



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 136 • NUMBER 126 • 2nd SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, October 4, 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

Wednesday, October 4, 2000

The House met at 2 p.m.

[English]

Prayers

• (1400)

[English]

The Speaker: As is our practice on Wednesday we will now sing O Canada, and we will be led by the hon. member for Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore.

[Editor's Note: Members sang the national anthem]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

THE LATE RIGHT HON. PIERRE ELLIOTT TRUDEAU

Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past five days Canadians were united in their grief over the passing of former Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

Canadians felt great sadness and tremendous loss when they heard that the northern magus had left this world. Canadians of all political stripes agreed that in one way or another Pierre Trudeau influenced our lives, so much so that Canadians felt compelled to pay their respects one last time to the philosopher king.

[Translation]

Thanks to the availability of all the men and women working on the Hill, Canadians were able to pay their respects to a great Canadian.

Thousands upon thousands of them came to Ottawa to pay tribute to Mr. Trudeau, and they kept coming until the early hours of the morning.

On behalf of all the members of my party, I wish to thank the constables, the pages and all the House of Commons employees who made our parliament accessible to us during those sorrowful days.

TAXATION

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of my constituents of Nanaimo—Cowichan.

While grants and contracts have been awarded to questionable applicants and thriving businesses in the Prime Minister's riding, unemployment rates in my riding are at an unacceptably high level. Under the Liberal government taxes have moved steadily upwards. Liberal mathematicians would have us believe otherwise but nothing could be further from the truth.

My constituents have seen money taken from their pockets and paycheques. There is very little support and respect for small business development. Individual and corporate taxes alike are forcing small businesses to move, downsize or close altogether. The odious softwood lumber agreement and a declining west coast fishery are only two examples of Liberal mismanagement.

The Liberals' kissing cousin, the provincial NDP government, mirrors these same negative traits with high corporate and personal taxes. It has created a climate of economic mistrust that has driven investment out of my province.

The people of my riding can hardly wait for a Canadian Alliance government which will offer real tax relief and create a climate for investment. They want to get back to work and they want to become prosperous again.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA OLYMPIC TEAM

Mr. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to warmly welcome our Canada Olympic team. In all, 311 athletes from nine provinces participated in 24 events; 51% of the athletes were women and 49% were men.

[English]

As well, I want to especially congratulate our medal winners. Canada won a total of 14 medals; three gold, three silver and eight bronze. We are proud of our athletes.

S. O. 31

[Translation]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Claude Drouin (Beauce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take advantage of the few minutes available to me to draw attention to the exceptional measures our government plans to put in place to contribute to reviving the Gaspé economy.

The Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada has this very day announced a special budget of \$35 million aimed at revitalizing and diversifying economic activity in the Gaspé and Îles-de-la-Madeleine in the medium and long term. This envelope is in addition to the funding already allocated to the Gaspé by various federal departments with a view to jump-starting regional development projects.

In addition to this special budgetary envelope of \$35 million, the minister and secretary of state announced the opening of a new Economic Development Canada office to be located in the Gaspé itself. This is a clear commitment by our government to the future of the Gaspé and Îles-de-la-Madeleine region and to the people of that riding.

* * *

• (1405)

BIENNALE DE MONTRÉAL 2000

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, September 28 to October 29 are the dates for the Biennale de Montréal 2000, the second Biennale, which is being held to mark the new millennium, with time as the theme.

Visual arts, architecture, performance arts and multimedia will all be represented during this event, which is a tribute to our artists' creativity and talent.

We support this event, which covers the full cultural spectrum, and wish the Biennale de Montréal 2000 great success.

Let us also hope that this type of event will awaken the curiosity of young people and encourage them to explore their culture.

Good luck to all the organizers. We hope that Quebecers turn out in large numbers.

* * *

[English]

PROSTATE CANCER

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago prostate cancer took the life of Mel Smith, Q.C. Mel was a talented and well known expert on the

Canadian constitution, particularly with respect to section 35 and its impact on rulings by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mel will be greatly missed, but just like breast cancer, prostate cancer cares nothing about the value of its victim to his family or to society as a whole. Members of this place are not immune from prostate cancer, as witnessed by the death of Pierre Trudeau from the disease last week.

The sad fact is, prostate cancer kills roughly the same number of men each year as breast cancer kills women, yet receives proportionately very little in terms of research funding from the government. All Canadians, regardless of gender, should be lobbying the government to provide more funding for prostate cancer research.

Every man over 50 should be having an annual digital rectal exam and PSA blood test for the detection of prostate cancer. With greater awareness and more funding we can beat this terrible disease.

* * *

[Translation]

WORLD MARCH OF WOMEN

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, from October 9 to 13, along with hundreds of women from 120 cities and towns in Quebec, members of the Bloc Québécois will be taking part in the World March of Women to call for an end to the poverty of and violence against women.

As we embark on a new millennium, all governments should be making it a priority to get involved in this worldwide movement for the equality of women, which includes 5,000 women's groups from 157 countries.

We invite Quebecers to sign the online card supporting the World March of Women, which can be found on the website of the Fédération des femmes du Québec.

"Our struggle is without borders, so take your sister by the hand; transform life; build equality", so goes the March of Women theme song.

May this message of hope be heard around the world, so that our daughters and their daughters can look to the future with confidence and serenity.

* * *

[English]

RALPH SHONK

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the tremendous volunteer efforts of Ralph Shonk of Burlington.

Mr. Shonk was awarded the Order of the Red Cross, Member Level, for his outstanding and exceptional service, the first time in

the 61 year history of the Burlington branch that a local member has received such an honour.

Among other contributions during his 41 years of service, Ralph Shonk worked hard to acquire a wheelchair accessible van for the agency, delivered for the meals on wheels program and was involved in international Red Cross efforts.

He represented the Red Cross at award presentations in Burlington schools, is a former member of Canada's air force and a father of four. Ralph Shonk embodies the values of Canadians from coast to coast to coast, a dedicated volunteer and a proud Canadian.

Today I join his wife, Margaret Shonk, and his many friends and family members in congratulating him on his dedication and volunteerism. I am sure all colleagues join me in wishing him many more happy healthy years.

* * *

[Translation]

FRANCO-ONTARIAN FLAG

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Ottawa—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Franco-Ontarian flag is now 25 years old. Unfurled officially in Sudbury on September 25, 1975, this flag symbolizes Franco-Ontarian solidarity and testifies to our desire to occupy our rightful place in Ontario in the economic, political and cultural sectors.

To celebrate this anniversary, the ACFO of Ottawa—Carleton, in partnership with a number of francophone organizations, presented "La francophonie en couleurs 2000" at the Ottawa Civic Centre on September 29 and 30. This celebration brought together over 10,000 francophones from all corners of the province.

I invite all my colleagues to join with me in wishing the Franco-Ontarian flag a long life.

* * *

[English]

DANIEL IGALI

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, this past weekend in Sydney, Australia, Daniel Igali of Surrey, British Columbia won the Olympic gold medal in the 69 kilogram class of freestyle wrestling. He is the first Canadian to win gold in wrestling. It was the crowning achievement for this young man from a family of 21 children. He came to Canada from his native Nigeria in 1994 to compete in the Commonwealth Games in Victoria and opted to remain here and pursue his passion.

• (1410)

He became a Canadian citizen in 1998 which allowed him to compete for Canada internationally. In 1999 he won the world

S. O. 31

championship and set his sights on the Olympics. He has now realized that dream.

I watched all three of Daniel's matches on Saturday. His skill, his power, his agility and his coolness under pressure combined to take him to victory. Upon winning the final match, he spread our flag across the mat and then knelt to kiss it. This emotional display of unabashed patriotism served to remind all Canadians of the freedoms and the opportunities we enjoy that we all too often take for granted.

Daniel Igali, a true champion in every sense of the word, your community and your country thank you.

* * *

[Translation]

WORLD MARCH OF WOMEN

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Ahuntsic, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on October 11, the women and men of Ahuntsic will march in protest against violence, poverty and discrimination against women.

This march will unite women from all backgrounds and communities in demanding a right as legitimate as respect.

[English]

Since the beginning of our mandate, our government has committed resources to assisting women and children. The government has already contributed \$800,000 to the international component of the World March of Women, nearly \$200,000 to the Canadian Women's March Committee and \$7 billion to assist families with children.

We eliminated the clawback from middle and higher income mothers. We contributed \$32 million to crime prevention to assure that women and children are a priority. We contributed \$22.5 million to the aboriginal head start initiative, as well as \$43 million for shelters for women, children and youth.

However, we have more to do. I encourage all my colleagues to join women across Canada, to march with them, to support them in their ridings and on the Hill and support equality across Canada.

* * *

BANKING

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the big banks are at it again, more branch closures, more services cut, more communities abandoned and the Liberal government stands by and lets it happen. Just when we thought the situation could not get any worse, along come the big banks to finish off the job.

Oral Questions

Take Winnipeg for example. In the core of the city, the historic north end, entire older neighbourhoods have been virtually deserted by the banks. As we speak, residents in North Winnipeg are receiving letters from the Bank of Montreal announcing yet another closure and a shut down of the last accessible branch for an entire community of senior citizens, low income residents and working families. For this area alone, six branches in just three years are gone. As one senior said "It is as if we do not count".

It is obscene for the bank to devastate the lives of our seniors while making record profits. What is even more outrageous is for this government to stand by and let it happen. Why do Liberals keep putting the needs of big corporations and banks ahead of the needs of the citizens of this land? Why does the government not hold the banks to account, instead of letting them strip the profits from neighbourhoods and leaving whole communities weakened and vulnerable.

* * *

[Translation]

ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in recent months, the democracy we so cherish and for which we all continue to fight has been under serious threat.

In any society, freedom of expression is a treasure as precious as all the gold in the world. Freedom of the press and freedom of speech are part of the acquired rights we are not prepared to give up.

The elected representatives sitting in this House must unite in a hard line stand against the actions committed by the members of organized crime who have decided to attack our democratic institutions.

These criminals must be made to understand that nothing they can say, absolutely nothing, will stop us from continuing our battle.

No threat, no intimidation, will be stronger than our total determination to take the necessary steps to put an end to the activities of organized crime.

* * *

[English]

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, while this government stands idle, shipyards have been closed, including mine in Saint John, New Brunswick, and shipyard workers have been laid off across Canada by the thousands.

One hour ago, busloads of frustrated shipyard workers from the province of Quebec and beyond arrived on Parliament Hill to protest this government's neglect. These brave men came to ensure

that the government does not miss its last chance to do what is right.

Tomorrow, the Standing Committee on Finance will review Bill C-213. The time has come for this innovative legislation and the time has come for the minister to endorse it. The time for the government to defend and promote a great Canadian shipbuilding industry has come.

We on both sides of the House must work together to resurrect our national shipbuilding industry, to give our military the ships it needs and to allow shipyard workers to proudly put food on the table for their families once again.

* * *

● (1415)

SOCIAL PROGRAMS

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my riding of Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford is a growing and prosperous community, but as in all of Canada certain individuals and families are not as fortunate as others. The Liberal government and my community are committed to helping those persons regain their footing.

The women and children's shelter in Barrie is a community resource that helps keep certain of our most vulnerable citizens out of harm's way. Thanks to a grant from the Government of Canada's national strategy on community safety and crime prevention, the twin objectives of protection and prevention may be achieved.

The national strategy has supported more than 1,100 social development projects at the local level across Canada. In this way we address the root causes of crime before it develops further and help reduce the social and economic burden that would otherwise result if we allowed social inequities to go unchecked.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Stockwell Day (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister knows, apparently the auditor general will not be tabling his report which deals with the HRDC disaster until approximately October 17. The problem is that there may be an election call before that date.

This morning our House leader asked the other parties to join with him unanimously to support a very important motion which would allow at least that portion of the auditor general's report, chapter 11 which deals with the HRDC disaster, to come forward

Oral Questions

before the House immediately. Will the Prime Minister support that motion?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will even do better than that. I will tell you that we will be sitting on October 17.

Mr. Stockwell Day (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate and thank the Prime Minister for listening to our concerns for several days and now responding to that issue.

Pardon me for sounding cynical, Mr. Speaker, but I just want to make sure I got it right. When he said that we would be sitting on October 17, did he mean here in parliament or is he talking about on a bus or a plane somewhere? Is it here?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the House of Commons, when we are talking about sitting it does not mean in our offices. It is in the House of Commons.

Again, I did not know exactly what to do and I know that the Leader of the Opposition is losing his confidence. A month ago he wanted to have an election. A week after that he did not want to have an election. Last week he challenged me to have an election. Over lunch he got nervous and said he is not sure any more. I want him to gain back his composure before we go out.

Mr. Stockwell Day (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am gaining in composure every day and every week because every time we ask the Prime Minister to do something, or most of the time, he is responding on some of the issues. I am gaining confidence in him, I really am.

• (1420)

When the report is tabled will he be giving the government response? Further to the report itself, in the public accounts committee last week it was revealed that on top of the billion dollar boondoggle that has taken place another \$344 million have apparently been mismanaged?

Will he be responding to this report and show how he will correct these disastrous things from happening in the future?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have debated all that in the House of Commons. The auditor general agrees with the six point plan that the minister proposed. The controversial program was eliminated.

Yes, if we were to have a debate it would be fun because I have a list of 30 golf courses in Alberta that received money from the Alberta government from 1996 to 1998 when the hon. member was the minister of finance. I have another list of 19 golf courses when he was a member there. I even know that in his own riding at one

time that government gave \$23,000 to a wet suit rental company. No, no, I am sorry—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

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

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, surely it is the Prime Minister who is all wet. He ought to know about RCMP investigations and golf courses.

The public has invested a whole lot, as the Prime Minister should know, in terms of the billion dollar boondoggle and some other things we have seen that have been expensive for the public. The public has a right to know what is in the auditor general's report.

Will the Prime Minister guarantee that the public will see the report before he calls an election? Yes or no.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member has been in the House and she does not know when the Prime Minister says we will be sitting that it is here. I will not be sitting on her lap. I will be here.

I have to make a correction. It was not a wet suit rental service. It was for upper class people, as they plan to do with their tax cut. It was a tuxedo rental company.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it gives a whole new picture of a lap dog, does it not?

Just a few months ago the Prime Minister was arguing that his HRD minister had really only lost \$250.51. Now the public accounts show that oops, it is over \$300 million. Which is it: \$250.51 or \$344,732,360.51?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should get her facts straight. Without question, my department always tries to collect outstanding debt.

This year's public accounts clearly show that only a very small portion of the written off debts involves grants and contributions. Rather, the vast majority of debts written off relate to the Canada student loans program. They refer to old debts deemed uncollectible because they have reached the statute of limitations or because the borrower has declared bankruptcy or has died.

* * *

[Translation]

BUDGET SURPLUSES

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois anticipated a surplus of about \$20 billion for the current year, while the Minister of Finance said that the surplus would only be \$5 billion.

Oral Questions

Later on, the minister told us to wait for the opinion of the country's top economists. He spoke to them over the weekend and surely he must have told them about the size of the surplus.

Based on the figures that he has, and I am sure that he has some figures, could the minister tell the House what the surplus will be this year?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we had preliminary discussions with the economists, but the Bloc Québécois leader must know that there are other meetings to come. Once all these meetings have taken place and the economists have completed their work, because it is their projections, we will present these projections.

• (1425)

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last year, we were quite accurate when we projected what the surplus would be, which was far from being the case for the minister. The top economists said that the surplus would be between \$18 billion and \$20 billion.

Could it be that the reason the minister does not want to reveal these surpluses is that he knows full well that he took that money from the unemployed and that, under the changes to employment insurance, he will only give them back \$300 million at best?

During the election campaign, in the coming days, the minister will talk about compassion, but could he show compassion for the unemployed now while we are sitting in the House and take appropriate action?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just said that a consensus will be reached based on the projections of the economists. These projections are not yet ready. As soon as they are, we will present them.

That being said, the reason for these surpluses is certainly our economic growth, which is one of the strongest in the world, our job creation, which is the strongest in the world, and the economy in general, which is doing very well in our country.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with surpluses mushrooming at the rate of \$94 million a day since last April, there are persistent rumours that the Minister of Finance will give in to the Bloc Québécois' repeated requests that he bring down a mini-budget before the next federal election is called.

Will the minister assure us that his mini-budget will include tax cuts to match his huge surpluses, tax cuts aimed at middle and low income earners?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have always said that our priority was to cut personal taxes, with priority going to middle and low income earners.

When it comes time to bring down a budget, I assure members that I will do so here in the House, not in an airplane or bus, as the leader of the Canadian Alliance suggested.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister of Finance to be serious.

Last week, when I asked him whether he would be lowering taxes for families earning \$35,000 or less, he said it had already been done.

How does he explain the answer he gave last week to those families watching today, families earning \$35,000 or less, who are still filing tax returns every year and still paying taxes?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer I gave last week is based on our budget, which cut taxes.

The answer I gave last week is entirely true, which is to say that, according to our forecasts, a family earning \$35,000 will not pay any net taxes to the federal government.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, prescription drugs are the fastest growing health care cost. Yet the government has still done nothing to address this crisis. Liberals have been promising year after year a national pharmacare plan for seniors, for hard pressed families, but they are still waiting.

Surely the health minister will take the opportunity at the meeting this week in Winnipeg to propose a national pharmacare plan to his health provincial counterparts.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Will there be a pharmacare plan in place before the next election?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think we are tabling a bill in the House of Commons either today or tomorrow on the agreement we signed with the provinces which includes all elements of medical services in Canada.

In our discussions with the provinces we discussed not only hospitals but medication too. Part of the agreement we have made with them is that some of the money which will be made available to them, something like \$23 billion over the next five years, is to go toward helping the provinces to deal with the problem of pharmaceutical care for citizens within each province.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there is not the vaguest hint of a national pharmacare plan in the so-called agreement with provincial governments.

Oral Questions

Canadians are sick to death of hearing vague talk about a possible discussion, about a future proposal for a pilot project that may or may not take place. They cannot take that to their local pharmacy and get the prescription drugs they need.

What Canadians need is a national pharmacare plan, the one the Prime Minister has been promising for seven straight years. Let me ask again: Will there be a national pharmacare plan in place before the next election?

• (1430)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after discussions with the three NDP premiers at the conference, they all agreed that the agreement we reached together was the way to cover all the elements of health care in Canada, including pharmacare.

* * *

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I welcome his assurance that he intends to give parliament the opportunity to live its full life.

However, in the event that some unforeseen circumstance might arise, I wonder if the Prime Minister can give the House his assurance that the full report of the auditor general will be made public on or before October 17, whether or not he goes to the polls.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the leader of the Conservative Party was.

I will repeat what I said before. On October 17 of this year the House of Commons of Canada will be sitting. I do not give instructions to the auditor general but he will be able to table his report. If he feels there is an urgency, under the law he can decide to table it earlier.

* * *

HEALTH

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Kings—Hants, PC): For the record, Mr. Speaker, I am treating that as an assurance that the full report of the auditor general will be made available to the public on or before the 17th.

I have a question about the health accord, an accord which we believe cheats the provinces out of \$3 million because it is a post-dated cheque. Will the Prime Minister give the House an assurance now that legislation giving effect to the health accord will pass through this parliament before a general election is called?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the bill will be introduced today. If the government proposes it, the opposition can dispose of it. If it wants, we can pass the bill

without debate right away: one, two, three and it will be done. It depends on the opposition.

The money will be voted before March 31. I understand that the hon. member is not keen to seek the advice of the Canadian people but the Canadian people have the right to decide what kind of society they want for the years to come.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the latest tabling of the public accounts shows some figures that I think need to be explained by the HRD minister.

It shows that under her watch public money was written off to the tune of \$50 million in 1997-98. That jumped incredibly to \$280 million in 1998-99. This year it will jump even more, if that can be believed, to \$344 million.

I invite the minister to explain why under her watch the write-offs of public money have increased so dramatically.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me again say to the hon. member that my department makes every effort to collect on outstanding debts and money owed to the government.

I can tell the hon. member that in this year's public accounts \$547,000 of unrecovered money in grants and contributions are being written off. I note that these files are at least two to five years old.

With regard to the Canada student loans program, we are talking about \$294 million. In fact, I need to correct the first number. It is \$500,000, but when we are talking about Canada students loans it is \$294 million and again—

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

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, those numbers are good and I am glad the minister actually has them but she did not answer the question.

The question was why the write-offs under her stewardship have risen so dramatically over the last three years, from \$50 million to \$280 million to \$344 million. Where will it end? Is the minister looking after public money or not? She needs to be able to tell Canadians that she is.

• (1435)

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to tell the Canadian people that we are looking after public money.

If the hon. member were serious about the issues that she has been raising she would have taken the time to read our second

Oral Questions

progress report which shows that my department is a very different place now than it was a year ago. We have implemented organizational changes to improve accountability. We have new systems in place that improve our monitoring and assessment of programs. We have hired new staff to help us with project management. And our performance tracking directorate is telling us that we are on track to do what we told the Canadians public we would do.

* * *

[Translation]

WOMEN'S MARCH

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in a few days, women from across Quebec and across Canada will begin marching to express their demands on the subjects of poverty and violence. At the initiative of the Fédération des femmes du Québec, marches will be held in 157 countries.

Could the Minister of Finance tell us today whether we will see specific measures for women, finally, in the mini budget he is preparing in order to dispose of the enormous surplus amassed since the start of the year?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first let me say there is no doubt this is a very important measure, and we support it 100%.

Next, it may be seen from past budgets that we have always taken the needs of women into account, and we certainly intend to do so in the future.

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is clear from the Minister of Finance's response that there is a need for specific measures.

