answer lies in the answer I was giving to the member from the NDP. When the Crow rate disappeared, farmers in western Canada saw a big livestock industry being created with our feed grains being used on the prairies.

We are raising a lot of the hogs and cattle that were formerly being raised in Ontario and Quebec due to western Canada having the competitive advantage and eastern Canada having the advantage of the Crow rate to get our cheap feed grain. Now we have the packing plants and the production in the west, which is helping. Ontario and Quebec still have a lot of that production, which is also good.

With respect to the current farm income crisis, certainly the government should be supporting our farmers closer to the levels at which our foreign competitors, the U.S. and EU, are supporting theirs.

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it has been a delight to listen to some of this rather curious debate.

This is either the last day of the Reform Party or the first day of the Canadian Alliance, however one wants to cut it.

When we talk about the budget and saving money, I have a couple of questions to put forward in a rhetorical sense and members opposite can decide whether they wish to respond.

I would like to know, for example, if the former leader of the Reform/Canadian Alliance Party is sleeping in Stornoway tonight. I am not trying to be difficult. I would not want to see that man and his lovely wife out on the streets of Ottawa. Lord knows, we have a homeless problem and we do not want to exacerbate it. Is the moving van in the driveway and is the new leader of the Canadian Alliance moving in? Maybe they are all going to bunk together and have a pyjama party. That is a possibility.

There is another question which has not been addressed, which impacts on the fiscal responsibility of the government and opposition parties. Who has been paying the salary of the individual who is the immediate past leader of the Reform Party? Who has been paying the salary, which is not only an MP's salary but is also a salary that is afforded the Leader of the Opposition, along with a limousine, which of course he was not going to use? We remember

that. With the limousine there is a chauffeur. That is why they call them limos, I am told.

Who has been paying for all that for the past three months as that individual travelled the nation to sell his vision of a new united alternative? In all fairness, the party which stands in this place and purports to hold the feet of the government to the fire on fiscal and financial matters should be responsible enough to tally up the bill for living in Stornoway, that illustrious bingo hall down the road, and for using the limousine for the past three months while the member openly campaigned from sea to sea to sea for his own purposes, to further his own career.

What about all the staff time? Was his staff working in the leader's office, concentrating on the business of parliament, of a member of parliament or of the Leader of the Opposition? Or, were they in some surreptitious manner helping this individual to sell his so-called vision?

I wish that one day we could turn the tables and have someone from this side of the House ask a question of the Leader of the Opposition. I would like to ask him to explain what I suspect would be hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars spent on campaigning to bury the old Reform Party and somehow launch the new.

• (1750)

An hon. member: There is the real boondoggle.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: That is right. There is the real boondoggle. Good line. I wish I had thought of it.

Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Don Valley West.

Another point that needs to be looked at, once we get over the fiscal situation, are the principles. Just a short time ago a member opposite stood to talk about principles. It seems to me that the Canadian Alliance and principles is an oxymoron. Or, could it be that its members have discarded their support of the National Rifle Association and Charlton Heston? Or, could it be that while they buried the Reform Party, they buried that policy which calls for the elimination of any form of subsidy to the Canadian farmer? Is that possible? Have they actually gone into the shower and rid themselves of all of those so-called principles and policies? I think not.

Could it be that they are somehow hoping to ride into town on the wave of the new Reverend Day, who will come here with guns blazing, shouting his particular brand of political right wing extremism and the Canadian public will forget about everything they have said in the past few years?

The Budget

Mr. Ken Epp: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As a member of the finance committee, I would say that we are here to discuss the budget. I would really like to ask this member to be relevant to the debate.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The hon. member has somewhat of a point. I would ask the hon. member to keep his speech on the budget.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Madam Speaker, I can understand that the members opposite do not want me discussing the spending habits of their former leader. I do not mind the fact that they would raise some concern about that. In relationship to this budget, could it be that the newest baby born in this place has somehow changed its spots? I think not.

Let us talk about health care. I do not care what we want to call it, but we have a party which clearly would abandon and scrap the Canada Health Act. If that would not have an impact on the budget—

An hon. member: That is a lie.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: The member says that is a lie. The former leader of the former Reform Party who used to occupy those benches has called for the scrapping of the Canada Health Act without any kind of plan or explanation as to what it would be replaced with. I can tell members what it would be replaced with. It would be replaced with a privatized, U.S. style health care system which the Prime Minister, the Minister of Health and this government would not stand for. We could look at delivery mechanisms.

What I find really interesting is the confusion of members opposite of all parties. I do not want to single out members of the fifth party. It has been purported that the only safe seat is occupied by the member for Fundy—Royal. That was probably true before his leader opened his mouth in support of some privatization of health care coming from western Canada. That might have been true before the divisions in his party occurred when his leader did not support the clarity bill, one of the finest and clearest pieces of legislation ever put through this place. And yet other members over there did not agree with their leader. We can understand their confusion.

Let us talk about health care. This government is committed. The CHST payments have an established floor of a \$11.5 billion. Members opposite were crying for nothing more than tax cuts leading up to the last budget. What happened? After we set the floor at \$11.5 billion, after we provided \$58 billion in tax relief, after we completely eliminated the \$42 billion deficit left to us by the great legacy of the Conservative Party, after we invested in science and technology, created new seats in universities for our future, worked with our youth, helped in retraining, worked with

people who were unemployed—after we did all of those things—we also provided tax cuts.

● (1755)

Then what happened? They stood and said “You have not transferred enough to health care”.

We put an additional \$2.5 billion on the table for health care. Guess what? We found out that last year, when we put an additional \$3.5 billion on the table for health care, the provinces of Quebec and Ontario chose not to use that money. They left it sitting in a trust account, wisely invested I am sure.

I do not understand. The people in my province and in my riding do not understand how they could eliminate beds in hospitals, how they could fill up emergency departments, how they could continually cry for more money to be given to health care, and then it comes out that they have not even spent the money that was allocated to them.

If anyone over there thinks that the government is about to write blank cheques for anything, they are sadly mistaken. The health care system must be accountable. It must be accessible to all, as we know, and the government will ensure that happens. However, we will not do it by simply throwing money at a problem without a clear direction with all health ministers in the country, from all provinces and territories, sitting down with our health minister and working out a deal to ensure that we have sustainable, affordable, accessible health care for generations to come.

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to the hon. member’s speech. His speech was very indicative of what we saw in the terrible budget that was tabled a few weeks back.

During essentially 70% of his speech he never uttered the words “tax cut”. When the rest of the industrialized world is taking giant leaps to reduce taxes, the government is taking baby steps and jeopardizing this country’s competitiveness well into the future.

When will the government grow up and learn what a tax cut really is?

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Madam Speaker, it is really interesting to get a lecture from a member of the Conservative Party on tax cuts and fiscal management. We know that the former leader of that party, the former Prime Minister and his government, introduced the GST. We know that. We understand that the Conservatives did that. We understand that they introduced the excise tax on gasoline. We understand that they did that.