Here are some that women have proposed: increasing international aid to .7% of the GNP; unconditionally transferring to Quebec money intended for parental leave, so it may be universal; and providing the provinces with major funding to develop daycare services.

Could the Minister of Finance tell us what kind of commitment he is prepared to make for the women of Quebec and Canada?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I consider the hon. member to be making representation with her question. It was well put, and we will give it due consideration.

* * *

[English]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, two years ago the government was handing out student loans. Two years ago the government was handing out grants and

contributions. The only thing that has changed in the last two years is the minister.

Why is it that in the last two years we have seen her department increase bad debt write-offs by 700% under her leadership?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again I point out to the hon. member that the files to which he refers are sometimes six or seven years old and sometimes even older than that. As part of good management we look at the files and determine at what point we write off the debt.

Let me say that on this side of the House we continue to be committed to helping Canadians across the country by ensuring that they can benefit from our new and growing economy. On that side of the House it is absolutely clear that is seen as being a waste. I would ask those members how they face their own constituents who are involved in these programs and benefiting from them when they are calling them a waste.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, forgive me for challenging the minister but she does not exactly have a stellar record on these issues. The only thing we can do is refer to the numbers. The numbers do not tell a very good story: from \$50 million two years ago in bad debt write-offs to \$344 million today. That is a horrible record by anybody's standards, maybe even hers.

How can she justify that type of huge increase in bad debt write-offs under her leadership? She is responsible.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the record will show that I have taken responsibility for the administration of my department. I think the record will show, as will progress reports, as will the voice of the auditor general, that this government takes very seriously accountability and management of taxpayer dollars.

I would encourage the hon. member to look at the facts, to look at the progress reports and to recognize the changes that have occurred in my department, and to give credit where credit is due.

* * *

[Translation]

SHIPPING

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, during the 1993 election campaign, the Prime Minister came to the Lévis shipyard and pledged to act quickly to help the marine industry. Seven years later, on the eve of another election campaign, nothing has been done.

What does the Prime Minister have to say to the workers who are here today to hold him accountable?

Oral Questions

• (1440)

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is well aware that the bill is being reviewed by the Standing Committee on Finance.

Also, we have had consultations with interested stakeholders from across the shipbuilding industry, including shipbuilders, shipowners and workers. We have received many suggestions and we can look at them. Let us also not forget that there is an excess capacity of about 40% in that industry. That is the fundamental problem.

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when he is in trouble, the Minister of Industry always resorts to nice rhetoric and endless consultations.

How can the minister reconcile his grand speeches to marine workers with the fact that he, along with other Liberal members, did not support my bill, which essentially seeks to help the marine industry and its workers?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the real question from the Bloc Québécois and the Progressive Conservative Party is: How much of the taxpayers' money do they want to give, through subsidies, to an industry that has an excess capacity? They are only interested in subsidies, and that is the fundamental problem.

* * *

[English]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, forgive me if I am wrong but I imagine that if you were a minister of the crown responsible for administering billions of dollars and you had a report saying that all of a sudden write-offs under your responsibility have increased by nine times, or 700%, you might just take the time to find out why.

It is clear this afternoon that the HRD minister does not know why there is a ninefold increase in write-offs in her department.

Can she explain to us precisely why there is this huge, aberrant increase in write-offs that are costing taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member might want to ask his own leader for some details on that.

I note that when the leader of that party was a provincial MLA he was happy to welcome \$20 million in loan guarantees from the Alberta government for Fletcher's Fine Foods in his riding, saying that it would boost local jobs. Unfortunately this undertaking did

not come to fruition. It went bad and the government of Alberta was left with a bill for \$14 million. I wonder if it wrote that off.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister is so weak that she does not even know how to evade a question properly. It is unbelievable.

We are asking serious, straight questions about a serious, sober matter regarding a ninefold, 700% increase in write-offs in her department. By responding with obvious evasions like that, she is indicating that she does not know what happened to the missing money.

Can she tell the House why there was a ninefold increase in write-offs costing hundreds of millions of dollars to Canadian taxpayers? Can she tell us, yes or no, with no evasions?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to point out to the hon. gentleman is that in the process of governing and making investments there are from time to time overpayments. There are from time to time bad debts, whether it be in the Government of Canada or in the government of Alberta.

On this side of the House we will not stop investing in young Canadians. We will not stop investing in the Canada student loan program for people who want to get an education and participate in the economy. We know that is the right thing to do. On that side we know that they will not accept it.

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Human Resources Development Canada has listed the amount of \$165,984 under the heading "Losses of public money due to an offence, illegal act or accident" in the 1999-2000 public accounts.

Since this amount corresponds exactly to the amount received by the company which moved from the riding of Rosemont to the Prime Minister's riding, will the minister confirm that this is indeed the same company, 3393062 Canada Inc.?

• (1445)

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said on a number of occasions, when it comes to that particular file, it is under investigation and it is inappropriate for me to comment further.

* * *

MIDDLE EAST

Mr. Joe Fontana (London North Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in recent days, to our great regret and sorrow, we have witnessed the resumption of violence and death in certain areas of Israel, Gaza and the West Bank.

Oral Questions

We all fear that the recent hostilities will impede the negotiations toward a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. The hopes and prayers of millions of Canadians and people around the world are with Prime Minister Barak and Chairman Arafat to give peace a real chance for Palestinians and Israelis alike.

Could the Minister of Foreign Affairs tell the House what is Canada's reaction to the disturbing developments in the Middle East?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the member for a very timely question.

I want to tell the House that yesterday I issued a statement on behalf of the government in which we condemned all acts of violence, especially those that affected vulnerable civilians. The same message was repeated in the security council by a representative. We have also given the same message to the representatives of the Palestinian authority and the government of Israel.

In particular, we urge all parties to refrain from any unilateral action that would provoke further violence or further disruption. In that case I have to say the visit of Mr. Sharon was ill timed and ill considered in this context.

I also want to report to the House that through our office in Ramallah we are providing assistance for emergency medical aid and are considering other forms of humanitarian aid.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in the public accounts of Canada under illegal offences and illegal acts, there is an amount for \$165,984 that was paid out by the Department of Human Resources Development. The statement says it was paid to a promoter not having met his or her requirements under the TJF program in the province of Quebec.

Could the minister please tell us who received this money under fraudulent pretences from the Government of Canada?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just answered that question.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, grants are public knowledge. Beneficiaries or recipients of grants are public knowledge.

The minister already said today that she makes sure that every effort is made to collect this money, including laying criminal

charges if necessary. Therefore I think that we are entitled to the name of this person from the minister. I ask her again to come clean and tell us who has been defrauding the Government of Canada.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, there are parts that the hon. member who asked the question earlier made reference to in the context of Rosemont. The House knows that that file is under investigation and as such I will not make further comment.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Dennis Gruending (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

Eighty billion litres of toxic discharge from the Adams mine threatens clean water in Ontario and Quebec and it seems that the minister simply does not care. Toronto will vote on this contract this week.

In March the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development received a petition from a first nation to protect its water. Six months after that request and three years into this project, why is there no federal environmental assessment?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many times I have to tell the New Democratic Party that we are bound by the law and constitution which respect the division of responsibilities between provincial and federal governments.

I would point out that the concern expressed with respect to Quebec was in fact dealt with by a Quebec report. I quote the press release of the Quebec government which said:

[Translation]

According to this analysis, the project will have no significant environmental impact on Lac Témiscamingue if the conditions of the Ontario Minister of the Environment's certificate of authorization are met by promoters.

[English]

Mr. Dennis Gruending (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, with values like this, who needs the Alliance?

The minister's government signed away powers to Mike Harris in 1997. The minister has given his officials no time line to report back to him on an assessment and he has simply ignored the first nations impact of the mine. What a great environmentalist. He cannot get his endangered species bill passed let alone stop 20 million tonnes of garbage being dumped into the water table.

Will the minister stop making excuses and finally announce a federal environmental assessment?

Oral Questions

● (1450)

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, given the performance of the New Democratic Party, it is understandable why the endangered species legislation is very high on their minds.

I would suggest to the hon. member that we will not unduly and improperly pressure agencies which parliament set up to be independent of the executive of the Government of Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC): Mr. Speaker, last year, the auditor general asked the government how the employment insurance commission set the EI premium rate.

My question is a very simple one. Why is this not indicated in Bill C-44? What is the government hiding?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it should be clear to the member from the legislation introduced by the minister that all this will be examined. A response will be provided in due course.

[English]

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development. The premium rate is much higher than necessary, even according to HRDC's own actuary. Will the government take decisive action on this hidden tax on employment and reduce the premium to at least \$2 right now?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would take a look at the history of decisions taken over the last number of years, he will see that what we have done is to adopt the recommendations of the commissioners. That is the way the situation worked. What he should also take a look at is that each and every year since we have taken office those premiums have come down. In the seven years prior to our taking office, the seven years in which his party was in office, every single year those premiums went up.

* * *

CHILDREN

Mrs. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, by now most Canadians are aware that on September 11 the Prime Minister and the first ministers reached a historic agreement on health care. What has not received quite as much public attention is that an equally important agreement was also reached to help young children and support their families.

Can the Secretary of State for Children and Youth please tell the House what the government hopes to achieve with the agreement on early childhood development?

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on September 11 the Government of Canada entered into a \$2.2 billion agreement with the provinces and territories. The agreement reached covers four areas: promoting healthy pregnancy and infancy; improving family support; strengthening early childhood development; and strengthening community support.

Public reaction has been very positive. This new partnership approach is social policy that will make a difference and will bring hope to all children of the country.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I want to give the HRDC minister one last opportunity to explain, giving a simple explanation, as to why write-offs of money owed to her department have increased so dramatically, 700%, since she became minister. We are suggesting that she cannot do her job. Perhaps that is wrong. There may be a good reason for this.

Would the minister please clear this up so that Canadians will know what they can expect from the minister?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I would let the hon. member know that we have a two year project with treasury board to do our best to clean up outstanding debts. That is why she has seen an increase in write-offs.

Since she asked me the very question about whether or not I can do the job, would she ask her leader why during the time he was treasurer there was over \$409 million in total write-offs to companies like Centennial Food Corporation for \$11.7 million, to Gainers for \$421,000, to North Saskatchewan Riverboat for \$500,000, to ALPAC, and there are more. The point is—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Rosemont—Petite-Patrie.

● (1455)

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, again relating to the transfer of grant money from Rosemont to Saint-Maurice, the minister seems to be hiding the truth from us.

For some months now—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. I would ask the hon. member to be very judicious in his choice of words.

Oral Questions

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Mr. Speaker, in the transfer of grant money from Rosemont to Saint-Maurice, there is one thing that appears clear, and that is that for some months now the minister has always refused to answer our questions.

The public accounts report is clear: there is a figure of \$165,984 under the heading "Losses of public money due to an illegal act". My question is a simple one: Is the minister telling us the whole truth and what is it she wants to cover up in Saint-Maurice?

[*English*]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again I would respond that the hon. member knows that this file is under investigation. He full well knows that it would be inappropriate for me to make any further comments.

* * *

AUTO INDUSTRY

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

Despite many assurances that free trade agreements like the WTO and the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement would not affect managed trade like the auto pact, we are now in a situation where the WTO has ruled against the auto pact and will be making further regulations as to how Canada can comply with that ruling.

What does the government intend to do to protect the jobs of all those auto workers who have a right to expect that security which they have become accustomed to and which was the backbone of the Ontario economy? What is the minister going to do to protect those jobs in the auto industry?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are of course extremely pleased with the health of the auto industry in Canada. It is extremely dynamic and is doing very well. I can tell the House that we are absolutely confident that the industry will continue on its very healthy progress of the last few years.

As for the WTO decision, we had asked for ten and a half months to implement the decision. We were very pleased that we were given eight months. We will respect that international commitment to the WTO that protects Canadian interests around the world all the time because we need a rules based system.

* * *

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC): Mr. Speaker, the premier of Newfoundland, Mr. Tobin, has been very critical of the

government's health care package, saying that it is no bonanza because funding will not be fully restored to 1994-95 levels until the year 2006.

What is the minister going to do to address the health care problems of small provinces like Newfoundland that cannot wait until 2006 to have its health care funding restored to 1995 levels?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Charbonneau (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the September 11 agreement was signed by all the provincial premiers and at this time, the health ministers and the federal Minister of Health are meeting in Winnipeg in order to put in place all the provisions of the agreement as promptly as possible.

All the health ministers are engaged in discussions with the federal minister on the conditions for implementation of this agreement, and things are going very well.

* * *

[*English*]

PRISONS AND PENITENTIARIES

Ms. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think all members of the House know that drugs pose a real problem in our prison system.

I would like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General just what are you doing to help deal with this problem and prevent drugs from entering our prisons?

The Speaker: I remind the hon. member to please address her questions to the Chair.

Mr. Lynn Myers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as you know Correctional Service Canada has zero tolerance when it comes to drugs. As a result of its good work and the work of the Government of Canada we have done three things. The first is to have ion scanners in place. The second is that planning is in place for drug dogs to sniff out drugs. The third is random searching. As a result of this great work, positive testing for drugs has gone down from 39% in 1993 to 12% last year. This is great news.

* * *

● (1500)

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of the Right Hon. Geoffrey Hoon, Secretary of State for Defence of the United Kingdom.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

*Routine Proceedings***BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to inform the House that Thursday, October 5, shall not be an allotted day but that Monday, October 16, shall be.

Mr. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order arising out of question period. I would seek unanimous consent to move the following motion:

That, in the event of the presentation of a report by the auditor general to the Speaker during any recess, prorogation or dissolution of parliament, the Speaker would therefore be entitled to make such reports or report public immediately upon receipt from the auditor general.

I seek unanimous consent of the House to move the motion given the responses from the Prime Minister today.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough have unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1505)

[*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 11 petitions.

* * *

[*English*]

WAYS AND MEANS

NOTICE OF MOTION

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 83(1) I wish to table a notice of a ways and means motion involving amendments to the Excise Tax Act in accordance with the proposal set out in our accompanying publication, "Legislative Proposals and Explanatory Notes", relating to the Excise Tax Act.

These provisions would facilitate Canada's logistics industry by helping those who are exporting. This notice of ways and means motion is a result of stellar work carried out by the member for Stoney Creek. I know members from all parties would want to applaud his efforts in this regard. I would ask that an order of the day be designated for consideration of this motion.

* * *

CANADA HEALTH CARE, EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER SOCIAL SERVICES FUNDING ACT

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-45, an act respecting the provision of increased funding for health care services, medical equipment, health information and communications technologies, early childhood development and other social services and to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act.

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

* * *

CANADA FOUNDATION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT TECHNOLOGY ACT

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-46, an act to establish a foundation to fund sustainable development technology.

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

* * *

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-500, an act to amend the Food and Drugs Act (genetically modified food).

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-500 is an act to amend the Food and Drugs Act for genetically modified food. The bill provides for all foods or food ingredients that are or contain genetically modified material to be labelled to this effect, in accordance with regulations of course.

The bill also provides for the application of the precautionary principle in allowing the Minister of Health to monitor and initiate research into the potential long term effects of the consumption of genetically modified food on human health.

Finally, the bill would enable food manufacturers and consumers to make an informed decision on whether to purchase products containing genetically modified material.

Routine Proceedings

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

• (1510)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mauril Bélanger: Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek the unanimous consent of the House that Motion No. 37 be adopted without debate. This motion concerns the second report of the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages, expressing a desire for Ottawa, the capital of Canada, to be officially bilingual. I seek unanimous consent that the House adopt this motion without debate.

The Deputy Speaker: To clarify the situation, the motion in question is Motion No. 37, which is on the order paper. Is there unanimous consent of the House to adopt this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

MARRIAGE

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have six different petitions to present today from my constituents. The first petition is one in which constituents ask us to maintain the definition of marriage as a union of one man and one woman, to the exclusion of all others.

FOOD LABELLING

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the second group of petitions is with regard to labelling and asks parliament to enact legislation for mandatory labelling of foods containing genetically engineered organisms.

TAXATION

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the third petition is with regard to tax relief and asks the government to institute at least a 25% cut in federal taxes.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the fourth petition is with regard to

the legalization of child pornography. It asks parliament to enact the notwithstanding clause to make sure that child pornography is not legalized in Canada.

The fifth petition is from another group of constituents with the same issues.

IRAQ

Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Brampton West—Mississauga, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from my constituents in which they cite the devastating effects on the children of Iraq of harsh sanctions.

They are petitioning the Government of Canada to take the lead in persuading the UN to lift the sanctions against the people of Iraq.

ENERGY PRICES

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce in the House today a petition signed by many Canadians concerned about the high cost of energy. They are concerned that energy is the underpinning of our economy and that there is no action from the government to defend the interests of consumers, small business people, farmers and our economy in general.

They are asking that the House of Commons establish an energy price commission that would hold the big oil companies, which control 85% of our refinery capacity, accountable for the energy prices they charge Canadians.

It is my pleasure to introduce this petition, which I support 100%.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre does not need reminding of the point that his views on the petition are not ones that are the subject of a presentation of a petition. He is to present the petition and leave it at that. I would invite him to comply in every respect in this regard. Perhaps he forgot over the summer.

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, as always you are correct. I appreciate your advice.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my second petition, which I am introducing in the House of Commons on behalf of many petitioners across Canada, is in light of the fact that there have been cuts of \$400 million to the CBC, which has caused thousands of layoffs. It amounts to one of the largest cuts made by the Liberal government to any agency while it has been in power since 1993.

They are asking the House of Commons and parliament to take measures to restore adequate funding to the CBC to allow maintenance of and improvements to current local television news while improving the network for all Canadians.

MISSILE DEFENCE PROGRAM

Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition by several residents of greater Montreal that calls on parliament and the Government of Canada not to support the U.S. national missile defence program to be operated by NORAD.

The petitioners say the NMD is a unilateral initiative of the United States that no other major country supports. It would be a step toward the deployment of weapons in space and would lead to a new arms race. It violates the ABM treaty and is running counter to Canada's commitment as a signatory to the non-proliferation treaty.

• (1515)

Therefore the petitioners call upon parliament to declare that Canada objects to the national missile defence program in the United States and that parliament play a leadership role in banning nuclear weapons and missile flight tests.

SEAL HUNT

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to introduce four petitions today. The first is from a local resident of east Vancouver who has collected 89 sheets of signatures of people in Vancouver very concerned about the cruelty, waste and unlawful behaviour that are documented features of the Canadian commercial seal hunt of harp and hooded seals.

The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to enact legislation to stop the commercial seal hunt in Canada.

HEALTH CARE

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my second petition is signed by many people across the country who call upon parliament and the Government of Canada to end the two tier American style health care system in Canada. They also call on the government to take action to stop bill 11 in Alberta.

It is signed by many people across the country who are very concerned about the state of our public health care system.

NUCLEAR ARMS

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce my third petition from veterans against nuclear arms.

They draw our attention to the fact that the Government of Canada has uncritically offered support for U.S. bombing of Afghanistan, Khartoum, and for the further ongoing bombing of Iraq in previous conflicts, and that this is done in violation of international law and the UN charter.

The petitioners pray and request that parliament returns Canada's foreign and defence policies to a full respect for and full compliance with international law and the UN charter.

Routine Proceedings

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my fourth petition is signed by Canadians who are calling on the WTO to be more open, inclusive and democratic.

The petitioners want to see an alternative model of globalization, one that is designed to help citizens in Canada and around the world achieve a stable rules based economy which protects the rights of workers and the environment.

GASOLINE ADDITIVES

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition on behalf of citizens of Grand Bend, Port Dover and Camlachie. They urge the government to eliminate the gas additive MMT as it has a negative impact both on people's health and our ecosystem at large.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Peter Mancini (Sydney—Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present three petitions, all dealing with concerns of my constituents.

They are opposed to Alberta's bill 11 which would permit private for profit health care in the country.

[Translation]

CANADA POST CORPORATION

Mr. Claude Drouin (Beauce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by 83 constituents of the riding of Bourassa concerning rural route mail couriers.

The petitioners call upon parliament to repeal subsection 13(5) of the Canada Post Corporation Act, which deprives rural couriers of their right to collective bargaining.

[English]

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table two petitions on behalf of many Canadians who have expressed ongoing concern about the ever encroaching American style health care system that is moving into Canada.

The petitioners call upon the government to stop the for profit hospitals and in particular to implement a national home care program and a national program for prescription drugs.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition on behalf of a number of residents of the North Thompson region of British Columbia.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners point out a number of concerns about the move toward a for profit privatized U.S. style health care system. They are concerned that the federal government has not stopped the province of Alberta from moving ahead with a privatized system.

They call upon the Government of Canada to do what it can to ensure that health care is available to Canadians regardless of income or where they live across the country.

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition from citizens concerned about the lack of a national highway policy.

They suggest that moneys collected from the excise tax on gasoline should be put into highway reconstruction and construction in order to improve the highway grid across the country. They feel that tax dollars being spent at the pump should be going back into highway development.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I present my third petition which is also from residents of the North Thompson Valley. They are distraught by the lack of action in terms of changes to the criminal code. They are concerned about the fact that violent people are being let out of prisons, in their minds, prematurely and that there are unsafe people in our communities.

• (1520)

They are calling upon the federal government to amend the criminal code to prevent persons convicted of serious crimes from being released from custody pending the hearing of their appeal, except in very exceptional circumstances.

PENSIONS

Mr. Dennis Gruending (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present today. The first one says that a small number of Saskatchewan senior women received in 1999 a gratuitous, one time only cash payment from the Saskatchewan Workers' Compensation Board with respect to the previous death of a spouse on the job.

This money was not income but was intended to right a wrong which had occurred many years previously. Revenue Canada clawed back from these women the entire amount of the old age supplement paid to them for the year 1999 and further has planned to withhold all old age supplement payments in the year 2000-01.

Therefore the petitioners from all over Saskatchewan call upon parliament to urge the government to immediately issue remission orders for this clawback and to require Revenue Canada to repay

these widows the amounts of OAS and GIS clawed back and withheld.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Dennis Gruending (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from many citizens concerned with the federal government's record on health care, in particular the fact that it has allowed Alberta to pass Bill C-11 without any real protests.

They ask that we stop for profit hospitals and restore federal funding for health care. They want a national home care program and a national program for prescription drugs.

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

Mr. Dennis Gruending (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my final petition is from another group of citizens very concerned about Canada's trade policy and the lack of democracy at the WTO.

They petition parliament to insist that Canada secure binding and enforcing rules to protect human rights, labour standards, cultural diversity and the environment in any future trade agreements, and that Canada work to build an alternative model of globalization, one which will not rob us of sovereignty but rather protect it.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 77 could be made an order for return, that return would be tabled immediately.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 77—**Mr. Paul Forseth:**

For the riding of New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby from January 1997 to January 2000: (a) what the federal grants, loans, and other financial provisions were granted; (b) in each case, what was the name of the associated program; (c) what was the originating agency or department; (d) what was the amount; and (e) what was the name of the recipient?

Return tabled.

[Translation]

Mr. Derek Lee: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Government Orders

[English]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**MOTIONS FOR PAPERS**

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. P-39 in the name of the hon. member for Calgary Northeast.

Motion P-39

That a humble address be presented to Her Excellency praying that she will cause to be laid before this House a copy of Canada's Submissions to the NATO Defence Planning Questionnaires for each year between 1987 and 2000.

It is not the practice of the House of Commons to request papers which if released would be detrimental to the security of the state or its allies and to the conduct of international relations.

This is in keeping with the spirit of the Access to Information Act. Subsection 15(1) states that a government institution may refuse to disclose any record that could reasonably be expected to be injurious to the conduct or the defence of Canada, or any state allied or associated with Canada.

According to subsections 15(1)(a) and 15(1)(b) this includes respectively the disclosure of any record relating to military tactics or strategy or military exercises or operations undertaken in preparation for hostilities or in connection with the detection, prevention or suppression of subversive or hostile activities, and the disclosure of any record relating to quantity, characteristics, capabilities or deployment of weapons or other defence equipment.

The requested information, if released, would be injurious to Canada's relations with our allies and to Canada's defence and that of our allies. I therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I ask that Motion No. P-39 be transferred for debate.

The Deputy Speaker: The motion is transferred for debate.

Mr. Derek Lee: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the other Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that the remaining Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

• (1525)

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (for the Minister of Human Resources Development) moved that Bill C-44, an act amending the Employment Insurance Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we all know, employment remains Canadians' number one concern.

They returned this government to office with a mandate to continue its work to promote economic growth and the creation of jobs. In fact, the job strategy makes these issues the main priority of the Government of Canada.

This government rightly considers its role is to create a context promoting investment and development of the private sector and, in particular, small and medium business, the real motive force in job creation in Canada's economy.

No one today can deny the enormous progress that has been made in achieving these major economic objectives so important to Canadians.

Since this Liberal government was elected in 1993, two million new jobs have been created, half of which have gone to women.

The unemployment rate has dropped by over 4% across the country. I would add with pride that in Quebec the drop in the rate is greater than the national average. There, the rate of unemployment, which was 8.4% in August, has dropped by five points.

Nearly 400,000 more Quebecers are employed today than were in 1993. Never have the prospects of the country as a whole for short and long term economic growth been so good considering, among other things, the announced reduction in employment insurance contributions, the seventh in as many years, and the \$58 billion in reductions in income tax, which will remain in the taxpayers' pockets.

Four years ago the government put an entirely new employment insurance system in place with the very specific purpose of helping people return to work as quickly as possible.

One of the great innovations of the employment insurance program introduced in 1996 was to provide not only temporary income support in the form of benefits but also active employment

Business of the House

measures to promote permanent integration of the unemployed into the labour market.

These measures were designed to be flexible enough to meet the specific needs of the unemployed, based on the local economy, through partnerships with the various levels of government, community organizations and employers.

In the year 2000 alone, more than \$2.21 billion were spent on active employment measures, including \$594 million in Quebec.

People now realize that this initiative was crucial, as evidenced by the fact that the federal government has since then signed 11 labour market agreements with the provinces and territories about the delivery of these active employment measures funded through the employment insurance account.

Through this initiative, the federal government was also able to give Quebec something it had been demanding for 30 years, namely full jurisdiction over manpower training.

Today, we are bringing forward several changes to EI. One of the changes proposed by the minister in this bill would eliminate the intensity rule.

• (1530)

As we know, the amount to which a claimant is entitled is 55% of his or her insurable earnings. The intensity rule, which reduces the benefit rate down to a minimum of 50%, was designed to discourage people from using employment insurance frequently and for extended periods.

However, we have noticed that in several regions, particularly in those where the economy is based mainly on seasonal work, workers who are already penalized by these annual and always deplorable seasonal layoffs are also penalized because they have no other choice but to rely on employment insurance to make ends meet.

Under the proposed change, the basic rate will stay at 55% of insurable earnings for all claimants, whether they are frequent claimants or not, whether they are seasonal workers or not.

Needless to say this change will benefit people in fishing regions, particularly in the Maritimes, but it is important to note that it will apply to all frequent claimants in all regions, throughout Canada, which means that it will apply to much larger pools of seasonal workers. In fact, this change will have a great impact in Quebec, where 41% of claimants are subject to the intensity rule.

We are also proposing to change the rules governing the clawbacks on benefits. At present, tax recovery applies to all claimants whose net income exceeds \$48,750 and to frequent claimants whose net income exceeds \$39,000.

These recipients have to pay back 30% of the amounts received, regardless of whether these are regular or special benefits. Those

who are forced to call upon employment insurance frequently can be required to reimburse up to 100% of their benefits.

We are proposing that, in future, only the highest wage earners, that is those with a net income in excess of \$48,750, be required to pay back benefits. Even then, there would be an exemption for first-time claimants and recipients of special benefits such as maternity, parental or sick benefits. Once again, this will be a change that will benefit the workers of Quebec.

Overall, we feel that the new employment insurance program has had good results so far. The government made a commitment to monitor the application and effects of the new program and to remedy any possible weaknesses. This is, in fact, what it is doing by introducing this bill.

[English]

Let me add that we will always be working together with the provinces and territories, business groups and communities to diversify the economy and help generate jobs and growth.

[Translation]

All my parliamentary colleagues, along with the entire Canadian public, acknowledge that economic development, skills development and permanent job creation are the best solutions in the long term, as the minister has indicated.

What all Canadians want first and foremost is jobs. They want to work so that they can improve their situation and their own feelings of self-worth, while contributing to the collective effort of society.

This is true as much for seasonal workers as for all other working men and women throughout the length and breadth of Canada.

* * *

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When the House was adjourned on Thursday last, it was about to complete debate and come to a vote on private member's Motion No. 259 in the name of the hon. member for Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys.

There have been consultations among the parties earlier today and I believe you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That the question on Motion No. 259 be deemed to have been put and a division thereon requested and deferred to the time of completion of consideration of government orders later this day.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. the parliamentary secretary have the unanimous consent of the House to propose this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

• (1535)

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-44, an act to amend the Employment Insurance Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to stand up and give the official opposition's take on this new bill, an act to amend the Employment Insurance Act.

In our view this bill violates three important principles. First, it violates the principle of sound policy making based on consultation, completeness, addressing fundamentals, all the things that good policies do and this bill does not.

Second, the bill violates the principle of doing the most good for the most people. Here we see a very short-sighted, very narrow approach taken to the unemployment insurance regime.

Third, the bill violates the principle of public interest over self-interest. I think everyone knows that the bill is being rushed in on the eve of an election simply to increase the political fortunes of the Liberals in some parts of the country. That is an insult to all Canadians in those parts of the country.

As an overview, the bill purports to do six things. First, it increases the amount that a seasonal worker can earn before his or her EI is clawed back. It is increased from \$39,000, which is the average industrial wage, to close to \$50,000.

Second, the bill puts into place a single rate of repayment for those who are clawed back at 30% instead of a higher clawback for more frequent claimants.

Third, it eliminates the clawback for all first time claimants.

Fourth, it eliminates the intensity rule which clawed back a portion of benefits for all frequent recipients of EI.

Fifth, it makes it easier for parents who left the workforce to raise children to qualify for EI benefits.

Sixth, it exempts paternal, maternity and sickness benefits from the clawback.

Those are the six things that the bill purports to do.

As I said, we believe that the bill violates three important principles and I would like to spend my time elaborating on that.

First, the bill violates the principle of sound policy making. This is a very important issue for Canadians. Many Canadians access EI benefits from time to time but more importantly, every single Canadian worker and every single Canadian business pays into and support the system and is therefore a very important stakeholder in the system. If we are going to change the system, then we need to get it right.

The House will know that about two decades ago an exhaustive study was made of the EI system by the Forget Commission which resulted in about 15 volumes of recommendations. Almost none of those have ever been implemented, including in this bill. Yet we have a bill coming forward in the face of not only the study that I mentioned but many subsequent studies and articles by experts and policy thinkers. The bill does virtually nothing to address the perversities, the complexities and the things that plainly are not working in the EI system. This is not good policy making.

What is needed is real reform of the EI-UI system, not just this kind of tinkering. In fact, to my knowledge the government consulted no one before bringing in the bill.

• (1540)

I think everyone acknowledges that this system, which is profoundly flawed, was supposedly fixed by these Liberals in 1996. Yet those so-called reforms just made things stingier. They did nothing to fix the underlying problems of the system.

The so-called reforms that the Liberals brought in in 1996 have now been summarily reversed with a stroke of the pen. Why? One can only suppose that it is to enhance Liberal electoral chances in Atlantic Canada; shocking as it may seem that the Liberals would stoop to such transparent tactics.

The fact is that the changes the Liberals brought in in 1996 drew an outcry from many of the people affected right away. That was four years ago. If the concerns which the Liberals heard about the system and about the changes they made were legitimate, why did it take four long years, right up until the brink of an election, for them to do something about it?

The member on the other side who just spoke did nothing to address that question and a lot of people are wondering why now. Why ignore concerns, outcries and discontent for years and years and then all of a sudden decide to do something now? The present changes have also been criticized very widely. There are some

Government Orders

legitimate criticisms which need to be answered by the government.

Many people feel that these changes will simply make it profitable for industries to gear up for short seasons. They believe they will not be doing their workers a disservice because their workers have the EI cushion. Instead of offering workers long term, stable jobs that they can count on to raise their families and better themselves in the long term, these changes simply pour cold water on that kind of positive change.

Some people are also concerned about the fact that these changes and others really entice young people to leave school earlier for jobs that offer no real future. A very good article was written by the Atlantic Institute for Market Studies. It was published in the *National Post* on September 28. Essentially it pointed out that two things are happening due to problems in the system.

One is that the rule that allows people to gain about half a year of EI benefits by catching as little as \$2,500 worth of fish has made some young people go into that industry in order to get the EI benefits. This is damaging in two ways. It hurts the young people who then become caught in what many in Atlantic Canada refer to as the EI trap. Instead of going on to school, gaining the skills and training they need to build a strong future for themselves, they are encouraged by these rules to leave school so they can say that they are available for work in order to gain short term benefits. Surely this was not the intention of the EI system. Those are the kinds of perversities that are not addressed at all in this bill. They are hurting a lot of young people and causing concern for a lot of families.

Also, at a time when the fish stocks are decreasing, we have rules that encourage people to get into an industry with declining stocks. What kind of future is that building for people? Not much, but we have a government that is blind to those kinds of perversities, that does nothing to address them and still claims that this bill is helping people in seasonal industries. Clearly that is not a claim that can be sustained at all. In fact, it is hurting the very people that the government is claiming it is helping.

We owe the people of Canada better than that. The bill does nothing to give long term hope for employment and a secure future and skills building to many people across the country. That is what we really want to do.

• (1545)

The minister herself has said that what Canadians want most is to have a job. The bill does nothing to deal with the problem of unemployment, which is severe and disabling in many parts of the country, and the government is silent on providing the help that it says people need, which is a secure job.

We have to conclude that these changes are really driven more by politics than by a desire to help the people who are affected by

the EI system, who are most people in the country and proportionately more in parts of the country with low employment.

The bill also violates the principle that government policy and legislation should do the most good for the most people. Most of us would agree that we have to look at the big picture when we are making policies and bringing in legislation. We need to ask ourselves whether the bill actually does look at the big picture, whether it does make an attempt to do the most good for the most people and whether it attempts to deliver more jobs for people, not simply and solely more benefits to cushion, in the short term, the effects of there being an absence of jobs.

The bill is also completely silent on the real needs of Canadian workers who are chronically underemployed or unemployed. The bill provides a few dollars more but will not give any real long term hope. Is that the message we want to send? I ask my friends in the NDP and PC Party, is that what we want to tell people? I ask these people because they represent voters and constituents in that part of the country. Do we want to tell people that we will give them a few more dollars and make the pain a bit less but that we will not give them any long term hope? Is that the message we want to send? That is exactly the thrust of the bill.

There may be some legitimate changes to the EI regulations in Bill C-44 but the long term solution to unemployment surely is training and skills enhancement, not encouraging people to move into dead end jobs. Surely the real solution to unemployment is getting the economic fundamentals right so there is economic prosperity, activity and new jobs are created. The bill contains none of that.

Even with what the bill does contain, which is a few more dollars for people caught in the trap of low employment, no employment or underemployment, it is an insult in light of what the Liberals are taking out of the EI system.

We have a \$38 billion surplus in the EI system. If we divided that amount among all of the unemployed workers they could get a university degree, receive training or set up their own businesses. What does the government give them out of that \$38 billion surplus that workers and businesses helped to create? It gives them a 15 cent reduction in EI premiums. I have not checked the minister's math, which may or may not be right given the track record of the minister, but she says that a 15 cent reduction will add up to \$1.5 billion. At the same time there is a \$38 billion surplus. What are the Liberals doing with the other \$36.5 billion one might ask?

At the same time, with the Canada pension plan premiums increasing by 40 cents on January 1 there will be a net increase in taxes that workers have to pay when they do work rather than any reduction.

• (1550)

However, the government refuses to look at the big picture and makes small, small-minded, small impact changes to do what? It is

to be able to pretend to people that it is responding to their concerns and that it is providing some of the much needed help for which people have been asking. It is a charade. It is a scam. It is not worthy of putting before the Canadian people.

The EI surplus does not belong to the Liberals. It belongs to thousands of business people and millions of workers. We believe that the people who are paying the shot, putting in the money and who have a stake should be making the decisions. I do not think the people putting up all this money every year and who have built up a \$38 billion surplus would decide to hand it over to the Liberals to use as they see fit.

There is even law-breaking in the way this EI premium reduction is being managed. The law says that the government can only charge premiums to pay out the current benefits and to build up a little cushion in case unexpectedly high unemployment comes along. The chief actuary of the fund himself has said that the surplus the Liberals have built up is far in excess of what would be needed to meet the requirements of the law. However the Liberals simply ignore their own laws and build up enormous, unjustified surpluses and then use them for whatever they want, which, as we can see, is mostly for their own political gain.

The Canadian Labour Congress said that this year for the first time more EI premiums will go into general revenues of the Liberal government than will be paid out in benefits. In other words, all the money that is being paid by struggling Canadian workers and small businesses who can barely keep their doors open is pouring into the coffers of the Liberal government. It is not helping employment or unemployed workers. It is helping the Liberals. The Liberals are helping themselves to it. That has to stop.

Is there anything in the bill to address the clear violation of what is right and proper? There is not a word. We only have the Liberals saying "We will give you a tiny reduction. Are we not generous? You lucky people who are paying us \$10 billion a year more than you are supposed to pay for this program, we will give you a little back. We will give you about 15% back and you should be grateful for that". That is what the Liberal government is telling Canadian workers. It is an insult and should be seen as an insult.

We believe, and all opposition parties believe, that employers and workers should control what is rightfully theirs. A couple of years ago all opposition party leaders held a joint news conference to make that very point to the government as surpluses in the EI fund rose above any kind of reasonable level. Opposition parties have different ideas on the types of benefits, the levels of benefits and the rates of payment. That is healthy. It is good to have different ideas because we come to a balanced and proper perspective when we share those ideas. However, we are all in agreement that the decisions about how to spend the money that comes out of the workers' pockets and the pockets of struggling small businesses should be made by the people who are putting up the money.

Government Orders

Does the bill address that issue? Not at all. There was a thing called the Canada Employment and Insurance Commission. It was set up to consult with all the people who pay into the system and advise the government on things like levels of EI rates. What does the bill do? It simply toasts the Canada Employment and Insurance Commission. It does an end run around them. It says that cabinet will set the rates directly and that it will also be done next year. What is the EI commission good for? What is it there for? Is its mandate respected? Is the consultation it is doing respected? No.

• (1555)

The EI commission is actually made up of people from labour, from employers, from workers and from all the groups who are affected by the system and yet the commission is simply being ignored, disregarded and an end run done around it by the government in the legislation.

Far from the government respecting the people who are paying the freight of this program, the government is ignoring and running roughshod over the representatives of these groups that are on the Canada Employment and Insurance Commission. This is a bad bill for so many reasons, and that is just another one.

The bill will hurt in several ways, as I pointed out. It allows companies to structure the way they operate to take maximum benefit of EI. It does not encourage businesses to find ways to operate in the full season and allow people to have long term, stable jobs. It encourages just the opposite. How does this help people? It cannot. It does not encourage the kind of break that people are asking for from dependence on short term assistance programs and over to what they really want, which is long term employment of which they can be proud, on which they can raise their families and on which they can build a future.

I recommend to the House an article by Fred McMahon who for a long time worked with the Atlantic Institute for Market Studies. This article was published on October 2 in the *Ottawa Citizen*. He essentially said that the EI system has harmed many regions of the country and that it has created a trap for many people. Surely that is a tragedy that must be addressed but it is not.

We need to be more compassionate than that. We need to look at what is happening to people who have no hope other than a few more dollars once in a while on the eve of an election from a Liberal government. We need to look at what can be done to provide strong economic growth and activity in parts of the country where people are unemployed or underemployed. We believe that the answer to that is in the Alliance's policies of actually letting people keep the money they earn. What a novel idea. When we earn money, the government will not actually take it away from us. It will let us keep it to create jobs, to buy consumer goods, to build

Government Orders

our businesses, to invest in skills, to fund education and to do the things that will create a strong economy.

That is not just pie in the sky. We have many examples across the world of economies that have done exactly that. They have significantly reduced the government grab of earnings from companies, entrepreneurs and workers and their economies have soared. Ireland is a prime example of that. There are many states in the U.S. that have significantly reduced taxes and seen a huge increase in the number of jobs available for their citizens.

If we want to look closer to home, we can attest to the fact that these measures do not just work in other countries. They also work here. The provinces of Alberta and Ontario, which have significantly cut taxes, have seen job opportunities for their citizens absolutely go through the roof. And what does the government do? It increases its tax take, or reduces it by such minuscule amounts that it has no appreciable effect on the overall level of economic activity.

• (1600)

We believe that our policies, which we will be putting to the people in the election, will actually secure jobs for hundreds of thousands of unemployed and underemployed workers. They will also pour millions of dollars into the economy in a positive way without any political tainting, without any perverse effect on the economies which desperately need that kind of infusion. Instead of a few dollars in handouts mostly tied to political patronage and political profiteering by the Liberal government, it would be money spent in the common sense way by workers, businessmen and entrepreneurs. That is what we need to be working for in this country.

The bill also violates the principle of public interest over self-interest. What we have here, as one person described to me today, is a knee-jerk policy decision designed solely to get votes.

I have given so many reasons today, and I know that other speakers to the bill will give even more, why the bill does not represent big picture policy to benefit the people most affected. It represents an 11th hour, quick vote buying kind of initiative by a government that should be ashamed of itself. That government says that it cares about people, that it values people. It did not care about the people who were affected by the EI changes over the last four years. All of a sudden are we supposed to believe that the bill is motivated by real caring? I do not think so.

This is simply the Liberal government indulging in some very cynical and reprehensible vote buying, vote manipulating policy making. It is an insult to every person affected. It suggests that people who are most affected and most needy, and to whom even a few dollars would mean an awful lot, can be bought right before an election. It is so cynical and insulting.

The Liberal government should be ashamed of itself. I appeal to Liberal members to vote against this kind of ad hockery in public policy making on the eve of an election. The people in the country who are the most needy and have the biggest difficulty in finding long term stable employment deserve far better than this and we should give it to them.

There is also a lot of evidence which I believe must come out in debate, in the committee hearings, in letting people speak, that in the long run these kinds of measures will hurt more than help regularly unemployed workers. It is a tiny, tiny bit of short term gain but so much long term pain in a system that is fundamentally flawed. It does not address the real needs of workers, which are for real work, real economic opportunity and real relief from chronic dependence on politicians and what they may or may not give.

We have seen the politicians over there take away, then give back a little, then take away some more. Surely we can do better for people than to play those kinds of games with them, their futures and their families. They deserve better. I am appalled that the Liberal government has done such a cynical, shortsighted, inadequate job of addressing those issues.

All employed workers are going to carry the freight for this, whether they are part time, seasonal, or full time in low paying jobs. The money comes straight out of their pockets and out of the pockets of their employers who would probably like to hire more people but simply do not have the money and resources left after the government is done taxing them to death.

• (1605)

The sad thing is that people who are the least able to pay, people who are the most needy in this system are going to be hurt by these changes. These changes help a few, but mostly those few at the higher end of the income scale.