At the same time, we understand that while the Conservatives want to stand and cheer on some of their accomplishments, they left office with an overdraft of \$42 billion, with record debt, with an inability for the government to have any flexibility to deal with

The Budget

its fiscal program without making serious changes in the relationships that existed with everyone in the country.

This government bit the bullet. Now we are rewarding Canadians for their hard work by making those tax cuts.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Madam Speaker, again I listened intently to my colleague from the Liberal Party. He quotes numbers like \$2.5 billion for health care. The reality is that \$2.5 billion announced in the budget is for health care, education and other social programs over a four year period. It is not just destined for health care.

If he is convinced that the health care announcement which the government made is so positive, why is every premier and territorial leader in the country upset and why is every other person who has ever accessed health care in the country, who has used home care and so on, upset with the Liberal government?

Several members on the other side, the Atlantic caucus as they call it, produced a document called "Catching the Wave". In that document they called upon the government to introduce a shipbuilding policy, and I notice that the budget completely left that out.

• (1800)

On Wednesday we will be having a vote on Bill C-213 from the Bloc Quebecois. We will be initiating that. Will the hon. member be supporting the other Liberal members of his caucus in supporting a very important initiative for shipbuilding policy in the country? The budget certainly was not inclusive in that regard.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Madam Speaker, the member opposite knows full well that a budget is a document that shows leadership and gives direction for policies. He is talking about a specific issue that would have to do with economic development. The government has led the way in terms of economic development.

I want to respond to the hon. member. I am not sure what his question really was because I heard him taking the opportunity to bash us again on health care and then saying that was not his question. Let us be clear. The government set the level of transfer payments at \$11.5 billion. We added \$2.5 billion to it. We are committed to a sustainable health care program without a doubt, but we will not simply open the vault and write a blank cheque. That is not what the Canadian public wants.

While I am at it, let me suggest to the member that there is no one responsible in the country who would suggest that somehow the provincial governments should wash their hands of their responsibility as taxing authorities with relation to health care. They cannot have it both ways. They cannot take transfers from the federal treasury, invest them in some kind of savings account and

then cry poor to the federal government. The member opposite might want to make political mileage out of that, but the Canadian people will not be fooled because they know better.

Mr. John Godfrey (Don Valley West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I take this opportunity to talk a bit about a subject which relates to some of the previous interventions. For example, the member for Selkirk—Interlake talked about the poor condition of aboriginal families in his province. Those aboriginal people have children who are in even worse condition, so my subject is the fate and the presence of children in the most recent budget.

There were those of us both within the government caucus and across the way who agitated and worked for a children's and families' budget to be the theme of this year's millennium budget. I am looking at the hon. member for Shefford as one of the allies in this cause. In some ways we were a little disappointed. We did not get the package deal we wanted. However, let me tell the House what we did get and what we hoped to get. Part of the function of a budget speech is not only to look back to the budget but to look forward to the next budget, to the great unfinished work we have before us.

Those of us who agitate and work on behalf of children and their families see that the children and their families need two things. They need more income but they also need support at the community level with services. I particularly talk about the case of parents with young pre-school children.

What was good about the budget from the point of view of child and family policy was that we focused on three matters of income. First, we reduced taxes which put more disposable income in the hands of families with young children. Second, because we wanted to make a statement that the early years are the most important years, we extended the parental benefit system from six months to a year for those children who are born after December 31, 2000. Third, we increased the amount available for the child tax credit and the national child benefit system.

All those things are important because they put more disposable income in the hands of families with young children, but disposable income alone will not be the answer to what families need.

• (1805)

What families need in their daily lives is for there to be a system of support at the community level. Whatever choices they may make in the workplace, whether they choose to work inside or outside the home, and whatever degree of risk their children may or may not be exposed to, the community will be there for them.

With the change in family life over the last 30 years we know that the traditional role of community fulfilled by informal networks has disappeared. With 70% of Canadian women of child

The Budget

bearing age working either part time or full time, we know that neighbourhoods have changed.

It was therefore interesting to look at the unfinished work of the budget, the first social project of the 21st century for this parliament, and the following words of the finance minister in his speech:

That is why federal and provincial governments agreed to develop a national children's agenda, to expand the capacity of governments, voluntary organizations and our communities to provide the services and support upon which so many of our families and their children rely.

He pointed to the hope of the government for a national action plan to be arrived at by December of this year, with provincial governments on a system of support services at the community level to help young children and their families.

This will be the first great test of the social union framework agreement. It will require the provinces and the federal government to sit down and work out what a national action plan would mean that would allow communities to access an early childhood development services fund to do a better job in filling in the gaps, which we all know to be present in our communities, if we are in the business of raising young children.

This will be an extraordinarily important and difficult operation. I hope we arrive at such an agreement but it will require the agreement of the provinces. It will require the support of communities to show us what they would do with the money. It will require the support of parents in whatever situation they find themselves to put pressure on us as politicians to do it. In turn, I hope it will trigger in the next budget a fund for community development services for our youngest children.

This will not be an easy matter, but what I find so heartening is that within this caucus and across parliament there are people who are dedicated to improving the lives of children and their families.

All of us understand that the magic of a democratic society rests in its civil society, in its neighbourhoods and communities. The family may be the building block upon which we construct family policy without understanding the magic of community. Why is it that some communities do a better job in preparing young children for school and making them confident about their future? Why is it that other communities with the same or more income do not do such a good job? It goes beyond income. It goes to the matter of social cohesion. It goes to the things which will overcome income if we do it right.

You have in your constituency, Mr. Speaker, a community which does this job. Port Colborne is an example of an area which goes beyond income to produce a kind of woveness. Our challenge as we look to the future budget is to support such communities. The federal government and the provinces should sit down together on a national action plan that will put in place the things families need,

whether it is child care, parenting resources, parenting courses, drop-in centres, playgrounds, nutrition programs, and in particular nutrition programs for expectant mothers because that is when so much crucial brain development takes place.

We need to put in place a system so that every family knows where to find the support it needs and we do not have mothers living in isolation, cut off from the community. We need to do it in a way which recognizes the character of every Canadian community. If we do our job well we reduce the risks all Canadian children experience.

• (1810)

What is so terrifying about our situation? It is true that poverty is a major risk factor for Canadian children and that 40% of poor children experience emotional or learning difficulties when they are in school. It is also true that 20% of the best off children in the country also experience those risks. There are more middle class children with emotional and learning difficulties in school than poor children because the middle class is so much bigger.

My plea is for all of us as we look to next year's budget to understand that we have a great piece of work ahead of us in working toward a national action plan to provide services at the community level for Canada's children. If we do our job right, this may be the greatest thing for which all of us will ultimately be remembered.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Liberals promise a future for our children and for health care. Yet they still have not been able to maintain their 1993 promise on the day care concern across the country. They also failed to break their promise on the GST.