We have to wonder when there are so many people in the country not able to work full time, not able to find secure employment, why the government cares so little about the real problem that it would insult them with this kind of last minute, short term, small minded tinkering.

This is not a bill that should even have seen the light of day. As the bill is debated and examined in committee, and as people in the public start to see what is in the bill, I believe it will draw an increasing level of opposition and criticism. And so it should because legitimate needs that ought to have been addressed in the EI system and in the bigger picture of employment needs of Canadians simply have been ignored in this bill, or have not been helped, or have been addressed in ways that can only be characterized as mere tinkering, nothing substantive, nothing really helpful to the people who are affected.

I invite Canadians who are watching this debate to listen to the concerns that are brought forward by their representatives and to

Government Orders

examine the bill for themselves. It is a very short bill. As I said, it is just a little bit of tinkering on the eve of an election. Consider the bigger issues that will be affecting the employment picture of our country in the years to come, particularly for those that are struggling the most to have the kind of employment prospects that they need for themselves and their family.

This is a bill that violates fundamental principles of sound policy making. It violates the principle of doing the most good for the most people. It also violates the principle of putting public interest before self-interest. The bill should not be supported and I urge members of the House to vote against it unless it is substantially changed. I believe it is so fundamentally flawed that the government should simply go back to the drawing board on this whole issue.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased today to rise to speak to Bill C-44. This is an important moment, not because of the profusion of measures on the table, but because the Minister of Human Resources Development is in flight.

She did not appear to defend her bill in the House today, she gave the task to a parliamentary secretary. I think this makes it clear what is going on. On the table, we have a bill that, for the first time since the Liberals took office, since they introduced unacceptable reform, and in a number of limited measures, returns some vestige of dignity to the workers facing unemployment. This cannot be called a victory, but it is a significant step. Some of the measures in the bill will have to be implemented as quickly as possible so these workers may be given sufficient income again.

I would remind those watching us today of the whole history of this bill. First, the former government, that is, the one before 1997, toured all of Canada. The present Minister of Foreign Affairs was the Minister of Human Resources Development at the time. People throughout Canada told the government that what was needed was a plan providing people between jobs with a decent income, a plan that was up to date, a plan that was open to self-employed workers, for example, and a plan that did justice to women by allowing them to qualify for maternity leave under decent conditions.

When all was said and done, the Liberal majority acted as though nothing had been said during the tour. The former Minister of Human Resources Development had his orders from the Minister of Finance, which the Prime Minister told us about last week. These orders were the following: "We have a deficit of \$42 billion. The ones who are going to pay it down are those who are the least well organized, through a reform that will let me help myself to \$7 billion or \$8 billion a year, so that I can be sure of eliminating my deficit no matter who is affected".

• (1610)

One of the things changed was the intensity rule, which the Liberals now want to restore. This is a terrible rule. It amounted to telling workers: "You are economic guinea pigs. If you are seasonal workers, it is because you do not wish to work longer, and we are going to penalize you. Each time you go through 20 weeks of EI, we will reduce your benefits by 1%".

This rule became law because federal government analysts said that our seasonal workers were deliberately avoiding work and something had to be done.

It took three years of reform. Eight or nine months ago a report came out saying that this was not having that effect. It is too bad, but when the season is over for a seasonal worker, in agriculture, forestry, tourism, the fishery or whatever, there is no longer any work. The worker cannot be transformed into a computer technician. A logger cannot be turned into a computer technician overnight. Sometimes he is very good at what he does but could never be retrained for something else.

It has taken the Liberal government three or four years, and maybe an election in the offing, to understand this, but we must pick up all the pieces so that workers can receive the money they need as soon as possible.

Bloc Québécois members have worked hard regarding this issue, particularly over the past three and a half years, since the last election. In June 1997, when I found out that I had been elected in my riding, I personally pledged before my constituents to give priority to this issue so that by the end of my mandate we would have made gains.

We worked tenaciously. The Bloc Québécois invested a lot of energy in that issue and I will give a brief historical overview.

We had, for example, an employment insurance week. For an entire week we heard from witnesses, the people who were confronted with this reality. Women and young seasonal workers told us about the impact of having to work 910 hours to qualify. We listened to these people for a week.

At the time, it was the current Minister for International Trade who was the Minister of Human Resources Development. Whatever the question, his answer was always "Things are going well in Canada. Jobs are being created and this is how we will get through this situation".

Last week we found out the true reason the government was acting in such a fashion and why we were always given the same prepared answer. It was because the Prime Minister of Canada had told his Minister of Finance "We need money to eliminate the deficit. We must have a zero deficit. You will achieve that result by targeting those who are less organized because, ultimately, it will

Government Orders

cost us less in terms of votes. We should be able to make it through if we go that route”.

The government did not put the same energy into settling the family trust issue. The efforts made by the government regarding these two different issues were far from being the same.

The Bloc worked very hard on the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development, particularly the member for Quebec and the member from Lac-Saint-Jean. All members of the Bloc Québécois from Quebec have put interesting proposals on the table. Six bills have been introduced here in the House to deal with the different types of discrimination. Some members even added other elements.

For example, the member for Quebec has tabled a bill on the requirements to qualify for benefits. We had to make sure that people could qualify. It is all very good to abolish the intensity rule—it will solve a small problem—but if people cannot qualify, what good will that do? No work means no benefits. If people cannot qualify, they cannot get benefits. Not only do we have to settle the intensity rule issue, but we also have to deal with the eligibility criteria.

The member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans introduced a bill on insurable employment. The government had decided to tighten eligibility requirements. It was trying to turn off all the taps in order to keep all the money it could keep.

On the matter of insurability, the government started to target very small businesses, family-type operations, and to be on the case of people who worked hard, small businesses employing two, three or four people who had been qualifying for unemployment benefits for three, four, five or ten years. They were told “You do not qualify anymore. Retroactively, you owe us \$18,000, \$20,000 or \$25,000 because of a mistake we made three years ago. We should have told you that your employment was not insurable”.

• (1615)

The present legislation allows this. It is not being corrected here but we do have a bill that would correct the problem.

We have also introduced a bill to make sure that specific standards apply to the management of the EI account and the setting of the contribution rate. We would have a system where the contribution rate meets the needs of the system and not the financing needs of the finance department. This is a very important issue.

On December 31 there will be \$32 billion in the EI account. That is a lot of money. The cost of the provisions in the bill, which the minister did not care to defend, will never be over \$500 million.

For ordinary people, \$500 million and \$32 billion is a lot of money. For those who have a hard time figuring it out, it is as if a pie were cut into 60 slices and you got only one. Someone else got the rest, while not having contributed a cent to the system.

The EI system is financed by employers and employees. The federal government rakes in the money because it does not care to respect the spirit of the law, which is that the EI account should finance the EI system only. Instead, it has been used to finance the government's surplus with the contributions from people who earn less than or up to \$39,000. It means that anyone earning \$40,000, \$41,000, \$42,000, \$50,000, \$60,000, \$70,000 or \$90,000 has not paid his share into the EI fund.

It also means that the EI money the federal government is spending comes from the poor because the rich do not pay their share. It is unfair.

This is why the three measures announced in the bill before the House are interesting, but they definitely do not go far enough. We will ensure that the workers are not hurt by the way members will vote in this House. We will vote for this bill but that does not mean that the fight is over. It only means that the fight has only begun.

I want the workers and our fellow citizens to understand that we still have some way to go, that we will fight until we have everything we need to deliver a decent employment insurance program.

In some of the bills we have introduced, we talk about access for self-employed workers. In Canada, the self-employed make up over 16% of our manpower. These workers are not covered by EI. One out of six workers is not covered because he is self-employed.

Despite its annual assessment of the program, the federal government was unable to come up with something that would allow self-employed persons to become eligible for employment insurance on a voluntary basis, as the Bloc Québécois has been proposing. This should be included in the reform before us today but it is not.

I could give an electoral perspective to my arguments since the Liberals are very sensitive to that. The Liberals have to think about it. One worker in six is a self-employed worker who is not eligible for employment insurance. Right now these people cannot even contribute to the program. They are not eligible. I think this should have been included in the bill.

We also proposed that the waiting period be abolished. As members know, this is the two week period when people lose their job. When people apply for benefits, they have no income. Someone who earns \$50,000, \$60,000 or \$70,000 a year and has a steady income may have difficulty understanding what that means. For those who earn \$500 a week, for example, or \$25,000 a year,

having no income for two weeks means there is a big hole in the family income. There is certainly room for a solution to this problem.

In this area, Canada is dead last among developed countries. In terms of employment insurance, we are behind the United States, which is nothing to brag about. It is certainly not an advantage.

Several measures are missing. On November 25, 1999 we introduced a bill that included all these reforms so we could tell the government "You see, we are an opposition party. We are not the government party. We do not have all the resources the government has but we are putting forward a general proposal". The bill contained all the elements that should be included in a good employment insurance program.

Today we are looking at the result. Certain measures in this bill were included in our general proposal. Let us first deal with the elimination of the intensity rule.

• (1620)

For those who do not know what the intensity rule is all about, it means that each time someone has received EI benefits for 20 weeks his or her benefits will be reduced by 1%. This means that a seasonal worker or someone who relies on EI every year will get, after three years, benefits representing 50% of his or her average wage instead of 55%. This may not seem like much but for someone earning \$600 a week 55% of his or her wage is \$330 and 50% is only \$300. This difference of \$30 a week counts.

This shows clearly that the federal government is only motivated by electoral gains. We all realized that the intensity rule was unfair, that it did not achieve any of its goals and that it was based on a false assumption, the assumption that people do not want to work. To be completely fair, the government should give back to these people the \$8, \$10 or \$15 a week it took away from them for three years. It was dishonest with these people, because the government used the \$8 and \$10 cuts to fight the deficit.

Today we realize that it deliberately penalized these people in a perverse and unacceptable way. I expect the government to compensate them retroactively, as the amounts involved are not huge. That would be a way to show at long last that it was wrong and now wants to do justice to these people, not so much because of the amount involved but rather out of respect for the dignity of the workers. It is important to do that and I think such a measure ought to be included in the bill.

The second measure contained in the bill, the removal of the discriminating rule of fiscal clawback for frequent claimants, is the very principle of the bill. We have an employment insurance system that should be funding EI benefits but a provision was put

Government Orders

into it that allowed for the clawing back, through income tax returns, of EI benefits received by a taxpayer whose income was over \$39,000. That situation will be corrected, and I think it should be. However, that is only one of 12 or 15 measures required to have a comprehensive and acceptable system.

The same thing applies to the change in the definition of new entrant or re-entrant to the labour force with respect to special benefits. For example, women will now be allowed to take into account maternity or sickness benefits received in the six previous years to qualify for benefits under the system without having to do 910 hours of work. However, regular benefits will not be taken into account, only special benefits.

That means that a woman about to give birth to her first child will not qualify under that rule. She cannot have received maternity benefits before because this will be her first child. This woman will not be able to qualify properly or more easily. This will only allow the women who already have a child to reintegrate into the labour market, and that is a good thing.

However, there may be the case of a woman who left the labour market for several years for whatever reasons and who has a first child. She will not necessarily qualify for maternity benefits or be able use the hours she had worked previously. I think this again is an unacceptable half measure.

The contribution rate will also be reduced to \$2.25. What is interesting here—and we approve of this reduction—is that it leaves room for other improvements. In spite of this reduction, the fund will still have this year a \$6 billion surplus. Every year, under the proposed changes, approximately \$6 billion will remain in the fund. That money will stay there and will not be used for employment insurance. What it means is this "We stole \$32 billion from you. We are giving back \$500 million. You should be satisfied with this. So don't say a word". That is what citizens and workers and even employers are now being told. In this regard, the proposed measures are quite inadequate.

As for seasonal workers, again I think that we succeeded in convincing the government on the issue of the intensity rule. During the last weeks and months, people have stood up in various areas, especially in Charlevoix, the North Shore and Lac-Saint-Jean, to let the federal government know that its proposals were unacceptable. With their help and with the work of those members of the House who are opposed to the Liberal measures, we have managed to do something interesting.

• (1625)

There is still horrible discrimination. Someone who qualified between July 9 and September 17, 2000 in our areas had to work

Government Orders

525 hours to be entitled to 21 weeks of benefits. Had that person applied after September 18, he or she would have had to work 420 hours to be entitled to 32 weeks of benefits.

The only reason the minister gave for this was that the act would have to be amended for those people to become eligible for benefits retroactively. This is precisely what it is all about today: amending the act. There was nothing preventing the minister from introducing an amendment to remedy discrimination against those people.

Imagine someone who has worked 460 hours being told that he is not eligible because the required number of hours is 525. Even worse, someone with 525 hours of work may be eligible but only get 21 weeks of benefits, while another person who has worked 420 hours will be eligible for 32 weeks of benefits for the same summer period. This is totally unacceptable. We cannot understand why the government is not trying to correct the situation.

I want to say something to all those members in this House who still do not understand what seasonal work is. I have listened to the hon. member from the Canadian Alliance and I would really like everyone to understand that the number of weeks worked by a seasonal worker has nothing to do with the economic activity of the whole country.

It is all very well to have the greatest economic growth, as we do at present, a very strong economic growth, but that does nothing in a sector in which there is 18 weeks work. An example of this is the peat bogs, where digging up the peat is very hard work, and there is 18 weeks of work. What is the point of selling more peat, when after 18 weeks there is no more work. The price of peat may go up but that does not make any more work.

The same thing goes for several other sectors. In the lower St. Lawrence area, the tourist season is of a certain duration in summer and a certain duration in winter, but in between there is no work, nor will any pop up tomorrow morning. It will be a long time before there is any.

I would like it to be understood that seasonal workers are not lazy and unwilling to work. They are people who work in an industry that is seasonal in nature.

This situation must be remedied by providing the seasonal workers with special status, one that is the same throughout Canada. They must be able to qualify with 420 hours worked, and receive 35 weeks benefits, whether they live in Halifax, Edmundston, Rivière-du-Loup, Gaspé, on the north shore, or anywhere else. They need to qualify in the same way, because the sector of industry in which they work has no connection with the number of hours and the unemployment level in their region.

Since the rate of unemployment is dropping, the iniquities are more obvious. Now that unemployment has gone down, in certain

regions, 550 or 600 hours are required in order to qualify. Seasonal workers cannot accumulate that many hours; there is not enough work for them.

The main theme of the present EI system is discrimination. Young people are being discriminated against. In my area, a young person who enters the workforce needs 910 hours of work to qualify, instead of 420 hours. This means twice as many hours of work.

Do you know what this means in an area like mine? This means that young people are all leaving for Quebec City or Montreal. A year later, when you need them, they are gone and have found work elsewhere. This is how our regions are being emptied. Our young people are leaving. Not only are we depriving them of an income, but the whole region as well, while we may need them in other sectors. Qualified workers will be needed in those sectors. This is unacceptable because our regions are being emptied, and this is unacceptable to all young Canadians.

A Liberal member told me "If we lower them, they will drop out even more". This is not the right way to help young people join the workforce. The right way is to make sure that they get proper training and have confidence in their abilities, not to hit them over the head. This is not the answer. This is not how it is done.

We must ensure that they can work long enough, without being discriminated against, otherwise we would using the same rule as for seasonal workers.

• (1630)

Maybe it will take a few more months to convince the Liberal government. We convinced the government in the case of seasonal workers and we will do the same for young people.

We need a measure and a decision before the next election. We could solve all these questions before the next election. We could do it in the next few days if we wanted to. If we do not want to solve these issues prior to the election, Quebecers and Canadians will do so at the polls. They will send another message to the Liberal government.

Let me quote the words of the Prime Minister. He said: "Employment-insurance was implemented to eliminate the deficit." The message was very clear for all liberals and I repeated it here in the House in several speeches. I told them: "If you do not adopt measures to rectify the EI situation you will get defeated with an even greater margin than the last time in Atlantic Canada, in Eastern Quebec, and in all the regions where there are a great number of seasonal workers".

This warning still stands. Liberals must understand that nobody is applauding those small changes to the employment-insurance system. People everywhere in the country have understood that if

Government Orders

we want more, we must put the requirements on the table quickly, before the next election. After that, maybe the people across the way will pay less attention. They may not want to listen. I have a prediction to make that may be of some interest to the Liberal members. They will be asked a lot of questions on this issue.

When the minister announced the three proposed changes in a press conference, a reporter asked her three times if the changes would eliminate all the inequities in the legislation. Not once was the minister able to provide an answer. She was so totally out of it that she was unable to defend her bill here today. She had the parliamentary secretary tackle the job. That is terrible.

The message remains the same. It is always here. The stakes are the same. If the Liberal majority believes the changes proposed in this bill are enough, they will surely have a political price to pay. It will be on the minds of voters throughout Canada, but particularly in Quebec and Atlantic Canada, where measures are needed to correct the situation.

Employment insurance is also unfair to students. Are the members aware that the EI premiums paid by a student who earned \$2,000 or less at a summer job are not refundable?

This is totally unacceptable. People pay premiums to an insurance program but are unable to receive any benefit, even when they are eligible. The benefits to which they would normally be eligible are not refundable.

The same principle applies. The prime minister wants to grab all the money he can. The government is going to prey on the weak, it will make sure that students, who are not organized in that regard, cannot recover the premiums they pay by setting a limit. It is almost as if it were laughing at them. It is telling them they will pay premiums but will not get their money back. This is another form of discrimination.

That program is also out of touch with the social realities facing workers. For example here are the coverage rates for regular benefits since 1995. In 1995, 52% of workers were covered; in 1996, 49%; in 1997, 42%; in 1998, 43%; and in 1999, 42%. We now have an insurance plan under which nobody is covered.

Let us look at the same percentages for young people: in 1995, 44% were covered. In 1996, the proportion was 38%; in 1997, 26%; in 1998, 25%; and in 1999, 24%. Do you understand what I was saying earlier? They are forced to pay premiums, but only one out of four is eligible for benefits. They no longer think that it is simply an insurance plan which does not work, they are under the impression that they are being robbed by the government. That is exactly what our young people think.

This is also true for women. In 1995, 51% of unemployed women received regular benefits. In 1999, that percentage had dropped to 38.4%.

• (1635)

Will the very modest measure taken today correct the situation? No. I can predict that one, two or three years down the road, we will realize that that was not enough, that we kept intact a system where the lowest possible benefits are paid out and as few people as possible qualify, so that the government can coffer as much money as possible.

I submit that we must read the fine print to see how the benefit rates will be established in the future. I think that the government is trying to pull a fast one on us. Instead of having to put the money back into the account, as the act currently provides, the government could say that that is just a payroll tax and that it does not have to replenish the EI account. That means that the government will never have to pay back the \$32 billion surplus that will have accumulated by December 31, 2000.

We must keep a close eye on that. Not only was the money taken and spend elsewhere, but the entire financial, accounting system is being diverted. With one stroke of the pen, the obligation for the government to put the money back into the system is removed.

Since 1994, the Liberals have accumulated a \$38 billion surplus. It will be \$32 billion by December 31, 2000, but that is because there was a deficit at the beginning of the period. Since 1994, this \$38 billion surplus has not been put back into the plan, but has been used instead to eliminate the deficit. It remains to be seen if the effort is the same in other areas. Let us try to see if the same kind of demand was put on high-income people, to make sure that they contribute. Were these people more able, or less able, to afford to fight the deficit?

The true objective of the reform was to save money. I was speaking about the total accumulated surplus, which was \$5.7 billion in 1996, \$12 billion in 1997, \$19 billion in 1998, \$25 billion in 1999 and \$32 billion in 2000. Hon. members surely recall the day when, in response to a question, the Minister of Finance stated that the money was spent. This was a revelation to many. This account is absolutely not managed in an open manner.

We had to seek all the elements one by one to be able, at the end of the day, to prove without a doubt that this program was only a way for the federal government to keep the money in its coffers. I think that the Liberals are really going to pay the price for that during the next election.

Today, everybody has a clear understanding of the surplus issue and of the fact that it was used for purposes other than those for which the money was collected in first place. And this is still going on. If the government does not reform this plan completely and just makes small changes, Canadians will not be fooled in the next

Government Orders

election, and they will make decisions to really show the government that they do not have to put up with such a situation.

The plan must be totally modified. I gave some examples, such as the universal status for seasonal workers. The abolition of the clawback rule in the case of frequent recipients is already in the law. We should also lower to 300 hours the eligibility criteria for special benefits, such as maternity leave, if we want women to really qualify, so that we can have an assurance until the federal government finally abides by the law and gives the money back to Quebec, thereby allowing Quebec to put its parental system in place.

Here again, our society is trailing. Between you and me, the parental system is not a matter of unemployment insurance. It should be an independent system that can be financed, among other things, by the employment insurance fund as set out in the act, but it should not be linked to qualifying conditions of this type, to make it easier to qualify so that young couples can have children under economically acceptable conditions.

Coverage of insured earning should be raised from 55% to 60%, which is very important according to me. Today's society is one of economic growth. Wealth is being created. The problem is that those who most vigorously fought against the deficit do not enjoy the benefits of wealth creation. They have been squeezed like lemons. They have made sacrifices over a period of five years and now, we are not ready to give them what belongs to them.

The government is giving tax reductions—and I have nothing against tax reductions—but there is surely a way to allow a 5% increase, from 55% to 60% of their average wage, for those making \$300 a week so that they have enough money to feed their children, support their family and enjoy a moderate level of dignity in order to live a happy life.

● (1640)

This is an important demand that is not found in the bill. It will not come from the government, but it will be one of the issues in the coming federal election. Canadians must have an employment insurance system that provides an adequate average benefit income, an EI system that allows people to be eligible under acceptable requirements and that is based on the principle that, as a whole, people want to work, are willing to work, are looking for jobs, but when there is none, they should be able to receive a decent income.