On the child tax credit, which they talked an awful lot about, they never put in strict guidelines to say that provinces could not claw that money back. This happens now in my province. My fear is that with the additional money through the child tax credit again the province of Nova Scotia will claw that money back because the federal government refuses to tell the province that under no circumstances can that money be clawed back. I would like the hon. member's comments on that.

Mr. John Godfrey: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may be surprised to know that I agree with him on two issues. Some of us who ran in the 1993 election and took the promise of a national child care strategy seriously do not consider that promise stale dated. Some of us believe it is an ideal toward which we should be working.

We also understand it is only part of a bundle of services that have to be undertaken at the community level. We do not restrict ourselves to the vision of a national child care strategy, though it would be central to the piece I have described on community.

The Budget

With regard to the clawback provision and the looseness of the reinvestment framework strategy for the national child benefit, I agree with him again. Whatever else we do in our national action plan we must make sure that a kind of discipline is imposed on ourselves and on the provinces. That discipline will come through the social union framework agreement when we allow ourselves to look at outcomes, to be held accountable to the Canadian public and to make outcomes like school readiness or birth weight, for example, part of the whole package in the accountability regime. We are not as far apart as he might have thought.

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, one part of the speech I did not pick up was actually mentioned by a couple of members. The government has allocated more revenues with respect to the environment. We all know that the environment was the sixth largest department when we were in government. Now it is the very smallest, the 21st largest.

Was this initiative, this little tidbit of cash, put in place to assist the government in passing its first piece of environmental legislation of its own? Is that why we had a bit of an augmentation in the environmental budget?

Mr. John Godfrey: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to weave the environmental piece back into the story of children by pointing out that in the budget we have allocated money, as the hon. member suggested, for the environmental health piece.

Which are the most vulnerable populations in terms of environmental health? It is very young children and very old people. Anybody who wishes to undertake a family or child based policy, as the hon. member suggested, has to take a horizontal view of all these questions and issues. We understand that if we do a survey of government departments whose policies have an impact on young children, we could easily find 16 or 17 including the Department of the Environment.

When we undertake these great challenges for the 21st century, the challenge will be to take traditional line governments and traditional orders of government between the provinces and the feds and ask how in these cross-cutting issues we can develop a full policy which makes sense in a holistic way, which takes into account the environmental dimensions of a children's policy or the childhood dimensions of an environmental policy. The two are inextricably linked.

• (1815)

The Speaker: It being 6.15 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the amendment now before the House.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1845)

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1220)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman
Chatters
Crête
de Savoye
Doyle
Duceppe
Epp
Gilmour
Grewal
Hanger
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Lebel
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Morrison
Obhrai
Picard (Drummond)
Ritz
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Turp

Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Brien
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duncan
Gauthier
Goldring
Guimond
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Konrad
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark
Mayfield
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Muise
Penson
Price
Rocheleau
Schmidt
St-Jacques
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Williams —63

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad

Alcock
Assadourian

Government Orders

Augustine	Axworthy
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepolo
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Galloway
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Iftody
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lill
Limoges	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marleau	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Julien	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—151	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

CANADIAN INSTITUTES OF HEALTH RESEARCH ACT

The House resumed from March 23 consideration of Bill C-13, an act to establish the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, to repeal the Medical Research Council Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions on the report stage amendments to Bill C-13. The question is on Motion No. 1.

[Translation]

The division on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 5 to 7, 11, 18, 23 and 24.

● (1850)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1221)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	de Savoye
Debien	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Gauthier
Guimond	Lebel
Marchand	Ménard
Picard (Drummond)	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp —23

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Caplan

Government Orders

Carroll
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Clouthier
 Collette
 Copps
 Cummins
 Desjarlais
 Dhaliwal
 Discepola
 Dromisky
 Duhamel
 Easter
 Epp
 Folco
 Gilmour
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
 Graham
 Grewal
 Guarnieri
 Harb
 Harvey
 Hill (Macleod)
 Hilstrom
 Itody
 Johnston
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keys
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Konrad
 Lastewka
 Lee
 Lill
 Longfield
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Malhi
 Mancini
 Mark
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Mayfield
 McDonough
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McTeague
 Meredith
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Mitchell
 Muise
 Myers
 Nystrom
 O'Reilly
 Pagtakhan
 Parrish
 Penson
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Proctor
 Proulx
 Redman
 Richardson
 Ritz
 Robinson
 Saada
 Sekora
 Sgro
 Solomon
 St. Denis
 St-Julien
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Strahl
 Telegdi
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Volpe
 Wasylcia-Leis
 Wilfert
 Wood—189

Casson
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Chatters
 Coderre
 Comuzzi
 Cullen
 Davies
 DeVillers
 Dion
 Doyle
 Drouin
 Duncan
 Eggleton
 Finlay
 Gallaway
 Godfrey
 Goldring
 Gray (Windsor West)
 Grose
 Hanger
 Harvard
 Herron
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Hubbard
 Jennings
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
 Knutson
 Kraft Sloan
 Lavigne
 Leung
 Limoges
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Manley
 Marleau
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 McCormick
 McGuire
 McNally
 McWhinney
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Minna
 Morrison
 Murray
 Nault
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Obhrai
 Paradis
 Patry
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Price
 Proud
 Provenzano
 Reed
 Riis
 Robillard
 Rock
 Schmidt
 Serré
 Shepherd
 Speller
 St-Jacques
 Stewart (Brant)
 Stoffer
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Wappel
 Whelan
 Williams

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 5 to 7, 11, 18, 23 and 24 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 9.

• (1855)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent to apply the result of the vote just taken to Motion No. 9 and to Motions Nos. 12, 13, 14, 20, 35, 46 and 15, all under the name of the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in such a fashion?

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening will be voting no on this motion.

The Speaker: It is not necessary to apply in this fashion so we will not go through that. Is it agreed to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1222*)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
 Bergeron
 Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
 Brien
 Crête
 Debien
 Duceppe
 Guimond
 Marchand
 Picard (Drummond)
 Sauvageau
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Bellehumeur
 Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Bigras
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
 de Savoye
 Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
 Gauthier
 Lebel
 Ménard
 Rocheleau
 St-Hilaire
 Turp —23

NAYS

Members

Adams
 Assad
 Augustine
 Bailey
 Bakopanos
 Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bennett

Alcock
 Assadourian
 Axworthy
 Baker
 Barnes
 Bélair
 Bellemare
 Benoit

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

Government Orders

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Cummins	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Galloway
Gilmour	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal	Grose
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hubbard
Iftody	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Price
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Ritz	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Sada	Schmidt
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault

Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert
Wood—189

Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Williams

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

(The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1223)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Crête
Debien
Duceppe
Guimond
Marchand
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bigras
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gauthier
Lebel
Ménard
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Turp —23

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Cadman
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Cummins
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Duhamel

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bryden
Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Duncan

*Government Orders**(Division No. 1224)*

Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Galloway
Gilmour	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal	Grose
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hubbard
Iftody	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Price
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Ritz	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Schmidt
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Williams
Wood—189	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