The discourse that has been going on here for the last five years must no longer be heard in the House of Commons. When we are told that many jobs are being created and this is how the problem will be solved, we must know that job creation is indeed important. But despite the creation of more jobs, there will always be people who are in a situation where they need some extra income. They do

essential tasks in society that need not be full time jobs. This reality must be part of our experience as parliamentarians, to show Canadians and Quebecers that we are aware of this reality.

We must also be able to suggest other measures. Some people talked about lowering the premium rate. There is something interesting being done in this regard. There is the creation of the independent fund. All the problems we are facing here, the fact we are forced to debate them here, would be solved if there were an independent fund. If it were employers and employees, those who finance the system, who determined the system's conditions, there would be some pretty heated discussions on the joint board of administration. They could discuss and even if sometimes they were not happy with negotiations, in the end, the rate would be determined by the people who are financing the system.

There would not be a third party which would come and take money from the employment fund to pay for embassies or finance other expenditures that should be paid for with taxes collected by government. Control by an independent fund would be an essential measure that is not present here and that should be at the heart of a bill making changes to employment insurance.

Judging by the way the Liberal government is changing things, I doubt we will have a new EI law tomorrow morning. I believe we are bound by many elements. There are the pressures we have exerted where we have convinced people by the logic of our argumentation that we were right and that changes were necessary. There were public demonstrations where people from all over Canada told the government: "Listen, you will give us back our share." There are also legal challenges coming up, some of them have already begun, notably by the CSN, to ensure that, in the end, the federal government does not act illegally.

The factor that is most important maybe for the Liberal majority, the Prime Minister in particular, is the issue of the next election. If the government is taking only this factor into account, it should consider the situation seriously so that we can settle this issue as fast as possible.

Consequently, it must put all these measures in the bill, including delegation of parental leave administration. The bill does not contain those measures. However, it provides a few other things we will support because people need to have their benefits as quickly as possible.

However, I challenge Liberal members to travel in the area, like the hon. member for Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet, who was in Rivière-du-Loup last week. He flew in on a government helicopter. He said, and this is almost a direct quote "I came here to tell you the truth, because the member for the Bloc will twist the facts".

In Rivière-du-Loup, the radio anchorman had this comment "Unfortunately, the member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—

Temiscouata—Les Basques has been saying for four years now that these things had to be changed. You never said a word about this”.

The member for Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet had even been travelling to the area. About a month or month and a half earlier on TVA, he had participated in an interview with the member of the National Assembly, Rosaire Bertrand. He had said at the time that no changes were needed, that the act was perfect, that things were going well and that was the way they dealt with the situation.

Well, this defender of the established order, who talks only when his government allows him to, was publicly rebuked by the people in my area because this is not the way they expect their political representatives to behave.

• (1645)

The Bloc Québécois has brought something new to federal politics. Bloc members speak out and express the opinion of the people. They act as defenders of Quebecers and of the disadvantaged.

The next election will offer us an opportunity. I am issuing an invitation to Liberal members: we are ready to meet them in any forum on this issue. The government's record on employment insurance has to be examined. When the time comes to give marks to the Liberal government and see if it gets a passing grade, seasonal workers in our ridings will tell those “You don't get a passing grade. Unfortunately, as MPs, you do not pay employment insurance. You will cope some other way and, when you're gone, you'll find yourselves a job. But we will not trust the government again, because we said four years ago that it could change things, and it did not change them”.

I think the few amendments on the table are inadequate. This is not what people are waiting for. They expect justice in this matter. In the end, it is a question of justice. It is a question of those who pay, who finance the system, benefiting from it. It is a question of enabling our society, which claimed to have programs to ensure social equality, to make sure the social programs exist in order to permit a better distribution of wealth.

Today, there is creation of wealth, but no distribution of wealth. These people are in intolerable situations. I find it unacceptable that people do not qualify for employment insurance because they are short 50 or 60 hours, when they have the number of hours that were required in the past.

A person with a family, who earns \$600 a week, gets \$330 at 55% of his salary. I challenge the members to live on that much and make ends meet. This amount is not much more than what a person gets on social assistance.

Government Orders

If the government wants to encourage people to work, it will not succeed by trying to penalize them with rules of intensity. It has been demonstrated that this does not work. The government has said so itself. The government put it in place. It did not work. The government penalized people for three years, but nothing came of it.

Mr. René Canuel: Let it pay the money back.

Mr. Paul Crête: As the hon. member for Matapédia—Matane puts it, now that we know for sure that the government stole from them, it should pay the money back.

To conclude, I would like to urge the people in Quebec and the rest of Canada to consider this bill as a first step toward an in-depth reform of the whole program. The Liberal government is going to have a very heavy political price to pay in the next election, if it does not go ahead with the reform.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Madawaska—Restigouche, Post-Secondary Education; the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, Employment Insurance; the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, Health.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre.

I am pleased to speak today on Bill C-44, a government bill to amend the Employment Insurance Act.

The bill introduced last week is a big step toward addressing the critical situation of Canadian workers, especially those who are working in seasonal industries such as fishing, tourism, transportation, the auto industry, construction and forestry.

As the NDP critic for employment insurance, I welcome this bill, but I am afraid that it does not go far enough for the workers who need help but cannot get any, because some provisions of the Employment Insurance Act make them ineligible for EI benefits.

• (1650)

Looking at the proposed changes, I am very happy to see that the government has finally listened to some of the suggestions made by the opposition. I would like to say a few words about these changes.

The government is abolishing the intensity rule. Claimants will therefore receive 55% of their salary. The benefit repayment

Government Orders

provision is being amended; first time claimants will be excluded from this provision.

For those taxpayers with a net income of \$48,750, the maximum repayment will be 30% of the net income exceeding \$48,750. Canadians receiving sickness, maternity or parental benefits will also be excluded from this provision.

For parents re-entering the labour force following the birth of a second child or who were out of the labour force for an extended period, the retroactive period will be six years.

The premium will be set at \$2.25. The maximum insurable earnings will stay at \$30,000 until the average salary in industry reaches that amount. After that, the maximum insurable earnings will be set according to the new average salary in industry.

On May 9, 2000, this House voted unanimously in favour of my motion M-222 calling for a review of the employment insurance program, which has been done, according to the government. However, these changes do not totally reflect the unemployment situation.

It would be a great pleasure for me to rise in this House today and to be able to congratulate the government for having finally seen the light. It would be a great pleasure to hear it say how it has made Canadians suffer over the last four years.

When we suggest positive changes, we are told, "What is wrong with these people, they are never happy". It would have been nice to finally be able to say that we are happy because the changes are going to fundamentally fix employment insurance in Canada.

I took a personal interest in the issue. As many Canadians know, I toured Canada. I visited every province of our country. I went to 22 cities and towns. I took part in over 21 town hall meetings.

From coast to coast to coast, as they say, from Newfoundland to Atlantic Canada to the Pacific, everywhere I went, employment insurance was an issue. Whether in British Columbia, the Madawaska, Gaspé or the Acadian peninsula, a lumberjack is a lumberjack.

The member for Calgary—Nose Hill said today in her speech that employment insurance led people not to work and companies not to create jobs. This is wrong, completely wrong. The problem with Alliance members is that they do not understand what seasonal work is all about.

One of my constituents whom I know quite well—I believe he is listening tonight—Jean Gauvin, a former fisheries minister who intends to run for the Canadian Alliance, said last week that he talked to the Leader of the Opposition and that the leader of the Canadian Alliance had told him he was going to make changes to

employment insurance. I am afraid, because if he makes changes to the EI program, it will be to tighten it up.

I hope people in my riding are listening to me tonight, so they can really understand what the message of the Canadian Alliance is.

I am sorry to have to say tonight in the House that when it comes to employment insurance, the Canadian Alliance and the Liberals are not much different. It is a pity.

• (1655)

When the government says it is prepared to increase EI benefits by 5%, I will tell members what this means. In the Atlantic provinces, it means that most of the people working in the tourist industry and in the fishery are working for minimum wage, and \$5.75 an hour x 50% works out to \$2.88 x 5%, or 14 cents an hour x 35 hours, for \$4.90 x four weeks, which is not even a \$25 increase.

The government has not understood, or does not wish to make real changes. Every time we have risen in the House to ask questions about EI, we have never been given a clear answer. The government has never come out and said that it has hurt Canadians and that it is going to make changes.

The minister has always boasted about her EI cuts "It forces people to get out and work, it forces companies to create jobs. Today, there are fewer people on EI". This is the same thing we are hearing from the Canadian Alliance. That is why I say today that unfortunately I do not see much of a difference between the two.

As I mentioned earlier, I toured across Canada and I met various people, including Jack McLellan, of Nanaimo, British Columbia, who had this to say:

Last fall, I attended the funeral of a co-worker, Brian Gellhoed, who was a victim of cutbacks in social benefits. Brian committed suicide after his EI ran out. Too proud to sell his home and the personal belongings he had accumulated over his lifetime in order to qualify for social assistance, he preferred to take his own life.

Another individual, a resident of Richibouctou, New Brunswick, told me this during the tour:

I am 22 years of age and I am affected by the cuts. I used to need 20 weeks of work to qualify for benefits. Now, with all the cutbacks and the tighter eligibility criteria, I need 26 weeks of work and I am unable to find anything for that long. My parents have helped me out financially, but they have their own problems. I am not receiving EI and I cannot pay my debts. I need money to live and I do not have a cent in my pockets. I am discouraged and fed up with the system. This morning, I stayed in bed. I seriously contemplated committing suicide and this was not the first time. Employment insurance must be made more accessible for young people and the discriminating criteria must be changed. We young people are discouraged and desperate. We no longer know what to do.

Another person told about a bill introduced by the hon. member for Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, Bill C-493,

asking that a worker who voluntarily quits his or her job to care for his or her family get employment insurance benefits.

My time is almost up, but the message that I want to convey is that the change that is needed is the one concerning the number of hours required to get benefits: 420 and 910 hours, this is discrimination against young people. For women going on maternity leave, 600 or 700 hours is too much.

There are no seasonal workers in Canada. There are only seasonal jobs, and workers have no control over them. It is the employers and the government who have control. It is for all these reasons that changes, major changes, are required.

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ): Madam Speaker, I know that we have a staunch defender of the victims of unemployment in the hon. member who has just spoken, a staunch defender of seasonal workers. I know that the hon. member has studied the employment insurance legislation in depth. The proof is that he has travelled throughout Canada to give people the chance to express their opinions on this.

• (1700)

I would like to ask a question of my colleague as an expert and a neighbour of my riding in the Gaspé. Can he confirm to this House that the Liberals already possess, in the 1996 legislation, a clause that makes it possible to reduce to zero, or close to it, the 5% increase connected with abolition of the intensity rule?

I will give an example, that of the dividing factor. In the crab fisheries, in certain cases—decided upon by the federal government—the fishery is closed, sometimes after seven weeks because of biological factors. Sometimes people manage to accumulate the 420 hours in those seven weeks. However because of the dividing factor, they divide by 14 the benefits these people get, not by the actual number of weeks. Hon. members will agree with me that 7 divided by 14 is 50%.

By abolishing the 5% intensity rule today the minister is only offering seasonal workers 2.5%.

Does my colleague intend to support the amendments the Bloc Québécois would like to present, for example those concerning the definition in the act of what constitutes a seasonal job?

Mr. Yvon Godin: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his question. He is my neighbour on the Baie des Chaleurs. I come from the Acadian peninsula, and he comes from the Gaspé.

It is surprising to see that the same problem occurs right along the Baie des Chaleurs. We share the same problem in my region and in his. I am happy he asked me this question. It gives me a chance to explain this part.

Government Orders

With the dividing factor, the necessary hours can be accumulated over 52 weeks. It is possible to go back 52 weeks in order to qualify for employment insurance. That means that someone who works 420 or 450 hours can go back 52 weeks. But when it comes to money to be paid out, it is possible to go back only 26 weeks.

If most of the hours worked are at the start of the season, for example, 400 hours worked at the start of the season, and the individual is without work mid season because of fishing quotas—and this applies to factory workers and loggers—and then works only 20 hours at the end of the season, the hours are calculated over 52 weeks. In other words, the person qualifies for employment insurance, but the benefits are calculated on the 20 hours worked. Accordingly, the person could end up receiving \$38 a week.

In the report about my tour across the country on the human impact of EI, I provide examples of this. People wrote me saying “I earned an average of \$400 a week, and I am getting only \$38 or \$50”.

The Liberals’ paltry 5% does not go far. It means absolutely nothing. This is why I said that Atlantic Canada could not be bought for 5%. It is not for sale. They are not crazy back home. There is television. Tonight they are watching the news and I am sure they are watching our debate. We are not for sale.

We supported the Liberals and the Conservatives for the past 100 years, and we are the poorest in the country. They never managed to create jobs, and today they tell fine tales saying they have again created jobs. It reminds me of *Les Belles histoires des pays d’en haut*. It does not work this way in Atlantic Canada.

[English]

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, Bill C-44 calls itself an act to amend the Employment Insurance Act. I think the Liberals should be honest. They should call it what it is. It is an act that is intended to tinker with the EI system so that they can buy back some of the votes of the millions of Atlantic Canadians who abandoned the Liberal Party out of rage and fury for the Liberal Party abandoning them. Pre-election cynicism is what it really is. It is no wonder that Canadian voters get cynical about the electoral process. They can surely see right through this.

Bill C-44 is an insult to Canadian workers. It is an insult to building trades workers, Atlantic fisheries workers and forestry workers all across the country. Workers should be offended. They are calling my office and telling me that they are offended because the Liberal Party did not listen to the experts on this issue. The experts are there. The experts have done the research. They have made that research available and the Liberals have chosen to ignore it.

Nobody in the country knows more about EI than the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst who did a cross-country national

Government Orders

tour consulting with Canadians. The Liberals chose to ignore that. The national building trades council has studied every aspect of unemployment insurance and made reasonable, balanced recommendations and the Liberals ignored that. The Canadian Labour Congress, the Canadian Manufacturers Association, industry representatives from labour and management have told the government that the EI system is broken, the wheels have fallen off and it does not work anymore and the Liberals still have chosen not to fix it.

• (1705)

If the Liberals were honest they would change the name of the employment insurance fund because to use the word insurance is fraudulent in itself. The word is misleading and deceptive. It should really be called the Liberals' big cash cow because that is what it has been in the years since they made the devastating changes to it. What were the changes?

In my riding alone, \$20.8 million a year has been sucked out. Already it is the third poorest riding in the country just because of these EI changes. What happens to these people? They get pushed on to provincial welfare. It is a way for the federal government to offload its responsibilities to provide income maintenance and insurance on to the provinces which then have to pay city welfare. It is no wonder people are furious.

The bill tinkers with the EI problems. It does two things. It eliminates the intensity rule. Big deal. The member for Acadie—Bathurst pointed out how insignificant and trivial that is. The bill changes the clawback provision back to where it used to be, not to improve it, not even all the way back. It used to be that EI did not get clawed back unless a person made \$63,000 a year. Then it went down to \$48,000. Then it went down to \$39,000. Now it is being put back up to \$48,000 and the government expects us to celebrate.

Two things that really cost Canadian workers are the divisor rule and the eligibility rule. They have been structured so nobody qualifies for EI anymore, but everybody has to pay into it. It is no wonder there is a surplus, a \$750 million a month surplus. No, I was not heard incorrectly; that is per month, not per year. The amount of \$750 million per month is being taken out of the system by the Liberals and it is not being put back into income maintenance where it belongs. What kind of insurance policy is that?

What if someone were forced to pay insurance on a house year after year and when the house burned down the person had a less than 35% chance of ever collecting any insurance benefit on it? That is no longer an insurance policy.

To deduct something from a person's paycheque for a specific purpose and to use it for something entirely different in the best case scenario is a breach of trust and in the worst case scenario is out and out fraud. The Liberals have been perpetrating this fraud on Canadian people all these years and milking it for every cent it is

worth. Thirty-four billion dollars that should have gone into income maintenance for the people who arguably need it the most, the unemployed workers, have gone to pay down the deficit. This is a misuse of funds and a breach of trust. It is dishonest and I say it is out and out fraud.

I do not think I have to explain the divisor rule. Every working person in this country knows the EI system and knows what the divisor rule is. That is what has really cost workers. The dead weeks are factored in when averaging out the benefit. It used to be the benefit would be calculated by averaging out the weeks worked. Now it is averaging out all of the weeks in the previous 26 weeks even if the person did not work in those weeks.

I used to represent the carpenters union. A couple of years ago members of the carpenters union would make \$400 or \$450 a week as their EI benefit, 55% of their gross earnings. Now with the divisor rule which factors in the dead weeks, the amount is \$180 or \$220 week, almost 50% less.

With the tinkering that goes on, the Liberals chose very selectively the two things that are not going to cost them squat. The government will still have a gross surplus of funds that will not go into an EI fund because that is a misnomer, but into general revenues for the government to use for whatever it wants. That is where the breach of trust comes in.

My party did a comprehensive brief on this issue. I see it on the desk of the member for Acadie—Bathurst. It is a well developed, comprehensive document that was the result of a national cross-country tour. We received input from concerned citizens from all walks of life, not just labour, but management as well who are very concerned about our dysfunctional, completely broken EI system. The government chose to ignore those meaningful recommendations.

The building trades council arguably has the most knowledgeable people on the EI issue in the labour movement because it directly affects so many of its 400,000 members. It had a good seven point plan with realistic proposals that would have made the system work. In other words, the money taken off paycheques would go toward income maintenance or training, one or the other. None of these things were picked up.

• (1710)

Even the detail about apprenticeship has been ignored by the government. When I was going through my apprenticeship the first two weeks of an EI claim were paid. It was not treated like an unemployment insurance claim; it was a training benefit. That aspect of the EI fund was very beneficial. Using EI money, seats were purchased at the community college. Now apprentices are charged tuition at community colleges as if they were going to university or something.

Government Orders

Again in a situation where the fund is showing a surplus of \$750 million a month, how does the government justify squeezing that last little bit out of something like the apprenticeship system? It is unconscionable. I am really horrified by the whole thing.

People thought with some optimism that leading up to an election they could expect some improvement, that the Liberals would make it right again. They thought they could expect the Liberals to use the money that is deducted from their paycheques honestly. What do we get? Instead of real improvements, we get this little package, Bill C-44, with tiny tinkering steps that will not benefit very many workers.

Thirty-five per cent of unemployed people qualify for benefits, 25% of women. There is a huge gender bias in the current EI system which the Liberals have failed to address as well.

Less than 15% of unemployed youth qualify for EI, even though under the new hours bank system contributions are credited by hours. Youth working part time have to pay in. They never had to pay in before if they worked under a certain number of hours per week. Now everybody has to pay in but there is a less than 15% chance of ever collecting any benefit.

It ceased to be an insurance program a long time ago. It is dishonest and disingenuous to call it such any longer. Let us call it what it is. It is a cash cow. It is a transparent attempt to buy back some of the votes of the good people of Atlantic Canada who so resoundingly rejected the Liberal Party for being so callous and indifferent to them in the first place.

The Liberals take money off a worker's cheque for heaven's sake and use it to pay down the deficit or to give tax breaks to the wealthy. As I have said before, it is like some perverted form of Robin Hood, to rob from the poor and give to the rich. That is what we are witnessing here. Incredibly that is what we are watching the Liberals do but we will not stand by idly. Fortunately I think we are going into an election and that will give us a platform to expose those guys, to expose this travesty, to expose what they have done to Atlantic Canada and what they seek to do again by buying these votes back. The electorate is very knowledgeable these days. People read the newspapers and watch television. People pay attention to their paycheques first and foremost. They know what is going on.

When I was a practising carpenter I paid \$45 every paycheque to EI and my employer paid 1.4 times that amount. That is a lot of money. Of every paycheque, \$80 or \$90 was being paid into the fund on my behalf in case of the unfortunate situation that I would become unemployed and would require income maintenance.

Where is all that money going? The Minister of Finance stands and crows about paying down the deficit. He is paying down the

deficit on the backs of unemployed workers. Are the Liberals proud of that? They will not be for long. As soon as we get on the doorsteps in the coming election they will not be proud of that. We will ram it down the Liberals' throats, especially in Atlantic Canada. I almost wish I were running in Atlantic Canada. It would be a cakewalk. It would be fun to remind people of what those guys have done to them over and over again. People will not need much reminding. It is a top of the mind issue. It is first and foremost. The Liberals will pay a political price, mark my words.

Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member certainly must think there is an election in the air by the way he rambled on. I have never heard such nonsense. Imagine. He is an hon. member who considers—

Mr. Pat Martin: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member on the Liberal side is saying that the speech I just gave is nonsense. It is unparliamentary—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): That is strictly debate.

Mr. Stan Keyes: Madam Speaker, the member should know it is not a point of order but he has not been around for very long.

The New Democratic Party member was talking about tinkering steps. He said it was little bits. We have premium reductions totalling \$1.2 billion, program changes coming up to \$500 million, a total of \$1.7 billion. I am sure the hon. member could not count to \$1.7 billion never mind admit that it is a lot of money for EI.

Here is what his brothers and sisters are saying.

• (1715)

The hon. member has the unmitigated gall to stand in this place and say that this is only vote getting for Atlantic Canada when his own brothers and sisters in the AFL-CIO say in today's paper in a full page ad that this is nothing at all about votes on the east coast, that this benefits working men and women from coast to coast to coast.

The Canadian office of the building and construction trades council says that repealing the intensity rule and restoring the single income tested clawback rule is sound policy for all unemployed workers from coast to coast to coast, that taking this action reveals a government with courage to take corrective steps when they are needed at any time during its mandate.