(The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was negated on the following division:)

Asselin
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Crête
Debien
Duceppe
Guimond
Marchand
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Belanger
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Cadman
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Cummins
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Epp
Folco
Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Grewal
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Iftody
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lastewka
Lee

YEAS

Members

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bigras
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gauthier
Lebel
Ménard
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Turp —23

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bryden
Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Davies
De Villers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Duncan
Eggleton
Finlay
Galloway
Godfrey
Goldring
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Hanger
Harvard
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung

Government Orders

Lill	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Price
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Ritz	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Schmidt
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Williams
Wood—189	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

(The House divided on Motion No. 14, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1225)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Bigas)
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigas
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	de Savoye
Debien	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Gauthier
Guimond	Lebel

Marchand
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Ménard
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Turp —23

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Belanger
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Cadman
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
Cummins
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Epp
Folco
Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Grewal
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Iftody
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Muise

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bryden
Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Duncan
Eggleton
Finlay
Galloway
Godfrey
Goldring
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Hanger
Harvard
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McGuire
McNally
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Murray

Government Orders

Myers
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Ritz
Robinson
Saada
Sekora
Sgro
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert
Wood—189

Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Obhrai
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Schmidt
Serré
Shepherd
Speller
St-Jacques
Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Williams

Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Cadman
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Cummins
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Epp
Folco
Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Grewal
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Iftody
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Muisse
Myers
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Ritz
Robinson
Saada
Sekora
Sgro
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi

Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bryden
Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Duncan
Eggleton
Finlay
Galloway
Godfrey
Goldring
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Hanger
Harvard
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McGuire
McNally
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Obhrai
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Schmidt
Serré
Shepherd
Speller
St-Jacques
Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer
Szabo
Thibeault

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

(The House divided on Motion No. 20, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1226)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Crête
Débien
Duceppe
Guimond
Marchand
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Bigras
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gauthier
Lebel
Ménard
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Turp —23

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopoulos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew

Government Orders

Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert
Wood—189

Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Williams

Hilstrom
Iftody
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Ritz
Robinson
Saada
Sekora
Sgro
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert
Wood—189

Hubbard
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McGuire
McNally
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Obhrai
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Petigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Schmidt
Serré
Shepherd
Speller
St-Jacques
Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Williams

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

(The House divided on Motion No. 35, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1238)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Crête
Debien
Duceppe
Guimond
Marchand
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Bigras
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gauthier
Lebel
Ménard
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Turp —23

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopoulos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Cadman
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
Cummins
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Epp
Folco
Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Grewal
Guarmieri
Harb
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bryden
Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Duncan
Eggleton
Finlay
Galloway
Godfrey
Goldring
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Hanger
Harvard
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

(The House divided on Motion No. 46, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1239)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Bigras

Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gauthier
Lebel
Ménard
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Turp —23

Crête
Debien
Duceppe
Guimond
Marchand
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Ritz
Robinson
Saada
Sekora
Sgro
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert
Wood—189

Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Obhrai
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Schmidt
Serré
Shepherd
Speller
St-Jacques
Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Williams

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Cadman
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Cummins
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Epp
Folco
Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Grewal
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Iftody
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manini
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bryden
Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Duncan
Eggleton
Finlay
Galloway
Godfrey
Goldring
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Hanger
Harvard
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McGuire
McNally
McWhinney

*Nil/aucun

PAIRED MEMBERS

(The House divided on Motion No. 15, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1241)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Brien
Crête
Debien
Duceppe
Guimond
Marchand
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bigras
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gauthier
Lebel
Ménard
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Turp —23

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy
Baker
Barnes
Bélair

Government Orders

Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Cummins	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Galloway
Gilmour	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal	Grose
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hubbard
Iftody	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Price
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Ritz	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Schmidt
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Strahl	Szabo

Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcyia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Williams
Wood—189	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 9, 12, 13, 14, 20, 35, 46 and 15 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 21.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening will be voting in favour of this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are in favour of this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP present in the House vote in favour of this motion.

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative members vote yea on this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 21, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1227)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigas	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)

Government Orders

Duceppe
Epp
Gilmour
Goldring
Guimond
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Konrad
Lill
Mancini
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Muisse
Obhrai
Picard (Drummond)
Proctor
Ritz
Rocheleau
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wasylycia-Leis

Duncan
Gauthier
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Hanger
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Lebel
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Penson
Price
Riis
Robinson
Sauvageau
Solomon
St-Jacques
Strahl
Turp
Williams—77

Pillitteri
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Sekora
Sgro
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—135

Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Serré
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 21 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 48.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe that you will find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motions Nos. 48, 49, 50, 19 and 51.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 48, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1228*)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman
Chatters
Crête
Davies
Debien
Doyle
Duceppe
Epp
Gilmour
Goldring
Guimond
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Konrad
Lill
Mancini
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Muisse
Obhrai

Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Brien
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duncan
Gauthier
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Hanger
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Lebel
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Penson

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Folco
Godfrey
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ifody
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Limoges
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Finlay
Gallaway
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marleau
McGuire
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)

Government Orders

Picard (Drummond)
Proctor
Ritz
Rocheleau
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wasylycia-Leis

Price
Riis
Robinson
Sauvageau
Solomon
St-Jacques
Strahl
Turp
Williams—77

(The House divided on Motion No. 49, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1229)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Cloutier
Collenette
Copp
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Folco
Godfrey
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Iftody
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Limoges
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Sekora
Sgro
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—135

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Drouin
Easter
Finlay
Gallaway
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marleau
McGuire
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Serré
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman
Chatters
Crête
Davies
Debien
Doyle
Duceppe
Epp
Gilmour
Goldring
Guimond
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Konrad
Lill
Mancini
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Muise
Obhrai
Picard (Drummond)
Proctor
Ritz
Rocheleau
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wasylycia-Leis

Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Brien
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duncan
Gauthier
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Hanger
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Lebel
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Penson
Price
Riis
Robinson
Sauvageau
Solomon
St-Jacques
Strahl
Turp
Williams—77

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Cloutier

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Coderre

Government Orders

Collenette
Coppes
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Folco
Godfrey
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Harvard
Iftody
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Limoges
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Sekora
Sgro
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—135

Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Finlay
Galloway
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marleau
McGuire
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Serré
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Willert

Doyle
Duceppe
Epp
Gilmour
Goldring
Guimond
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Konrad
Lill
Mancini
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Muisé
Obhrai
Picard (Drummond)
Proctor
Ritz
Rocheleau
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wasylcyia-Leis

Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duncan
Gauthier
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Hanger
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Lebel
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Penson
Price
Ris
Robinson
Sauvageau
Solomon
St-Jacques
Strahl
Turp
Williams—77

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

(The House divided on Motion No. 50, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1230)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman
Chatters
Crête
Davies
Debien

Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Brien
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
de Savoye
Desjarlais

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Folco
Godfrey
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Harvard
Iftody
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Limoges
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Finlay
Galloway
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marleau
McGuire
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)

Government Orders

Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
St-Julien	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—135	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

(The House divided on Motion No. 19, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1243)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Duncan
Epp	Gauthier
Gilmour	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring	Grewal
Guimond	Hanger
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Johnston
Konrad	Lebel
Lill	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Marchand
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nystrom
Obhrai	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Price
Proctor	Riis
Ritz	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solomon
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Wasylycia-Leis	Williams—77

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Folco
Godfrey
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Iftody
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Limoges
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Sekora
Sgro
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—135

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Drouin
Easter
Finlay
Galloway
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marleau
McGuire
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Serré
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

(The House divided on Motion No. 51, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1250)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Duncan
Epp	Gauthier
Gilmour	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring	Grewal
Guimond	Hanger
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Johnston
Konrad	Lebel
Lill	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Marchand
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Ménard	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nystrom
Obhrai	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Price
Proctor	Riis
Ritz	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solomon
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Wasylycia-Leis	Williams—77

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre

Government Orders

Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Galloway
Godfrey	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Iftody	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutsen	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marleau
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
St-Julien	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—135	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 48, 49, 50, 19 and 51 lost.

Mr. Paul Szabo: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Report stage Motion No. 56 on the order paper which authorizes parliament to conduct a five year review of the administration of this act was not properly moved at report stage.

• (1900)

In view of the importance of this provision to accountability and transparency, I seek the consent of the House to move this motion now so that it can be voted on before the concurrence motion?

The Speaker: Does the member have consent to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed

Government Orders

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 2 in Group No. 2.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening will be voting yes to the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are opposed to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Members of the NDP present will be voting nay to the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative members vote yea on this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1231)

YEAS

Members

Bailey	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Cummins	Doyle
Duncan	Epp
Gilmour	Goldring
Grewal	Hanger
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Johnston
Konrad	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Obhrai	Penson
Price	Ritz
Schmidt	St-Jacques
Strahl	Williams—40

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brien
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Cullen	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Galloway	Gauthier
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Iftody	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lebel	Lee
Leung	Lill
Limoges	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marchand	Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McTeague
McWhinney	Ménard
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	

Government Orders

Torsney
Turp
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—172

Crête
de Savoye
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duncan
Gauthier
Goldring
Guimond
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Konrad
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Meredith
Morrison
Penson
Ritz
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Williams—54

Cummins
Debien
Duceppe
Epp
Gilmour
Grewal
Hanger
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Lebel
Mark
Mayfield
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Strahl
Turp

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the vote just taken to the motion now before the House, with the Liberal members voting nay.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening will be voting yea to the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are in favour of this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP vote nay on this motion.

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative members vote nay on this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1232)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman
Chatters

Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bigras
Brien
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Easter
Finlay
Galloway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Herron
Iftody
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marleau
McCormick
McGuire
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Folco
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Harvey
Hubbard
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Minna
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patty

Government Orders

Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—158

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 lost.[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the vote just taken to the following motions: Motions Nos. 10, 22, 25 and 41.

[*English*]**The Speaker:** Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1240)

YEAS

Members	
Asselin	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
de Savoye	Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Duncan	Epp
Gauthier	Gilmour
Goldring	Grewal
Guimond	Hanger
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Johnston
Konrad	Lebel
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McNally	Ménard
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Ohrai
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Ritz	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
St-Hilaire	Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Williams—54	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumur
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Caldler
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Iftody	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marleau	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—158

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

(The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1244)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
de Savoye	Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Duncan	Epp
Gauthier	Gilmour
Goldring	Grewal
Guimond	Hanger
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Johnston
Konrad	Lebel
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McNally	Ménard
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Obhrai
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Ritz	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
St-Hilaire	Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Williams—54	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaire	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb

Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Iftody	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutsen	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marleau	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Parry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcyia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—158

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

(The House divided on Motion No. 25, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1245)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
de Savoye	Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Duncan	Epp
Gauthier	Gilmour
Goldring	Grewal
Guimond	Hanger
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Johnston
Konrad	

Government Orders

Lebel	Marchand	Serré	Sgro
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Shepherd	Solomon
Mayfield	McNally	Speller	St. Denis
Ménard	Meredith	St-Jacques	St-Julien
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison	Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Obhrai	Penson	Stoffer	Szabo
Picard (Drummond)	Ritz	Telegdi	Thibeault
Rocheleau	Sauvageau	Torsney	Ur
Schmidt	St-Hilaire	Valeri	Vanclief
Strahl	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Volpe	Wappel
Turp	Williams—54	Wasylcyia-Leis	Whelan
		Wilfert	Wood—158

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Iftody	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marleau	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Sekora

*Nil/aucun

(The House divided on Motion No. 41, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1248)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
de Savoye	Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Duncan	Epp
Folco	Gilmour
Gauthier	Grewal
Goldring	Hanger
Guimond	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (Macleod)	Johnston
Hilstrom	Lebel
Konrad	Mark
Marchand	Mayfield
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Ménard
McNally	Mills (Red Deer)
Meredith	Obhrai
Morrison	Picard (Drummond)
Ritz	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
St-Hilaire	Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Williams—54	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain

Government Orders

Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Iftody	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marleau	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—158

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 10, 22, 25 and 41 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 4.

● (1905)

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted

on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening will be voting in favour of this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are against the motion.

[English]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP present will be voting yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative Party members are in favour of the motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 1233)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Cummins	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Galloway
Gilmour	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring

Government Orders

Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal	Grose
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hubbard
Iftody	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Price
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Ritz	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Schmidt
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Williams
Wood—189	

NAYS

Members

Asselin	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	de Savoye
Debien	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Gauthier
Guimond	Lebel
Marchand	Ménard
Picard (Drummond)	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	

St-Hilaire	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp —23	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 16.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe that you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 16.**The Speaker:** Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 1242)***YEAS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélar
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Cadman	Caldler
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Cummins	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Galloway
Gilmour	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal	Grose
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hubbard
Iftody	Jennings

Government Orders

Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Ritz
Robinson
Saada
Sekora
Sgro
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasyllycia-Leis
Wilfert
Wood—189

Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McGuire
McNally
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Obhrai
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Schmidt
Serré
Shepherd
Speller
St-Jacques
Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Williams

The next question is on Motion No. 8. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 27, 31, 32, 34, 45 and 47.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening will be voting yea on this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members oppose the motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, New Democratic Party members are in favour of the motion.

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, New Democratic Party members are in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1234*)

NAYS

Members

Asselin	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	de Savoye
Débién	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Gauthier
Guimond	Lebel
Marchand	Ménard
Picard (Drummond)	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp —23

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 16 carried.