I have a question for the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre. Is \$1.7 billion about tinkering? What about his brothers and sisters in the AFL-CIO and other Canadian building and trade councils who fully endorse the actions of the government and the Minister of Canadian Heritage?

Government Orders

Mr. Pat Martin: Madam Speaker, this is what is particularly cheesy about Bill C-44. It is frankly forcing groups like our own caucus to vote for Bill C-44. Nobody denies that for a long time we have wanted the intensity rule eradicated. Frankly some of the labour groups likewise have to acknowledge that they have wanted to get rid of the intensity rule for a long time as well. It was one of three or four irritants in the system.

I spoke to the carpenters union today. I spoke to the International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades. I spoke to the IBEW and members of the building trades council who are terribly disappointed that nobody touched the divisor rule. Nobody touched the eligibility requirements of 920 hours to qualify and 700 hours to requalify. That is almost double the requirement there used to be to be eligible for benefits.

The proof will be in the pudding on election day because these groups will remember who the advocates for EI were and what party tore the guts out of the EI program to the point where it is dysfunctional and nothing but a cash cow for that party to spend.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I hope the ceiling does not fall, as I would like to compliment the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre for his brilliant analysis of the EI rip-off and the multibillion dollar surplus that has built up on the backs of Canadian workers. I deeply appreciate what was said.

It has to be said over and over again, and I hope by all parties, that we cannot balance the budget by setting up a slush fund. That is all that EI has become. It is a slush fund.

Mr. Pat Martin: Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate that comment. I think all parties are aware that the EI fund ceased to be an insurance program a long time ago. It is a misnomer. It is actually fraudulent to even call it an insurance program because it is anything but that. It is a cash cow for the Liberal Party to use for anything it chooses, anything other than income maintenance.

There was another point that came up. The hon. member over there mentioned the \$500 million in savings. That \$500 million per year in savings by eliminating the intensity rule and the change in the clawback provisions accounts for 1.5% of the \$34 billion that the Liberals have taken out of the fund, with no excuse. Thirty-four billion dollars compared to \$500 million is 1.5%, and the Liberals will pay a political price for it. I guarantee it.

Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC): Madam Speaker, I am certainly pleased to add my voice to this debate for my party. What we have in Bill C-44 is plainly an admission of guilt. What the government is admitting is that for the past four

years Canadians throughout the country have suffered. They have suffered because of the reforms to employment insurance.

People have suffered in British Columbia. People have suffered in Alberta and throughout western Canada. People have suffered in northern Ontario. People have suffered in the province of Quebec and people have suffered in my home of Atlantic Canada. It is not just a question of Atlantic Canada. This is a national question and the government is a national disgrace.

• (1720)

[*Translation*]

In the 1997 election, people were not afraid to express their feelings about the government.

I listened carefully to my colleagues on the opposition side and I want to congratulate them for the excellent comments they brought to this debate.

I also want to say a few words about the comments made by members of the Canadian Alliance. For some time now, we have been hearing members of the Alliance say that the Canadian Alliance is a national party, that they are there for all the provinces. Yet they have the audacity to say that seasonal workers are well paid, when we know that a significant percentage of these workers earn less than \$10,000 a year. We hear comments from Alliance supporters saying that the people in Atlantic Canada are lazy.

[*English*]

Recently we heard the comments of the Alliance pollster who said that anybody with vision in Atlantic Canada moved away. That is a disgrace. In this day and age we should be talking of uniting the country, not dividing it, not pointing the finger at a region of Canada. That does nothing to unite the country. We have a lot of work on our plate in order to do that. The comments coming out of the Alliance do nothing for that.

We see surplus after surplus in the EI account, a total accumulated surplus of over \$35 billion. This year we see the Government of Canada wanting to move a certain way, wanting to rectify the wrongs of the past, but it is a wrong that represents only \$1.7 billion of that \$7 billion surplus this year.

The member from the Liberal side said a while ago that we were doing wonderful things. In reality people are suffering. Children are suffering throughout the country. More could have been done and they did not do it. The Liberals had a golden opportunity to do it and they did not.

As I said earlier this week, what the government sees is not light at the end of the tunnel. It sees an election. I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Beauséjour—Petitcodiac.

Government Orders

What they have demonstrated is their inability to govern. Canadian taxpayers will decide who is best to govern, who approaches the country in a tolerant way, including every province of Canada.

• (1725)

[*Translation*]

Seasonal workers play an important role in Canada's economy; they play an important role in the maritime provinces, in Newfoundland, Quebec, Ontario and western Canada. These people must be recognized once and for all.

They play an important role in the forest industry. I can tell you that, without our seasonal workers, without those people who go out each year to plant trees and to guarantee the future of the forest industry, the most important in my riding, we would be in serious trouble.

These workers play a role that is vital to our economy throughout Canada. And, once again, this government is turning a deaf ear.

There have been demonstrations over the last months, but they were totally justified. People came to my office, dignified people with great qualities who could no longer plan their future. Some of them had children.

Once again, the Liberal government did nothing to relieve these people from this incredible burden.

[*English*]

There is a perception that seasonal workers do not want to work. That is totally false. That is so false and so far from the truth that it is not even funny.

What has to be done is that these economies have to be developed. I agree, but if I take a person that is planting trees this year, move him out of there and bring him into the company, who will plant the trees next year? There is a dynamic here that has to be understood. These people are not lazy. These people work hard every day, put in long hours, and guarantee the sustainability of our economies.

I will not put up with this. I will use my voice to defend these people every time anyone in the House of Commons or anywhere in Canada strikes them.

[*Translation*]

People want hope. They want to know that their children have a future. This bill does absolutely nothing to give them hope.

The government also tells us that it wants to reduce EI premiums. But considering the size of the surplus in the EI fund, it could reduce them even more.

[*English*]

People are also asking for a tax break. There has to be that balance. The government could have gone further and it has not. It has not gone there. These industries and these workers want to have that break in order for industries to hire more people and in order for these workers to have more money to put away for their children's education. The bill does absolutely nothing to address this issue. Hopefully we will have a reasonable debate in the House.

The Liberals are ranting. She is the only one here but hopefully we will have reasonable debate.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): May I remind the hon. member that we are not to mention whether members are here or not.

Unfortunately, there is no more time left for comments. When the bill returns to the House, the member who just spoke will have approximately five minutes for questions and comments if he so desires.

* * *

• (1730)

PRIVACY COMMISSIONER

The House resumed from September 28 consideration of the motion

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): It being 5.30 p.m., pursuant to order made Friday, September 29, 2000, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on Motion No. 12 under government orders.

Call in the members.

• (1805)

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 1394*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Anders
Assad
Augustine

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy

Government Orders

Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Casson	Catterall
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	DeVillers
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Elley	Epp
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goldring
Gouk	Graham
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Hill (MacLeod)
Hoepfner	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	Lowther
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally	McTeague
Mifflin	Mills (Red Deer)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Obhrai	Pagtakhan
Pankiw	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Ramsay	Redman
Reed	Reynolds
Richardson	Ritz
Saada	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solberg	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur

Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wilfert	Williams —182

NAYS**Members**

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Blaikie	Borotsik
Brien	Canuel
Cardin	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clark	Crête
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Dumas
Earle	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending	Guay
Guimond	Hardy
Hearn	Herron
Keddy (South Shore)	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Lill	Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
Ménard	Mercier
Muise	Nystrom
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Proctor
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Solomon	St-Hilaire
Stoffer	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Vautour
Venne	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne—74	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata	Wood
----------	------

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

MARINE CONSERVATION AREAS ACT

The House resumed from September 28 consideration of Bill C-8, an act respecting marine conservation areas, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Friday, September 29, 2000, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions on the report stage of Bill C-8.

Government Orders

The question is on Motion No. 1. The vote on Motion No. 1 also applies to Motions Nos. 2, 3, 7, 12, 13, 26 to 29, 37, 40 to 48, 53, 55, 56, 59 and 60.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote just completed on the previous motion to 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. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote yes to this motion and, as I mentioned, the member for Yorkton—Melville had to leave.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc members, with the exception of the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, who had to withdraw, are in favour of the motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party, with the exception of the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, who had to withdraw, are opposed to the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party will be voting no to the motion.

Mr. Keith Martin: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the motion.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting in support of the motion.

Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting no.

• (1810)

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1395*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bigras	

Brien	Cadman
Canuel	Cardin
Casson	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dumas
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Hill (MacLeod)	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Loubier	Lowther
Manning	Marceau
Marchand	Mark
Mayfield	McNally
Ménard	Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Ramsay	Reynolds
Ritz	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Solberg	St-Hilaire
Stinson	Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la-Mitis)
Venne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—82	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Clark
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Davies
DeVillers	Discepola
Dockrill	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Graham
Grose	Gruending
Guarnieri	Harb
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Hearn
Herron	Hoepfner
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lavigne

Government Orders

Lee	Leung	Benoit	Bergeron
Lill	Limoges	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Cummins
Lincoln	Longfield	Bigras	de Savoye
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Brien	Desrochers
Mahoney	Malhi	Canuel	Dumas
Maloney	Mancini	Casson	Epp
Manley	Marleau	Crête	Fournier
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Dalphond-Guiral	Gauthier
McCormick	McDonough	Debien	Girard-Bujold
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Gouk
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague	Elley	Guay
Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Forseth	Hanger
Minna	Mitchell	Gagnon	Jaffer
Muise	Murray	Gilmour	Jones
Myers	Nault	Goldring	Lalonde
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Grey (Edmonton North)	Lebel
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan	Guimond	Louther
Paradis	Parrish	Hill (Macleod)	Marceau
Patry	Peric	Johnston	Mark
Peterson	Pettigrew	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	McNally
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Laurin	Mercier
Pillitteri	Pratt	Loubier	Morrison
Price	Proctor	Manning	Pankiw
Proud	Proulx	Marchand	Penson
Provenzano	Redman	Mayfield	Picard (Drummond)
Reed	Richardson	Ménard	Ramsay
Riis	Robinson	Mills (Red Deer)	Ritz
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)	Obhrai	Sauvageau
Serre	Sgro	Penson	Solberg
Shepherd	Solomon	Picard (Drummond)	Stinson
Speller	St. Denis	Ramsay	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
St-Jacques	St-Julien	Ritz	Venne
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)	Sauvageau	Williams—82
Stoffer	Szabo	Solberg	
Telegdi	Thibeault	Stinson	
Torsney	Ur	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	
Valeri	Vanclief	Venne	
Vautour	Volpe	Williams—82	
Wappel	Wasylycia-Leis		
Wayne	Whelan		
Wilfert—171			

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata Wood

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 2, 3, 7, 12, 13, 26 to 29, 37, 40 to 48, 53, 55, 56, 59 and 60 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 4.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of the last vote to Motions Nos. 4, 8, 10, 14, 21, 30, 38, 51, 16 and 49.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1396)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Aselin
Bailey

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Caplan
Catterall
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Guarnieri
Hardy
Harvey
Herron
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carroll
Chamberlain
Clark
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Davies
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Gruending
Harb
Harvard
Hearn
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis

Government Orders

Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes	Goldring	Gouk
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Knutson	Laliberte	Guimond	Hanger
Lastewka	Lavigne	Hill (Macleod)	Jaffer
Lee	Leung	Johnston	Jones
Lill	Limoges	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lalonde
Lincoln	Longfield	Laurin	Lebel
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Loubier	Lowther
Mahoney	Malhi	Manning	Marceau
Maloney	Mancini	Marchand	Mark
Manley	Marleau	Mayfield	McNally
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Ménard	Mercier
McCormick	McDonough	Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)	Obhrai	Pankiw
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague	Penson	Perron
Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Picard (Drummond)	Piampodon
Minna	Mitchell	Ramsay	Reynolds
Muise	Murray	Ritz	Rocheleau
Myers	Nault	Sauvageau	Schmidt
Nyström	O'Brien (Labrador)	Solberg	St-Hilaire
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly	Stinson	Strahl
Pagtakhan	Paradis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Parrish	Patry	Venne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Peric	Peterson	Williams—82	
Pettigrew	Phinney		
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri		
Pratt	Price		
Proctor	Proud		
Proulx	Provenzano		
Redman	Reed		
Richardson	Riis		
Robinson	Saada	Adams	Alcock
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré	Anderson	Assad
Sgro	Shepherd	Assadourian	Augustine
Solomon	Speller	Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
St. Denis	St-Jacques	Baker	Bakopanos
St-Julien	Steckle	Beaumier	Bélaire
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer	Bélanger	Bellemare
Szabo	Telegdi	Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Thibeault	Torsney	Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Ur	Valeri	Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Vanclief	Vautour	Bonin	Bonwick
Volpe	Wappel	Borotsik	Boudria
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne	Bradshaw	Brown
Whelan	Wilfert—172	Bryden	Bulte
		Caccia	Calder
		Caplan	Carroll
		Catterall	Chamberlain
		Charbonneau	Clark
		Clouthier	Coderre
		Collenette	Comuzzi
		Copps	Cotler
		Cullen	Davies
		DeVillers	Discepola
		Dockrill	Doyle
		Dromisky	Drouin
		Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
		Earle	Easter
		Eggleton	Finlay
		Folco	Fontana
		Fry	Gagliano
		Galloway	Godfrey
		Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Graham
		Grose	Gruending
		Guarnieri	Harb
		Hardy	Harvard
		Harvey	Hearn
		Herron	Hoepfner
		Hubbard	Ianno
		Iftody	Jackson
		Jennings	Jordan
		Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
		Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
		Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
		Knutson	Laliberte
		Lastewka	Lavigne
		Lee	Leung
		Lill	Limoges
		Lincoln	Longfield
		MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
		Mahoney	Malhi
		Maloney	Mancini
		Manley	Marleau
		Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
		McCormick	McDonough
		McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
		McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
		Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
		Minna	Mitchell
		Muise	Murray

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos
Bélaire
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carroll
Chamberlain
Clark
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Davies
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Gruending
Harb
Harvard
Hearn
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murray

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata	Wood
----------	------

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 1399)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Bigras	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien	Cadman
Canuel	Cardin
Casson	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dumas
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold

Government Orders

Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robinson	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert—172

Stinson
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Venne
Williams—82

Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carroll
Chamberlain
Clark
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Davies
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Gruending
Harb
Harvard
Hearn
Hoeppner
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Saada
Serré

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata	Wood
----------	------

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 1401)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bigras	Cadman
Brien	Cardin
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Casson	Cummins
Crête	de Savoye
Dalphon-D-Guiral	Desrochers
Debien	Dumas
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Epp
Elley	Fournier
Forseth	Gauthier
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Gouk
Goldring	Guay
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Guimond	Jaffer
Hill (MacLeod)	Jones
Johnston	Lalonde
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)	Lebel
Laurin	Lowther
Loubier	Marceau
Manning	Mark
Marchand	McNally
Mayfield	Mercier
Ménard	Morrison
Mills (Red Deer)	Pankiw
Obhrai	Perron
Penson	Plamondon
Picard (Drummond)	Reynolds
Ramsay	Rocheleau
Ritz	Schmidt
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Solberg	

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Caplan
Catterall
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Guarnieri
Hardy
Harvey
Herron
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Minna
Muisse
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Robinson
Scott (Fredericton)

Government Orders

Sgro
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wasylcyia-Leis
Whelan

Shepherd
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Vautour
Wappel
Wayne
Wilfert—172

Assadourian
Axworthy
Baker
Beaumur
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Caplan
Catterall
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Guarnieri
Hardy
Harvey
Herron
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Minna
Muisse
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Robinson
Scott (Fredericton)
Sgro
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault

Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carroll
Chamberlain
Clark
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Davies
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Gruending
Harb
Harvard
Hearn
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Saada
Serré
Shepherd
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata

Wood

(The House divided on Motion No. 14, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1403)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Canuel
Casson
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Hill (MacLeod)
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laurin
Loubier
Manning
Marchand
Mayfield
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay
Ritz
Sauvageau
Solberg
Stinson
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Venne
Williams—82

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman
Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dumas
Epp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Gouk
Guay
Hanger
Jaffer
Jones
Lalonde
Lebel
Lowther
Marceau
Mark
McNally
Mercier
Morrison
Pankiw
Perron
Plamondon
Reynolds
Rocheleau
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anderson

Alcock
Assad

Government Orders

Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan

Valeri
Vautour
Wappel
Wayne
Wilfert—172

Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Caplan
Catterall
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Guarnieri
Hardy
Harvey
Herron
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Minna
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Robinson
Scott (Fredericton)
Sgro
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan

Bélaïr
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carroll
Chamberlain
Clark
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Davies
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Gruending
Harb
Harvard
Hearn
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Parry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Saada
Serré
Shepherd
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Vautour
Wappel
Wayne
Wilfert—172

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata

Wood

(The House divided on Motion No. 21, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1405)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Canuel
Casson
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Hill (Macleod)
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laurin
Loubier
Manning
Marchand
Mayfield
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay
Ritz
Sauvageau
Solberg
Stinson
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Venne
Williams—82

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman
Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dumas
Epp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Gouk
Guay
Hanger
Jaffer
Jones
Lalonde
Lebel
Lowther
Marceau
Mark
McNally
Mercier
Morrison
Pankiw
Perron
Plamondon
Reynolds
Rocheleau
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la-Mitis)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy
Baker

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata Wood

(The House divided on Motion No. 30, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1410)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Breitreuz (Yellowhead)
Bigras	Cadman
Brien	Cardin
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Casson	Cummins
Crête	de Savoye
Dalphonso-Guiral	Desrochers
Debien	Dumas
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Epp
Elley	Fournier
Forseth	Gauthier
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Gouk
Goldring	Guay
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Guimond	Jaffer
Hill (Macleod)	Jones
Johnston	Lalonde
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)	Lebel
Laurin	Lowther
Loubier	Marceau
Manning	Mark
Marchand	McNally
Mayfield	Mercier
Ménard	Morrison
Mills (Red Deer)	Pankiw
Obhrai	Perron
Penso	Plamondon
Picard (Drummond)	Reynolds
Ramsay	Rocheleau
Ritz	Schmidt
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Solberg	Strahl
Stinson	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Venne	
Williams—82	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte

Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Clark
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Davies
DeVillers	Discepolo
Dockrill	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Graham
Grose	Gruending
Guarnieri	Harb
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Hearn
Herron	Hoepfner
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robinson	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanelief	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcyia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert—172

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata Wood

Government Orders

(The House divided on Motion No. 38, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1415*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bigras	Cadman
Brien	Cardin
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Casson	Cummins
Crête	de Savoye
Dalphond-Guiral	Desrochers
Debien	Dumas
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Epp
Elley	Fournier
Forseth	Gauthier
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Gouk
Goldring	Guay
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Guimond	Jaffer
Hill (Macleod)	Jones
Johnston	Lalonde
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lebel
Laurin	Lowther
Loubier	Marceau
Manning	Mark
Marchand	McNally
Mayfield	Mercier
Ménard	Morrison
Mills (Red Deer)	Pankiw
Obhrai	Perron
Penson	Plamondon
Picard (Drummond)	Reynolds
Ramsay	Rocheleau
Ritz	Schmidt
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Solberg	Strahl
Stinson	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la-Mitis)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Venne	
Williams—82	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll

Catterall	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Clark
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Davies
DeVillers	Discepolo
Dockrill	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Graham
Grose	Gruending
Guarnieri	Harb
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Hearn
Herron	Hoeppner
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Labiberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robinson	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcyia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert—172

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata	Wood
----------	------

Government Orders

(The House divided on Motion No. 51, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1417*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bigras	Cadman
Brien	Cardin
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Casson	Cummins
Crête	de Savoye
Dalphond-Guiral	Desrochers
Debien	Dumas
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Epp
Elley	Fournier
Forseth	Gauthier
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Gouk
Goldring	Guay
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Guimond	Jaffer
Hill (Macleod)	Jones
Johnston	Lalonde
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lebel
Laurin	Lowther
Loubier	Marceau
Manning	Mark
Marchand	McNally
Mayfield	Mercier
Ménard	Morrison
Mills (Red Deer)	Pankiw
Obhrai	Perron
Penson	Plamondon
Picard (Drummond)	Reynolds
Ramsay	Rocheleau
Ritz	Schmidt
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Solberg	Strahl
Stinson	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Venne	
Williams—82	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll

Catterall	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Clark
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Davies
DeVillers	Discepolo
Dockrill	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Graham
Grose	Gruending
Guarnieri	Harb
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Hearn
Herron	Hoeppner
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robinson	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcyia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert—172

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata	Wood
----------	------

Government Orders

(The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1420)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bigras	Cadman
Brien	Cardin
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Casson	Cummins
Crête	de Savoye
Dalphond-Guiral	Desrochers
Debien	Dumas
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Epp
Elley	Fournier
Forseth	Gauthier
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Gouk
Goldring	Guay
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Guimond	Jaffer
Hill (Macleod)	Jones
Johnston	Lalonde
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lebel
Laurin	Lowther
Loubier	Marceau
Manning	Mark
Marchand	McNally
Mayfield	Mercier
Ménard	Morrison
Mills (Red Deer)	Pankiw
Obhrai	Perron
Penson	Plamondon
Picard (Drummond)	Reynolds
Ramsay	Rocheleau
Ritz	Schmidt
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Solberg	Strahl
Stinson	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la-Mitis)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Venne	
Williams—82	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll

Catterall	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Clark
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Davies
DeVillers	Discepolo
Dockrill	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Graham
Grose	Gruending
Guarnieri	Harb
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Hearn
Herron	Hoeppner
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Labiberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robinson	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcyia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert—172

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata	Wood
----------	------

Government Orders

(The House divided on Motion No. 49, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1422)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bigras	Cadman
Brien	Cardin
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Casson	Cummins
Crête	de Savoye
Dalphond-Guiral	Desrochers
Debien	Dumas
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Epp
Elley	Fournier
Forseth	Gauthier
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Gouk
Goldring	Guay
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Guimond	Jaffer
Hill (Macleod)	Jones
Johnston	Lalonde
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lebel
Laurin	Lowther
Loubier	Marceau
Manning	Mark
Marchand	McNally
Mayfield	Mercier
Ménard	Morrison
Mills (Red Deer)	Pankiw
Obhrai	Perron
Penson	Plamondon
Picard (Drummond)	Reynolds
Ramsay	Rocheleau
Ritz	Schmidt
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Solberg	Strahl
Stinson	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Venne	
Williams—82	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll

Catterall	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Clark
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Davies
DeVillers	Discepolo
Dockrill	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Graham
Grose	Gruending
Guarnieri	Harb
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Hearn
Herron	Hoeppner
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robinson	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcyia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert—172

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata	Wood
----------	------

Government Orders

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 4, 8, 10, 14, 21, 30, 38, 51, 16 and 49 lost.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We would like to add the hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle to the motion just passed.