YEAS

Members

Bailey	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Cummins	Davies
Desjarlais	Doyle
Duncan	Epp
Gilmour	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring	Grewal
Hanger	Harvey
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Johnston	Konrad
Lill	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McDonough
McNally	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nystrom
Obhrai	Penson
Price	Proctor
Riis	Ritz
Robinson	Schmidt
Solomon	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Strahl
Wasyllycia-Leis	Williams—54

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bellemare
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
Cullen
Debien
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Drouin
Duceppe
Easter
Finlay
Galloway
Godfrey
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hubbard
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Lee
Limoges
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
McGuire
McTeague
Ménard
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Serré
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Turp
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—158

Alcock
Assadourian
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Boudria
Brien
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
de Savoye
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duhamel
Eggleton
Folco
Gauthier
Graham
Grose
Guimond
Harvard
Hfody
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lebel
Leung
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchand
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Rocheleau
Saada
Sekora
Sgro
Speller
St-Hilaire
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thibeault
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 8 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 27, 31, 32, 34, 45 and 47 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 52.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 52.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just want to add the hon. member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar to this division. He will be voting yea.

The Speaker: It will be noted.

(The House divided on Motion No. 52, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1251)

YEAS

Members

Bailey
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Casson
Cummins
Desjarlais
Duncan
Gilmour
Goldring
Gruending
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Konrad
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Penson
Proctor
Ritz
Schmidt
St-Jacques
Strahl
Williams—55

Benoit
Borotsik
Cadman
Chatters
Davies
Doyle
Epp
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Hanger
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Lill
Mancini
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Mills (Red Deer)
Muise
Obhrai
Price
Riis
Robinson
Solomon
Stoffer
Wasylycia-Leis

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Beaumier

Alcock
Assadourian
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr

*Nil/aucun

Government Orders

Bélanger
Bellemare
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collette
Copps
Cullen
Debien
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Drouin
Duceppe
Easter
Finlay
Galloway
Godfrey
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hubbard
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Lee
Limoges
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
McGuire
McTeague
Ménard
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Serré
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Turp
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—158

Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Boudria
Brien
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
de Savoye
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duhamel
Eggleton
Folco
Gauthier
Graham
Grose
Guimond
Harvard
Iftody
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lebel
Leung
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchand
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Rocheleau
Saada
Sekora
Sgro
Speller
St-Hilaire
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thibeault
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 52 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 26. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 30, 37 and 38.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent to have members who voted on the preceding motion recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening will be voting no to Motion No. 26.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are in favour of this motion.

• (1910)

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, NDP members will be voting against the motion.

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative Party members will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 26, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1235*)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Bigras
Brien
Crête
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gauthier
Harvey
Lebel
Marchand
Muisé
Price
Sauvageau
St-Jacques
Turp—32

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Doyle
Duceppe
Guimond
Herron
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Béclair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Cummins	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Duncan	Easter
Eggleton	Epp
Finlay	Folco
Galloway	Gilmour
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grewal
Grose	Gruending
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harvard
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hubbard
Iftody	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Mark
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McNally	McTeague
McWhinney	Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman

Reed	Richardson
Riis	Ritz
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Saada
Schmidt	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Julien	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Williams
Wood —181	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 26 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 30, 37 and 38 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 28.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening will be voting no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members will be voting against the motion.

[English]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the NDP members present will be voting no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative Party members will be voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 28, which was negated on the following division:)

Government Orders

(Division No. 1236)

YEAS

Members

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Doyle
Herron
Muisse
St-Jacques—9

Borotsik
Harvey
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Price

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brien
Bryden
Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
Cullen
Davies
Debien
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duhamel
Easter
Epp
Folco
Gauthier
Godfrey
Goldring
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Guarnieri
Hanger
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Lee
Lill
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Mark

Alcock
Assadourian
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bellemare
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown
Bulte
Cadman
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
Cummins
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Drouin
Duceppe
Duncan
Eggleton
Finlay
Galloway
Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Grewal
Gruending
Guimond
Harb
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Ifody
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lastewka
Lebel
Leung
Limoges
MacAulay
Malhi
Mancini
Marchand

Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McGuire
McNally
McWhinney
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Obhrai
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Robillard
Rocheleau
Saada
Schmidt
Serré
Shepherd
Speller
St-Hilaire
Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer
Szabo
Thibeault
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Williams

Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Ménard
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Myers
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Ritz
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Sekora
Sgro
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Torsney
Turp
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcyia-Leis
Wilfert
Wood—204

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 28 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 33.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present will be voting in favour of this motion. I also note that the member for Calgary East has had to leave the Chamber.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members support the motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present will be voting against the motion.

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Progressive Conservative Party are in favour of this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 33, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1237)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
de Savoye	Debien
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Duncan
Epp	Gauthier
Gilmour	Goldring
Grewal	Guimond
Hanger	Harvey
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Johnston	Konrad
Lebel	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McNally	Ménard
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Price	Ritz
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Williams —62	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown

Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Galloway
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Gruending
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Iftody	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Saada
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Willfert	Wood—150

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 33 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 29.

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent that those members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House. Liberal members vote no.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is it the pleasure of the House to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members will be voting no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois oppose this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP will be voting yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Progressive Conservative Party are in favour of this motion.

• (1915)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 29, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1246)

YEAS

Members

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Davies	Desjarlais
Doyle	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending	Harvey
Herron	Lill
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
Muise	Nystrom
Price	Proctor
Riis	Robinson
Solomon	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Wasylcia-Leis—24

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine

Axworthy	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casson	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Cullen	Cummins
de Savoye	Debien
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepolo
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Galloway
Gauthier	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goldring
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal	Grose
Guarnieri	Guimond
Hanger	Harb
Harvard	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hubbard	Iftody
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Ritz	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Sekora

Government Orders

Serré
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wilfert
Wood—188

Sgro
Speller
St-Hilaire
Stewart (Brant)
Strahl
Telegdi
Torsney
Turp
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Williams

Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
de Savoye
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duhamel
Easter
Epp
Folco
Gauthier
Godfrey
Graham
Grewal
Guarnieri
Hanger
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Lee
Limoges
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Ménard
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Ritz
Rocheleau
Saada
Schmidt
Serré
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wilfert
Wood—188

Cadman
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
Cummins
Debien
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Drouin
Duceppe
Duncan
Eggleton
Finlay
Galloway
Gilmour
Goldring
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Guimond
Harb
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Ifody
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lastewka
Lebel
Leung
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchand
Marleau
Mayfield
McGuire
McNally
McWhinney
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Sekora
Sgro
Speller
St-Hilaire
Stewart (Brant)
Strahl
Telegdi
Torsney
Turp
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Williams

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 29 lost.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motions Nos. 36 and 55.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 36, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1247)

YEAS

Members

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Davies
Doyle
Gruending
Herron
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Muisse
Price
Riis
Solomon
Stoffer

Borotsik
Desjarlais
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Harvey
Lill
Mancini
McDonough
Nystrom
Proctor
Robinson
St-Jacques
Wasylcia-Leis—24

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brien
Bryden

Alcock
Assadourian
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bellemare
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown
Bulte

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

(The House divided on Motion No. 55, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1252)

YEAS

Members

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Davies	Desjarlais
Doyle	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending	Harvey
Herron	Lill
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
Muise	Nystrom
Price	Proctor
Riis	Robinson
Solomon	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Wasylycia-Leis—24

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casson	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Cullen	Cummins
de Savoye	Debien
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton
Épp	Finlay
Folco	Galloway
Gauthier	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goldring
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal	Grose
Guarnieri	Guimond
Hanger	Harb
Harvard	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hubbard	Iftody
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes

Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Parry
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Ritz	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Sekora
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Williams
Wood—188	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motions Nos. 36 and 55 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 42.

[Translation]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent that those members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House. Liberal members vote no.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there consent to proceed in this fashion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present this evening will be voting in favour of this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois support this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, New Democratic Party members vote yes on this motion.

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members vote no on this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 42, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1249*)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Duncan	Epp
Gauthier	Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Grewal	Gruending
Guimond	Hanger
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Johnston
Konrad	Lebel
Lill	Mancini
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McDonough
McNally	Ménard
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Nystrom
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Proctor	Riis
Ritz	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solomon
St-Hilaire	Stoffer
Strahl	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Wasylcia-Leis
Williams—68	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier

Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepolo
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Galloway	Godfrey
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Iftody
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marleau
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Price	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—144

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 42 lost.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

Government Orders

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is it the pleasure of the House to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, on the concurrence motion at report stage of this bill Canadian Alliance members will be voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois are opposed to this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party members who are present are opposed to this motion.

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members vote yes on this motion.

[*English*]

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

(Division No. 1253)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Cummins	DeVillers
Dhaltwal	Dion
Discepola	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton

Epp	Finlay
Folco	Galloway
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goldring	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grewal
Grose	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hubbard	Iftody
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Mark
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McNally	McTeague
McWhinney	Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Penson
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Price	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Schmidt
Sekora	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert
Williams	Wood—174

NAYS

Members

Asselin	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Gauthier
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Gruending
Guimond	Lebel
Lill	Mancini
Marchand	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough	Ménard
Nystrom	Picard (Drummond)
Proctor	Riis

Government Orders

Robinson
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wasylycia-Leis—38

Rocheleau
Solomon
Stoffer
Turp

PAIRED MEMBERS

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

It being 7.20 p.m. this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.20 p.m.)

*Nil/aucun

CONTENTS

Monday, March 27, 2000

Points of Order

Canadian Alliance

Mr. Strahl	5223
The Speaker	5223

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

The Budget

Financial Statement of the Minister of Finance

Budget Motion	5223
Mr. Myers	5223
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	5225
Mr. Myers	5225
Mr. Hanger	5226
Mr. Myers	5226
Mr. Bailey	5226
Mr. Limoges	5226
Mr. Bailey	5227
Mr. Limoges	5227
Mr. Stoffer	5227
Mr. Limoges	5228
Mr. Obhrai	5228
Mr. Szabo	5228
Mr. Obhrai	5228
Mr. Schmidt	5229
Mr. Obhrai	5229
Mr. Szabo	5229
Mr. Obhrai	5229
Mr. Stoffer	5229
Mr. Obhrai	5230
Mr. Hanger	5230
Mr. Schmidt	5231
Mr. Hanger	5231
Mr. Shepherd	5231
Mr. Hanger	5231
Mr. Schmidt	5231
Mr. Hanger	5232
Mr. Jordan	5232
Mr. Stoffer	5233
Mr. Jordan	5234
Mr. Harb	5234

Points of Order

Canadian Alliance

Mr. Bryden	5235
------------------	------

The Budget

Financial Statement of the Minister of Finance

Motion	5236
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	5236
Mr. Harb	5236
Mr. Bergeron	5236
Mr. Szabo	5238
Mr. Bergeron	5239
Mrs. Picard	5239
Mr. Stoffer	5240
Mrs. Picard	5241
Ms. Catterall	5241
Mr. Bailey	5242

Ms. Catterall	5242
Mr. Herron	5243
Ms. Catterall	5243
Mr. Calder	5243
Mr. Herron	5243
Mr. Calder	5243
Mr. Herron	5243
Mr. Calder	5243
Mr. Herron	5243
Mr. Calder	5243
Mr. Borotsik	5245
Mr. Calder	5245
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	5245
Mr. Calder	5245
Mr. Stoffer	5245
Mr. Calder	5245
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	5245
Ms. Catterall	5247
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	5247
Mr. Stoffer	5248
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	5248

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Tobacco Industry

Mr. Assadourian	5248
-----------------------	------

Leader of the Official Opposition

Miss Grey	5248
-----------------	------

Gas Prices

Mr. Adams	5248
-----------------	------

Blood Donor Month

Mr. Harb	5249
----------------	------

Nunavik Inuit

Mr. St-Julien	5249
---------------------	------

The Late Hamed Nastoh

Mr. Cadman	5249
------------------	------

Canadian Film Industry

Mr. Patry	5249
-----------------	------

Drama Awards

Mr. Finlay	5249
------------------	------

World Theatre Day

Mr. de Savoye	5250
---------------------	------

Canadian Alliance

Mr. Schmidt	5250
-------------------	------

Arts and Culture

Ms. Folco	5250
-----------------	------

Hepatitis C

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis	5250
--------------------------	------

World Tuberculosis Day

Ms. Augustine	5251
---------------------	------

Hepatitis C

Ms. St-Jacques	5251
----------------------	------

Canadian Aid for Chernobyl

Mr. Jordan	5251
------------------	------

Quiet Revolution	
Mr. Turp	5251
Hepatitis C	
Ms. Davies	5251
Heroism	
Mr. Hanger	5252
Health Care	
Mr. Doyle	5252

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Economic Development Agency	
Miss Grey	5252
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	5252
Miss Grey	5252
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	5253
Miss Grey	5253
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	5253
Mr. Strahl	5253
Mr. Cauchon	5253
Mr. Strahl	5253
Mr. Cauchon	5253
Human Resources Development	
Mr. Duceppe	5253
Ms. Brown	5254
Mr. Duceppe	5254
Ms. Brown	5254
Mr. Gauthier	5254
Ms. Brown	5254
Mr. Gauthier	5254
Ms. Brown	5254
Health	
Ms. McDonough	5254
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	5255
Ms. McDonough	5255
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	5255
Human Resources Development	
Mr. MacKay	5255
Ms. Brown	5255
Mr. MacKay	5255
Ms. Brown	5255
Economic Development Agency	
Mr. Penson	5255
Mr. Cauchon	5255
Mr. Penson	5256
Mr. Cauchon	5256
Billboards	
Mr. Guimond	5256
Mr. Collenette	5256
Mr. Guimond	5256
Mr. Collenette	5256
Economic Development Agency	
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5256
Mr. Cauchon	5256
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5257
Mr. Cauchon	5257
Gasoline Pricing	
Mr. Brien	5257
Mr. Manley	5257