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 5.

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. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote yea.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois vote nay.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of NDP present vote nay.

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members are voting no to this motion.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I vote in support of this motion.

Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner: Mr. Speaker, I vote no to this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1397)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Benoit
Cadman
Cummins
Epp
Gilmour
Gouk
Hanger
Jaffer
Jones
Lowther
Mark
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Penson
Reynolds

Ablonczy
Bailey
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Casson
Elley
Forseth
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hill (Macleod)
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Morrison
Pankiw
Ramsay
Ritz

Schmidt
Stinson
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Solberg
Strahl
Williams—42

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Carroll
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Copp
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desrochers
Discepolo
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Graham
Gruending
Guay
Harb
Harvard
Hearn
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marceau
Marleau
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)

Alarie
Anderson
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Beaumur
Bélanger
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brien
Bryden
Caccia
Canuel
Cardin
Catterall
Charbonneau
Clark
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cullen
Davies
Debien
DeVillers
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fournier
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Guarnieri
Guimond
Hardy
Harvey
Herron
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)

Government Orders

McTeague	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Perron	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robinson	Rocheleau
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Vautour	Venne
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert—212

Gilmour
Gouk
Hanger
Jaffer
Jones
Lowther
Mark
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Penson
Reynolds
Schmidt
Stinson
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hill (MacLeod)
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Morrison
Pankiw
Ramsay
Ritz
Solberg
Strahl
Williams—42

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Carroll
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Copp
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desrochers
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Graham
Gruending
Guay
Harb
Harvard
Hearn
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Alarie
Anderson
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brien
Bryden
Caccia
Canuel
Cardin
Catterall
Charbonneau
Clark
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cullen
Davies
Debien
DeVillers
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fournier
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Guarnieri
Guimond
Hardy
Harvey
Herron
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lalonde

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata Wood

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 9.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe that you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motions Nos. 9, 11, 23, 24, 31, 32, and 52.

• (1815)

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1400)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman	Casson
Cummins	Elley
Epp	Forseth

Government Orders

Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marceau	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert—212	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata Wood

(The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1402)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman	Casson
Cummins	Elley
Epp	Forseth

Gilmour	Goldring
Gouk	Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger	Hill (Macleod)
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lowther	Manning
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Schmidt	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—42

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Blaikie	Bonwick
Bonin	Boudria
Borotsik	Brien
Bradshaw	Bryden
Brown	Caccia
Bulte	Canuel
Calder	Cardin
Caplan	Catterall
Carroll	Charbonneau
Chamberlain	Clark
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Coderre
Clouthier	Comuzzi
Collenette	Cotler
Copps	Cullen
Crête	Davies
Dalphond-Guiral	Debien
de Savoye	DeVillers
Desrochers	Dockrill
Discepola	Dromisky
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Drouin	Duhamel
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Earle
Dumas	Eggleton
Easter	Folco
Finlay	Fournier
Fontana	Gagliano
Fry	Galloway
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Gauthier	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Godfrey	Grose
Graham	Guarnieri
Gruending	Guimond
Guay	Hardy
Harb	Harvey
Harvard	Herron
Hearn	Hubbard
Hoepfner	Iftody
Ianno	Jennings
Jackson	Karetak-Lindell
Jordan	Keddy (South Shore)
Karygiannis	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Keyes	Knutson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Lalonde
Laliberte	

Government Orders

Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marceau
Marleau
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Ménard
Mifflin
Minna
Muisse
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Rocheleau
Sauvageau
Serré
Shepherd
Speller
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Ur
Vanclief
Venne
Wappel
Wayne
Wilfert—212

Laurin
Lebel
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mercier
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Perron
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pratt
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Robinson
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Sgro
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Jacques
Steckle
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Valeri
Vautour
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan

Gilmour
Gouk
Hanger
Jaffer
Jones
Lowther
Mark
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Penson
Reynolds
Schmidt
Stinson
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hill (Macleod)
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Morrison
Pankiw
Ramsay
Ritz
Solberg
Strahl
Williams—42

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Bélaïr
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Carroll
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desrochers
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Graham
Gruending
Guay
Harb
Harvard
Hearn
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte

Alarie
Anderson
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brien
Bryden
Caccia
Canuel
Cardin
Catterall
Charbonneau
Clark
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cullen
Davies
Debien
DeVillers
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fournier
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Guarnieri
Guimond
Hardy
Harvey
Herron
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lalonde

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata

Wood

(The House divided on Motion No. 23, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1407)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Benoit
Cadman
Cummins
Epp

Ablonczy
Bailey
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Casson
Elley
Forseth

Government Orders

Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marceau	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert—212	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata Wood

(The House divided on Motion No. 24, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1408*)

YEAS**Members**

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman	Casson
Cummins	Elley
Epp	Forseth

Gilmour	Goldring
Gouk	Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger	Hill (Macleod)
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lowther	Manning
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Schmidt	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—42

NAYS**Members**

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Blaikie	Bonwick
Bonin	Boudria
Borotsik	Brien
Bradshaw	Bryden
Brown	Caccia
Bulte	Canuel
Calder	Cardin
Caplan	Catterall
Carroll	Charbonneau
Chamberlain	Clark
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Coderre
Clouthier	Comuzzi
Collenette	Cotler
Copps	Cullen
Crête	Davies
Dalphond-Guiral	Debien
de Savoye	DeVillers
Desrochers	Dockrill
Discepola	Dromisky
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Drouin	Duhamel
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Earle
Dumas	Eggleton
Easter	Folco
Finlay	Fournier
Fontana	Gagliano
Fry	Galloway
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Gauthier	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Godfrey	Grose
Graham	Guarnieri
Gruending	Guimond
Guay	Hardy
Harb	Harvey
Harvard	Herron
Hearn	Hubbard
Hoepfner	Iftody
Ianno	Jennings
Jackson	Karetak-Lindell
Jordan	Keddy (South Shore)
Karygiannis	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Keyes	Knutson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Lalonde
Laliberte	

Government Orders

Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marceau	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert—212	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata	Wood
----------	------

(The House divided on Motion No. 31, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1411)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman	Casson
Cummins	Elley
Epp	Forseth

Gilmour	Goldring
Gouk	Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger	Hill (Macleod)
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lowther	Manning
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Schmidt	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—42

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brien
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia
Calder	Canuel
Caplan	Cardin
Carroll	Catterall
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Clark
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Crête	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desrochers	De Villers
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham	Grose
Gruending	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Hardy
Harvard	Harvey
Hearn	Herron
Hoepfner	Hubbard
Ianno	Ifody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson

Government Orders

Laliberte	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marceau	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert—212	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata	Wood
----------	------

(The House divided on Motion No. 32, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1412)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman	Casson
Cummins	Elley
Epp	Forseth

Gilmour
Gouk
Hanger
Jaffer
Jones
Lowther
Mark
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Penson
Reynolds
Schmidt
Stinson
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hill (Macleod)
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Morrison
Pankiw
Ramsay
Ritz
Solberg
Strahl
Williams—42

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Bélaïr
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Carroll
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Crête
Dalphonde-Guiral
de Savoye
Desrochers
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Graham
Gruending
Guay
Harb
Harvard
Hearn
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Alarie
Anderson
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brien
Bryden
Caccia
Canuel
Cardin
Catterall
Charbonneau
Clark
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cullen
Davies
Debien
De Villers
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fournier
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Guarnieri
Guimond
Hardy
Harvey
Herron
Hubbard
Ifody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson

Government Orders

Laliberte
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marceau
Marleau
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Ménard
Mifflin
Minna
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Rocheleau
Sauvageau
Serré
Shepherd
Speller
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Ur
Vanclief
Venne
Wappel
Wayne
Wilfert—212

Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mercier
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Perron
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pratt
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Robinson
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Sgro
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Jacques
Steckle
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Valeri
Vautour
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata Wood

(The House divided on Motion No. 52, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1418)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Benoit
Cadman
Cummins
Epp

Ablonczy
Bailey
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Casson
Elley
Forseth

Gilmour
Gouk
Hanger
Jaffer
Jones
Lowther
Mark
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Penson
Reynolds
Schmidt
Stinson
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hill (Macleod)
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Morrison
Pankiw
Ramsay
Ritz
Solberg
Strahl
Williams—42

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Bélaïr
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Carroll
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desrochers
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Graham
Gruending
Guay
Harb
Harvard
Hearn
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Alarie
Anderson
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brien
Bryden
Caccia
Canuel
Cardin
Catterall
Charbonneau
Clark
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cullen
Davies
Debien
De Villers
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fournier
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Guarnieri
Guimond
Hardy
Harvey
Herron
Hubbard
Ifody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson

Government Orders

Laliberte	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marceau	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert—212	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata	Wood
----------	------

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 9, 11, 23, 24, 31, 32 and 52 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 33 and 34 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 6. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 57 and 58.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find there is unanimous consent to apply the vote just completed on the previous motion to 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. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois oppose the motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, NDP members will be voting in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members are voting yes to this motion.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I vote yea.

Mr. Jake E. Hooppner: Yea, Mr. Speaker.

(The House divided on Motion No. 6, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1398*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Clark
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Cummins
Davies	DeVillers
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Elley	Epp
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano

Government Orders

Galloway	Gilmour	Brien	Canuel
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Cardin	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Goldring	Gouk	Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Graham	Grey (Edmonton North)	de Savoye	Debien
Grose	Gruending	Desrochers	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Guarnieri	Hanger	Dumas	Fournier
Harb	Hardy	Gagnon	Gauthier
Harvard	Harvey	Girard-Bujold	Guay
Hearn	Herron	Guimond	Lalonde
Hill (Macleod)	Hoepfner	Laurin	Lebel
Hubbard	Ianno	Loubier	Marceau
Iftody	Jackson	Marchand	Ménard
Jaffer	Jennings	Mercier	Perron
Johnston	Jones	Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell	Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Karygiannis	Keddy (South Shore)	St-Hilaire	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Keyes	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Venne —41
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)		
Knutson	Laliberte		
Lastewka	Lavigne		
Lee	Leung		
Lill	Limoges		
Lincoln	Longfield		
Lowther	MacAulay		
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney		
Malhi	Maloney		
Mancini	Manley		
Manning	Mark		
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)		
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield		
McCormick	McDonough		
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)		
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McNally		
McTeague	Mifflin		
Mills (Red Deer)	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)		
Minna	Mitchell		
Morrison	Muise		
Murray	Myers		
Nault	Nystrom		
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)		
O'Reilly	Obhrai		
Pagtakhan	Pankiw		
Paradis	Parrish		
Patry	Penson		
Peric	Peterson		
Pettigrew	Phinney		
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri		
Pratt	Price		
Proctor	Proud		
Proulx	Provenzano		
Ramsay	Redman		
Reed	Reynolds		
Richardson	Riis		
Ritz	Robinson		
Saada	Schmidt		
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré		
Sgro	Shepherd		
Solberg	Solomon		
Speller	St. Denis		
St-Jacques	St-Julien		
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)		
Stinson	Stoffer		
Strahl	Szabo		
Telegdi	Thibeault		
Torsney	Ur		
Valeri	Vanclief		
Vautour	Volpe		
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis		
Wayne	Whelan		
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Wilfert		
Williams—213			

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata

Wood

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 6 carried. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 57 and 58 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 15.

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. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote nay.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote against the motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, NDP members will be voting in favour of this motion.

[English]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members are voting in favour of the motion.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: I vote nay, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner: Portage—Lisgar votes yea, Mr. Speaker.

(The House divided on Motion No. 15, which was agreed to on the following division:)

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras

Government Orders

(Division No. 1404)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Caplan
Catterall
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copp
Cullen
DeVillers
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fry
Gallaway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Guarnieri
Hardy
Harvey
Herron
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Saada
Serré
Shepherd
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Stoffer
Telegdi

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carroll
Chamberlain
Clark
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Davies
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Gruending
Harb
Harvard
Hearn
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marleau
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Minna
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proctor
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Robinson
Scott (Fredericton)
Sgro
Solomon
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault

Torsney
Valeri
Vautour
Wappel
Wayne
Wilfert—171

Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Canuel
Casson
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Hill (Macleod)
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laurin
Loubier
Manning
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Mercier
Morrison
Pankiw
Perron
Plamondon
Reynolds
Rocheleau
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman
Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dumas
Epp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Gouk
Guay
Hanger
Jaffer
Jones
Lalonde
Lebel
Lowther
Marceau
Mark
Mayfield
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Obhrai
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay
Ritz
Sauvageau
Solberg
Stinson
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Venne
Williams—83

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata

Wood

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 15 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 22.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Government Orders

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote against the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP vote no to this motion.

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members are voting in favour of the motion.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: I vote yea, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner: Mr. Speaker, I vote yea for Portage—Lisgar.

• (1820)

(The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1406)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Cadman
Casson	Clark
Cummins	Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Gilmour	Goldring
Gouk	Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger	Hearn
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lowther	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Manning	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McNally	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Schmidt	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Vautour	Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams —56

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Baumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellehumeur

Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brien	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Canuel	Caplan
Cardin	Carroll
Catterall	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Crête	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desrochers	DeVillers
Discepola	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham	Grose
Gruending	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Hardy
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Laliberte	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	

Government Orders

St-Jacques
Steckle
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Valeri
Venne
Wappel
Whelan

St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert—198

Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman
Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Hearn
Hill (MacLeod)
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laurin
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Mark
Mayfield
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Muisse
Pankiw
Perron
Plamondon
Reynolds
Rocheleau
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Venne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Borotsik
Brien
Canuel
Casson
Clark
Cummins
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Epp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Gouk
Guay
Hanger
Herron
Hoeppner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Lalonde
Lebel
Lowther
Manning
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Mercier
Morrison
Obhrai
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay
Ritz
Sauvageau
Solberg
Stinson
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Vautour
Wayne
Williams—97

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata Wood

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 22 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 25.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote in favour of this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, NDP members will be voting against the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative members are voting yea.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: I vote yea, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner: Portage—Lisgar votes yea, Mr. Speaker.

(The House divided on Motion No. 25, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1409*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bélisle (Mégantic—Lac-Édouard—Pabok)

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bélaïr
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Carroll
Chamberlain
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
DeVillers
Dockrill
Drouin
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Guarnieri
Hardy
Harvey
Ianno

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Caccia
Caplan
Catterall
Charbonneau
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Davies
Discepola
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grüending
Harb
Harvard
Hubbard
Ifody

Government Orders

Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marleau	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
Mifflin	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robinson
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert —157	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata	Wood
----------	------

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 25 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 35.

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. John Reynolds: The Canadian Alliance members present vote yea, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote against the motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, NDP members will be voting in favour of this motion.

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members will be voting in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Jack Ramsay: I vote yea, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner: Portage—Lisgar votes yea, Mr. Speaker.

(The House divided on Motion No. 35, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1413*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Blaikie
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman	Casson
Clark	Cummins
Davies	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Gilmour	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Gruending
Hanger	Hardy
Hearn	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lill
Lowther	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Manning
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Riis	Ritz
Robinson	Schmidt
Solberg	Solomon
Stinson	Stoffer
Strahl	Vautour
Wasylycia-Leis	Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—74

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	

Government Orders

Bigras	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brien	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Canuel	Caplan
Cardin	Carroll
Catterall	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cloutier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Crête	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
DeVillers	Discepolo
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duhamel
Dumas	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fournier	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Graham	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottetown)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Laliberté	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	Loubier
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Marleau
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Perron	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pratt	Price
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Rocheleau	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la-Mitis)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert—180

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata

Wood

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 35 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 36.

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. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote yea.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote against the motion.

[English]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP vote no.

Mr. Norman Doyle: Progressive Conservative members vote yes to this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: I vote yea, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner: Yea, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to inform you that the member for Repentigny could not be here for this vote.

• (1825)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 36, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 1414)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Caccia

Cadman
 Caplan
 Casson
 Chamberlain
 Clark
 Coderre
 Comuzzi
 Cotler
 Cummins
 Discepolo
 Dromisky
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Easter
 Elley
 Finlay
 Fontana
 Fry
 Gallaway
 Godfrey
 Gouk
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Guarnieri
 Harb
 Harvey
 Herron
 Hoepfner
 Ianno
 Jackson
 Jennings
 Jones
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Keyes
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Laliberte
 Lavigne
 Leung
 Lincoln
 Lowther
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Malhi
 Manley
 Mark
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 McCormick
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McNally
 Mifflin
 Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
 Mitchell
 Muise
 Myers
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 O'Reilly
 Pagtakhan
 Paradis
 Patry
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Pratt
 Proud
 Provenzano
 Redman
 Reynolds
 Ritz
 Schmidt
 Serré
 Shepherd
 Speller
 St-Jacques
 Steckle
 Stinson
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Volpe
 Wayne
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)
 Williams —195

Calder
 Carroll
 Catterall
 Charbonneau
 Clouthier
 Collenette
 Copps
 Cullen
 DeVillers
 Doyle
 Drouin
 Duhamel
 Eggleton
 Epp
 Folco
 Forseth
 Gagliano
 Gilmour
 Goldring
 Graham
 Grose
 Hanger
 Harvard
 Hearn
 Hill (Macleod)
 Hubbard
 Iftody
 Jaffer
 Johnston
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
 Knutson
 Lastewka
 Lee
 Limoges
 Longfield
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Manning
 Marleau
 Mayfield
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 McTeague
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Minna
 Morrison
 Murray
 Nault
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Obhrai
 Pankiw
 Parrish
 Penson
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Price
 Proulx
 Ramsay
 Reed
 Richardson
 Saada
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Sgro
 Solberg
 St. Denis
 St-Julien
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Strahl
 Telegdi
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Vautour
 Wappel
 Whelan
 Wilfert

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Blaikie	Brien
Canuel	Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desrochers	Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dumas
Earle	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending	Guay
Guimond	Hardy
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lill
Loubier	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
Ménard	Mercier
Nystrom	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Proctor	Riis
Robinson	Rocheleau
Solomon	St-Hilaire
Stoffer	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Venne
Wasylycia-Leis—58	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata

Wood

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 36 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 39.

[Translation]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberals voting yea.

[English]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote yea.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote no to this motion.

[English]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP vote yea to this motion.

Mr. Norman Doyle: Progressive Conservative members are voting in favour of the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Government Orders

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I vote yea.

Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner: Mr. Speaker, Portage—Lisgar votes yea to this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 39, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 1416)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Clark
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Cullen	Cummins
Davies	DeVillers
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Elley	Epp
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Gilmour
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring	Gouk
Graham	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Gruending
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Hardy
Harvard	Harvey
Hearn	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hoepfner
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Johnston	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	

Limoges	Lincoln
Longfield	Lowther
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Manning
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally	McTeague
Mifflin	Mills (Red Deer)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Obhrai	Pagtakhan
Pankiw	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Ramsay
Redman	Reed
Reynolds	Richardson
Riis	Ritz
Robinson	Saada
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solberg
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Stoffer	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcyia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wilfert	Williams—213

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Brien	Canuel
Cardin	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye	Debien
Desrochers	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Guay
Guimond	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Loubier	Marceau
Marchand	Ménard
Mercier	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Rocheleau	St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Venne —40	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata

Wood

Government Orders

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 39 carried. The next question is on Motion No. 54.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform you that the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell could not be here for this vote. However, I think you would find unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberals voting nay.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote no to this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP will vote in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members are voting against this motion.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: I vote yea, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner: Mr. Speaker, Portage—Lisgar votes no.