Mr. Brien	5257
Mr. Manley	5257
Economic Development Agency	
Ms. Meredith	5257
Mr. Cauchon	5257
Ms. Meredith	5258
Mr. Manley	5258
Aéroports de Montréal	
Mrs. Tremblay	5258
Mr. Collenette	5258
Toronto Waterfront	
Ms. Bennett	5258
Mr. Collenette	5258
Economic Development Agency	
Mr. Obhrai	5258
Mr. Cauchon	5258
Mr. Obhrai	5258
Mr. Cauchon	5259
Mr. Cauchon	5259
Public Works and Government Services	
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	5259
Mr. Gagliano	5259
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	5259
Mr. Gagliano	5259
Human Resources Development	
Mr. MacKay	5259
Ms. Brown	5259
Mr. MacKay	5259
Mr. Baker	5260
National Defence	
Mr. Richardson	5260
Mr. Bertrand	5260
Economic Development Agency	
Mr. Mayfield	5260
Mr. Cauchon	5260
Shipbuilding	
Mr. Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	5260
Mr. Manley	5260
Hepatitis C	
Ms. Desjarlais	5260
Mr. Rock	5261
The Environment	
Mr. Herron	5261
Ms. Torsney	5261
Points of Order	
Canadian Alliance—Speaker's Ruling	
The Speaker	5261
Privilege	
Bill C-206	
Mr. Bryden	5261
Mr. Bryden	5262
Mr. Bryden	5263
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5263

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government response to petitions	
Mr. Lee	5263

Criminal Code	
Bill C-462. Introduction and first reading	5263
Mr. Herron	5263
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	5263
Petitions	
Breast Cancer	
Mr. Lastewka	5263
Child Pornography	
Mr. Cummins	5264
Immigration	
Mr. Cummins	5264
Genetically Altered Foods	
Ms. Carroll	5264
Child Poverty	
Ms. Carroll	5264
Mining	
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	5264
Child Pornography	
Mr. Sekora	5264
Canada Post Corporation	
Mr. Sekora	5264
Equality	
Mr. Goldring	5264
Breast Cancer	
Mr. O'Reilly	5264
The Constitution	
Ms. Desjarlais	5265
Child Poverty	
Mr. DeVillers	5265
Ms. Catterall	5265
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lee	5265

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

The Budget	
Budget motion	5265
Ms. Davies	5265
Mr. Adams	5267
Ms. Davies	5267
Ms. Blondin-Andrew	5268
Mr. Schmidt	5269
Ms. Blondin-Andrew	5270
Ms. Desjarlais	5270
Ms. Blondin-Andrew	5270
Mr. Mitchell	5270
Mr. Bailey	5272
Mr. Mitchell	5272
Mr. Muise	5272
Mr. Mitchell	5273
Mr. Herron	5273
Mr. Epp	5274
Mr. Herron	5274
Mr. Muise	5275
Mr. Bryden	5276
Mr. Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	5278
Mr. Bryden	5278
Mr. Stoffer	5278
Mr. Bryden	5278
Mr. Reed	5279
Mr. Hanger	5279
Mr. Reed	5279

Ms. Desjarlais	5280
Mr. Reed	5280
Mr. Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	5280
Mr. Reed	5280
Mr. Epp	5280
Mr. Reed	5280
Mr. Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	5280
Mr. Reed	5280
Mr. Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	5280
Mr. Schmidt	5280
Mr. Herron	5282
Mr. Schmidt	5282
Mr. Adams	5282
Mr. Schmidt	5283
Mr. Hilstrom	5283
Mr. Adams	5284
Mr. Hilstrom	5284
Mr. Stoffer	5284
Mr. Hilstrom	5284
Mr. Bailey	5284
Mr. Hilstrom	5285
Mr. Mahoney	5285
Mr. Epp	5286
Mr. Mahoney	5286
Mr. Herron	5286
Mr. Mahoney	5286
Mr. Stoffer	5287
Mr. Mahoney	5287
Mr. Godfrey	5287
Mr. Stoffer	5288
Mr. Godfrey	5288
Mr. Herron	5289
Mr. Godfrey	5289
Amendment negated	5290

Canadian Institutes of Health Research Act

Bill C-13. Report stage	5290
Motion No. 1 negated	5291
Mr. Kilger	5291
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5291
Motion No. 9 negated	5292
Motion No. 12 negated	5293
Motion No. 13 negated	5294
Motion No. 14 negated	5295
Motion No. 20 negated	5296
Motion No. 35 negated	5296
Motion No. 46 negated	5297
Motion No. 15 negated	5298
Mr. Kilger	5298
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5298
Mr. Bergeron	5298
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	5298
Mr. Harvey	5298
Motion No. 21 negated	5299
Mr. Kilger	5299
Motion No. 48 negated	5300
Motion No. 49 negated	5301
Motion No. 50 negated	5302
Motion No. 19 negated	5303
Motion No. 51 negated	5303
Mr. Szabo	5303
Mr. Kilger	5304
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5304
Mr. Bergeron	5304
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	5304

Mr. Harvey	5304
Motion No. 2 negatived	5305
Mr. Kilger	5305
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5305
Mr. Bergeron	5305
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	5305
Mr. Harvey	5305
Motion No. 3 negatived	5306
Mr. Kilger	5306
Motion No. 10 negatived	5307
Motion No. 22 negatived	5307
Motion No. 25 negatived	5308
Motion No. 41 negatived	5309
Mr. Kilger	5309
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5309
Mr. Bergeron	5309
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	5309
Mr. Harvey	5309
Motion No. 4 agreed to	5310
Mr. Kilger	5310
Motion No. 16 agreed to	5311
Mr. Kilger	5311
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5311
Mr. Bergeron	5311
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	5311
Mr. Harvey	5311
Motion No. 8 negatived	5312
Mr. Kilger	5312
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	5312
Motion No. 52 negatived	5313
Mr. Kilger	5313
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5313
Mr. Bergeron	5313
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	5313
Mr. Harvey	5313

Motion No. 26 negatived	5314
Mr. Kilger	5314
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5314
Mr. Bergeron	5314
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	5314
Mr. Harvey	5314
Motion No. 28 negatived	5315
Mr. Kilger	5315
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5315
Mr. Bergeron	5316
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	5316
Mr. Harvey	5316
Motion No. 33 negatived	5316
Mr. Kilger	5317
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5317
Mr. Bergeron	5317
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	5317
Mr. Harvey	5317
Motion No. 29 negatived	5318
Mr. Kilger	5318
Motions Nos. 36 and 55 negatived	5319
Mr. Kilger	5319
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5320
Mr. Bergeron	5320
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	5320
Mr. Harvey	5320
Motion No. 42 negatived	5320
Motion for concurrence	5320
Mr. Rock	5320
Mr. Kilger	5321
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5321
Mr. Bergeron	5321
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	5321
Mr. Harvey	5321
Motion agreed to	5322

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,
45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:
Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,
45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9