(The House divided on Motion No. 54, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1419*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Casson
Davies
Earle
Épp
Gilmour
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Hill (Macleod)
Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lowther
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Morrison
Obhrai

Ablonczy
Bailey
Blaikie
Cadman
Cummins
Dockrill
Elley
Forseth
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gouk
Gruending
Hardy
Jaffer
Jones
Lill
Mancini
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pankiw

Penson
Ramsay
Riis
Robinson
Solberg
Stinson
Strahl
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Proctor
Reynolds
Ritz
Schmidt
Solomon
Stoffer
Wasylcia-Leis
Williams—60

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Carroll
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
DeVillers
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Eggleton
Folco
Fournier
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Graham
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hearn
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Limoges
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marceau
Marleau
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Ménard
Mifflin
Minna

Alarie
Anderson
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Borotsik
Brien
Bryden
Caccia
Canuel
Cardin
Catterall
Charbonneau
Clark
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
Cullen
de Savoye
Desrochers
Discepola
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duhamel
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Grose
Guay
Harb
Harvey
Herron
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Leung
Lincoln
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Marchand
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mercier
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)

Government Orders

Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pratt
Price	Proud
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Rocheleau
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert—192

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata	Wood
----------	------

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 54 lost.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe there is consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 50.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 50, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 1423)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bailey
Benoit	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Cadman
Casson	Cummins
Davies	Dockrill
Earle	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Gilmour	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Gruending
Hanger	Hardy
Hill (MacLeod)	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)	Lill
Lowther	Mancini
Manning	Mark

Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McDonough
McNally	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Riis	Ritz
Robinson	Schmidt
Solberg	Solomon
Stinson	Stoffer
Strahl	Wasylcia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—60

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Bevilacqua	Bonin
Blondin-Andrew	Borotsik
Bonwick	Brien
Bradshaw	Bryden
Brown	Caccia
Bulte	Canuel
Calder	Cardin
Caplan	Catterall
Carroll	Charbonneau
Chamberlain	Clark
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Coderre
Clouthier	Comuzzi
Collenette	Cotler
Copps	Cullen
Crête	de Savoye
Dalphon-DuGiral	Desrochers
Debien	Discepola
DeVillers	Dromisky
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Drouin	Duhamel
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Easter
Dumas	Finlay
Eggleton	Fontana
Folco	Fry
Fournier	Gagnon
Gagliano	Gauthier
Galloway	Godfrey
Girard-Bujold	Grose
Graham	Guay
Guarnieri	Harb
Guimond	Harvey
Harvard	Herron
Hearn	Hubbard
Hoepfner	Iftody
Ianno	Jennings
Jackson	Karetak-Lindell
Jordan	Keddy (South Shore)
Karygiannis	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Keys	Knutson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Lalonde
Laliberte	Laurin
Lastewka	Lebel
Lavigne	Leung
Lee	Lincoln
Limoges	Loubier
Longfield	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
MacAulay	Malhi
Mahoney	
Maloney	

Government Orders

Manley
 Marchand
 McCormick
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McTeague
 Mercier
 Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
 Mitchell
 Murray
 Nault
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Pagtakhan
 Parrish
 Peric
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Plamondon
 Price
 Proulx
 Redman
 Richardson
 Saada
 Serré
 Shepherd
 St. Denis
 St-Jacques
 Steckle
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Venne
 Wappel
 Whelan

Marceau
 Marleau
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 Ménard
 Mifflin
 Minna
 Muise
 Myers
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 O'Reilly
 Paradis
 Patry
 Perron
 Pettigrew
 Picard (Drummond)
 Pillitteri
 Pratt
 Proud
 Provenzano
 Reed
 Rocheleau
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Sgro
 Speller
 St-Hilaire
 St-Julien
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Telegdi
 Torsney
 Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
 Valeri
 Vautour
 Volpe
 Wayne
 Wilfert—192

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata

Wood

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 50 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 17. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 18 to 20.

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. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote no to this motion.

● (1830)

[*English*]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP present are voting no.

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members are voting for the motion.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I vote yea.

Mr. Jake E. Hooppner: Mr. Speaker, I vote yea.

(The House divided on Motion No. 17, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1421*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
 Anders
 Bailey
 Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead)
 Casson
 Cummins
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Epp
 Gilmour
 Gouk
 Hanger
 Herron
 Hooppner
 Johnston
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Lowther
 Manning
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 McNally
 Morrison
 Obhrai
 Penson
 Reynolds
 Schmidt
 Stinson
 Vautour
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Abлонczy
 Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
 Benoit
 Borotsik
 Cadman
 Clark
 Doyle
 Elley
 Forseth
 Goldring
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Hearn
 Hill (Macleod)
 Jaffer
 Jones
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Mark
 Mayfield
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Muise
 Pankiw
 Ramsay
 Ritz
 Solberg
 Strahl
 Wayne
 Williams —56

NAYS

Members

Adams
 Alcock
 Assad
 Asselin
 Axworthy
 Baker
 Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bellemare
 Bergeron
 Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
 Bevilacqua
 Blaikie
 Bonin
 Bradshaw
 Brown
 Bulte
 Calder
 Caplan
 Carroll
 Chamberlain
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
 Coderre

Alarie
 Anderson
 Assadourian
 Augustine
 Bachand (Saint-Jean)
 Bakopanos
 Bélair
 Bellehumeur
 Bennett
 Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
 Bertrand
 Bigras
 Blondin-Andrew
 Bonwick
 Brien
 Bryden
 Caccia
 Canuel
 Cardin
 Catterall
 Charbonneau
 Clouthier

Government Orders

Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cotler
Crête	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desrochers	DeVillers
Discepola	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham	Grose
Gruending	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Hardy
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Laliberte	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré
Sgro	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan	Wilfert—196

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata Wood

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 17 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 18 to 20 lost.

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

[Translation]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform you that the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell has returned. I think you would find unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberals voting yea.

[English]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote nay, with the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca abstaining.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote no to this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, NDP members will be voting against the motion.

[English]

Mr. Norman Doyle: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members are voting no.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I vote nay.

Mr. Jake E. Hooppner: Mr. Speaker, I vote nay.

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

(Division No. 1424)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder

Private Members' Business

Caplan
Catterall
Charbonneau
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cotler
DeVillers
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lavigne
Leung
Lincoln
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Proulx
Redman
Richardson
Scott (Fredericton)
Sgro
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wilfert—139

Carroll
Chamberlain
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Grose
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Limoges
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marleau
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proud
Provenzano
Reed
Saada
Serré
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan

Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gouk
Gruending
Guimond
Hardy
Herron
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Manning
Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Muise
Obhrai
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Proctor
Reynolds
Ritz
Rocheleau
Solberg
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)
Vautour
Wasylcyia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Epp
Fournier
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay
Hanger
Hearn
Hill (MacLeod)
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laurin
Lill
Lowther
Mancini
Marceau
Mark
Mayfield
McNally
Mercier
Morrison
Nystrom
Pankiw
Perron
Plamondon
Ramsay
Riis
Robinson
Schmidt
Solomon
Stinson
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la-Mitis)
Venne
Wayne
Williams—113

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata Wood

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Borotsik
Brien
Canuel
Casson
Clark
Cummins
Davies
Debien

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman
Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desrochers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

CULTURAL INDUSTRY

The House resumed from September 28 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made earlier today, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 259 under private members' business.

Private Members' Business

● (1845)

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

*(Division No. 1425)***YEAS**

Members

Adams	Alarie
Assadourian	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bigras
Blaikie	Brien
Canuel	Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
Debien	Desrochers
Dockrill	Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dumas
Earle	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham	Gruending
Guay	Guimond
Hardy	Ianno
Jaffer	Keyes
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	Lavigne
Lebel	Lill
Lincoln	Loubier
Mancini	Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
Mercier	Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Proctor	Reynolds
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Scott (Fredericton)
Solomon	Stoffer
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay)	Wasylycia-Leis —64

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alcock	Anders
Anderson	Assad
Augustine	Axworthy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Blondin-Andrew
Bevilacqua	Bonwick
Bonin	Boudria
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bradshaw	Bryden
Brown	Caccia
Bulte	Calder
Cadman	Carroll
Caplan	Catterall
Casson	Charbonneau
Chamberlain	Clouthier
Clark	Collenette
Coderre	Copps
Comuzzi	Cummins
Cullen	DeVillers
de Savoye	Doyle
Discepolo	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Drouin	Easter
Duhamel	Elley
Eggleton	Finlay
Epp	Fontana
Folco	Gagliano
Fry	

Galloway	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goldring
Gouk	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hearn	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hoepfner
Hubbard	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Lastewka	Lee
Leung	Limoges
Longfield	Lowther
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marceau	Mark
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally	McTeague
Mifflin	Mills (Red Deer)
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Pagtakhan	Pankiw
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Penson
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proud	Proulx
Provenzano	Ramsay
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Ritz
Saada	Schmidt
Serré	Sgro
Shepherd	Solberg
Speller	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wayne
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wilfert	Williams—183

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nunziata	Wood
----------	------

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Private Members' Business

[English]

EMERGENCY SERVICE VOLUNTEERS**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Kings—Hants, PC)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Income Tax Act should be amended to provide a tax credit of \$500 to all emergency service volunteers.

He said: Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to take this opportunity to introduce the motion on emergency service volunteers. I thank my colleague for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough for seconding my motion. I look forward to an active debate and interest in this matter in the House of Commons.

This motion would lead the House of Commons to replace the tax deduction, for which only a few community volunteers in Canada are eligible, with a tax credit that would help all emergency service volunteers in communities across the country.

As the House knows, emergency service volunteers, including volunteer firefighters, currently receive a \$1,000 tax deduction if they receive an honorarium from their municipality. It is conditional. Most rural volunteer fire departments do not pay an honorarium to their volunteers. The motion would provide a \$500 tax credit to all emergency service volunteers, including volunteer firefighters. This credit would end up being worth more than the \$1,000 deduction.

As background, in 1997 the member for Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey tabled a bill then known as Bill C-249, which provided for an increase from \$500 to \$1,000 in the tax deduction for volunteer firefighters.

• (1850)

However, as I mentioned a moment ago, that only applied to firefighters who received honorariums from their fire departments. Most rural volunteer fire departments simply cannot afford to pay that kind of honorarium.

The 1998 budget adopted the recommendations of Bill C-249. Indeed it extends the provisions of that bill to volunteer ambulance technicians and other emergency service volunteers. My predecessor in this place from Kings—Hants, Mr. Scott Brison, originally introduced this motion as a result of representations made to him in his constituency and in conversations he had with people involved in emergency and volunteer services across the country. He appeared before the subcommittee on private members' business in June 2000 and was successful in persuading the committee to deem this motion a votable motion.

[Translation]

In Quebec as in the rest of Canada, most municipalities have to rely on civic minded men and women to act as volunteer firefighters and protect the public in case of disaster.

Unfortunately, their work is not fully appreciated, so the purpose of my motion is to recognize at least in some little way their contribution to their municipalities.

They carry out their duties and protect their fellow citizens, at the peril of their own lives sometimes, as was the case in Warwick, in the riding of Richmond—Arthabaska, where four volunteer firefighters were killed a few years ago.

[English]

After years of government cutbacks and reductions, communities both large and small rely increasingly on the help and the dedication of volunteers who have had to step in and fill the void created when governments cut back. That is evident today across Canada, from Hantsport to downtown Calgary, with non-profit organizations struggling to make ends meet.

The Government of Canada greatly underestimates the role and importance that organizations such as food banks, support groups and volunteer fire departments play in our communities. They are an essential part of Canada's social fabric. When the Minister of Finance announced the tax credit for emergency service volunteers in 1998, he said:

As witnessed over the past year in floods and the ice storm, it is important to recognize the extraordinary service provided by the thousands of Canadians who register as volunteers in our communities, mostly rural, and who provide essential emergency services like firefighting and first aid.

My party and I are glad that the minister recognized something needed to be done and that he followed up on a private member's initiative from the House. However, it is time now to take the next step, to expand this to a tax credit that will be available to all emergency service volunteers in the country. Small communities across Canada that rely on their volunteer firefighters in times of emergency are being unfairly left out in the cold by the current government. The Income Tax Act should be amended to provide a tax credit to all emergency service volunteers, regardless of whether the municipality can provide them with an honorarium.

The current policy discriminates against rural firefighters, for example, who rarely receive any compensation from their municipality. I should say, and members with any association with rural communities would know this to be the case, that in many cases and to an increasing degree, volunteer fire departments in rural areas are now carrying out functions that go well beyond dealing with fires. The heavy burden of cutbacks in medical services and

Private Members' Business

other emergency services means that more and more of these people are spending more and more of their time dealing with issues other than fires.

In cases in my constituency I have spoken to people who spend 24 25, or 26 hours a week as volunteers. This is in addition to their regular jobs. Yet they have no incentive, no compensation under our tax system, because they reside in municipalities that are too small to be able to pay them an honorarium.

When they are fighting fires, volunteer firefighters risk their lives to help their fellow citizens and protect their communities. It is not fair when some are rewarded for this while others are not. Volunteer firefighters are essential to rural communities. They risk their lives day in, day out.

• (1855)

Let me quote an advertisement from the Thornhill Volunteer Fire Department in British Columbia. It is a help wanted advertisement and says:

Help wanted! Volunteers over 18 for year round outdoor work. Job training required at no pay. Must be in good condition. Must be able to withstand wide range of temperature extremes, and work under any weather conditions. Must be able to lift their own weight, and move at the speed of life. And do it all over again, perhaps the same day. Must provide own transportation. Uniforms and basic equipment will be supplied. Remuneration includes respect, smiles and "thank yous" (Occasionally).

This advertisement sums up exactly what is expected of volunteer firefighters. Clearly it indicates how rural communities rely on them.

I do not think any member of the House or anyone in the government would want to deny this reality. They would want to be of help to the firefighters who are now excluded, unintentionally, I think, but nonetheless very dramatically in terms of their own well-being.

In Nova Scotia there are currently over 9,000 firefighters, most of whom did not receive a tax credit for their service. In my riding of Kings—Hants reaction to this motion has been excellent. For example, Matt Dunfield, a volunteer firefighter from the Windsor Volunteer Fire Department said in a letter,

—what has been proposed is a great idea as it covers all volunteer emergency service providers, regardless of how much they receive as compensation from the municipality they serve. With this proposal maybe more community members will step forward and offer their services to their communities well being.

Graham Murphy, who has been a volunteer firefighter in Windsor, Nova Scotia, for over 25 years and whose father and grandfather were both fire chiefs in Wolfville also said in a letter:

This bill if passed will be of great benefit to volunteer firefighters serving our smaller communities as they often receive no compensation for the sacrifices they make. The current law does little for those truly unrewarded volunteers. This bill is a small price to pay for a priceless service.

In closing, volunteer firefighters from coast to coast risk their lives to help their fellow citizens and protect their communities. All of them should be recognized for their dedication by being provided with a \$500 tax credit. I hope and urge the government and members of all parties in the House to support this motion.

Mr. Roy Cullen (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the motion before us today proposes that the Income Tax Act be amended to provide all emergency service volunteers with a tax credit in the amount of \$500 per year.

I thank the member for Kings—Hants for highlighting the very valuable role played by emergency services volunteers in Canadian communities. As I am certain we are all aware, many Canadians provide emergency services such as firefighting and first aid on a volunteer basis, especially in small and rural communities. These volunteers give freely of their time and expertise to their communities, often at considerable risk to themselves. They are to be commended for their dedication and effort.

[Translation]

The government has long recognized that small communities are often unable to maintain full-time emergency personnel, and depend on the essential services provided by these devoted volunteers.

In order to encourage the commitment of these individuals, the Income Tax Act has, for many years, allowed an exemption on the nominal amounts received from a municipality or another public authority by volunteer firefighters in the course of their duties.

[English]

This provision recognizes these volunteers often receive small amounts to help defray the expenses they incur in carrying out their duties and that taxing these amounts would be inappropriate. To offer additional support the 1998 budget increased this annual exemption from \$500 to \$1,000 and extended it to other emergency service volunteers, including volunteer ambulance technicians, search and rescue volunteers and others who in their capacity as volunteers are called upon to assist in emergencies or disasters.

• (1900)

The motion we are discussing today proposes to go beyond this existing provision. I would note that historically tax assistance for volunteers has been restricted to amounts received by eligible volunteers from public authorities. This motion in contrast would extend a tax credit to all emergency service volunteers whether or not they received any amount in the course of their volunteer duties. The intent behind this proposal is admirable in that it seeks to provide tax recognition to those emergency service volunteers who do not receive any allowance or honorarium.

Private Members' Business

[Translation]

But I think that passing such a tax credit would raise important questions in the context of tax policy and administration. I will, if I may, develop these points.

[English]

At the outset I would note that by implementing this proposal we would in effect be providing emergency volunteers with a fixed tax credit without regard to expenses incurred or time spent. Under such a system the dedicated year round volunteer would be receiving the same tax assistance as an individual who is called upon only once or twice during the course of the year. This would be difficult to justify especially as a dedicated volunteer is likely to incur much larger expenses than a one time volunteer.

Moreover it would be very difficult to explain why such a generous provision was limited to emergency service volunteers only. Other volunteers such as hospital workers and coaches for sports teams who contribute to their communities in different ways would be very likely to ask why this credit was not extended to them given that it appears to reward volunteer activity in itself and is unrelated either to effort or expense. I am not sure that I would be able to offer a convincing answer to this question.

While extending the credit to all volunteers would resolve this issue, it would also be extremely costly for the government. It would be important to keep in mind that volunteer service is performed at an individual's discretion and without expectation of personal financial benefit. To provide a general tax credit for volunteers would be to ignore this very crucial point.

[Translation]

Furthermore, even if this tax credit were limited strictly to emergency service volunteers, it would be very difficult to ensure that it was claimed only by actual volunteers. This is because tax assistance would no longer be limited to the amounts paid by the municipality for which the taxpayer does the volunteer work.

[English]

As a result, there would be fewer incentives for public authorities to ensure that the credit was being claimed only by actual volunteers. To prevent abuse a compliance mechanism would have to be developed possibly involving a separate form or annual certification. This would place a significant administrative burden on municipalities, volunteers and the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency, especially considering the large volume of claims that would likely be made.

The current treatment avoids this problem to a large extent because tax assistance is restricted to amounts actually paid up to \$1,000. Clearly, municipalities have much better control over these amounts and who receives them.

[Translation]

In this context, the present \$1,000 exemption for emergency service volunteers is the most balanced solution, because it provides tax assistance to these important volunteers in a straightforward and transparent manner.

[English]

In closing, I would like to thank again the member for Kings—Hants for bringing this issue to our attention. However I feel that the motion as it stands before us today would reduce equity in the tax system rather than enhance it and would be very complex for volunteers and municipalities to comply with. For these reasons I feel that the motion should not be supported by the House.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Well, Mr. Speaker, there we go. A member of the government is telling volunteer firefighters throughout the country from coast to coast to coast to go away and not bother the government with their very minor concern. For him to compare soccer and gymnastics volunteers to volunteer firefighters and first aid volunteers is the typical Liberal approach to government, to divide and conquer. We cannot pass this very worthwhile motion brought forward by the hon. member for Kings—Hants because the Liberals do not want to. They do not want to even seriously debate the issue.

• (1905)

What the member from the Liberal Party just mentioned is absolute nonsense. If the Liberals had any political will or political backbone left they would look at this issue very seriously. Next time there is a fire in a rural area, they should go out with the volunteer firefighters at two o'clock in the morning and see if the hon. member is there to help volunteers save lives and risking his life in order to protect property and people.

There are 28 volunteer fire departments in the beautiful riding of Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore. They wholeheartedly support this motion. The only change they would add is that instead of \$500 they would like to see it increased to \$1,000. I firmly believe that every first aid volunteer and volunteer firefighter in the country should receive an automatic \$1,000 tax deduction.

There is a very fine gentleman, a great constituent in my riding, Mr. Peter Sheen, who has volunteered for a long time with the Beaverbank, Kinsac volunteer fire department. He brought to my attention that he has to pay unemployment insurance and CPP premiums on his honorarium. This is a person who at any moment, in the middle of the night or at the crack of dawn, will get up to go fight a fire.

Picture the life of volunteer firefighters in rural Nova Scotia, although the situation can be painted right across the country, in Inuvik, Victoria or St. John's, Newfoundland. They work all day,

Private Members' Business

go home and look after their kids, go to sleep and at 1 a.m. the phone rings. They go fight a very dangerous fire somewhere. They never know if it could be a neighbour, a personal friend or a relative. They fight that fire until eight o'clock the next morning.

All this time the volunteers are thinking about how they have to get to their regular day job. The people risked their lives, not only for their community but for their country, because that is really what volunteer firefighters and first aiders do. They not only represent their constituency, they represent their country. Those people also have a full time obligation in their other jobs. If they cannot meet that obligation, chances are they may be dismissed by their employer. This is a risk that volunteer firefighters have every single time.

It is not an easy job being a volunteer firefighter. They get training when it is available. In rural areas where there is not much access to funds it is difficult to get the proper training. In some areas volunteer firefighters drive great distances to the fire hall on Tuesday nights which is when most of the training and meetings are.

All that gas and everything else which volunteer firefighters pay for out of their pockets costs money. All they are asking for is a slight little recognition in the Income Tax Act that would give them a \$500 tax deduction. I personally would like to see it at \$1,000.

There is no question that big businesses can deduct the costs for their boxes at the Skydome and their car expenses. They can deduct everything but a volunteer cannot deduct anything. That is sad and absolutely scandalous. It is typical of the Liberals who govern from the centre of the country and ignore its extremities. It is okay to live in a big urban area where there are paid firefighters but the Liberals have to get their heads out of the city and back into the rural country where I live, and where a lot of Canadians live from coast to coast to coast. The government should understand that what the hon. member for Kings—Hants is doing is an honourable gesture to these brave men and women throughout our country.

I am not going to take up too much time but I find it absolutely irresponsible of the government, or anyone else for that matter, to turn this motion away. As the hon. member for Kings—Hants has said, he is hoping for support from all people.

The government must remember, if it was not for volunteer firefighters, who would protect homes in a rural riding at two or three o'clock in the morning? Who is going to protect the children? Who is going to protect the property? The government should think about that the next time.

• (1910)

Who was first on the scene of the Swissair disaster in Nova Scotia? Volunteers, fishermen, search and rescue volunteers,

volunteers who gave up a lot of time. Many of them went on vacation early in order to help out. It cost them a tremendous amount of money but they did not ask for restitution. They did not even ask for applause. All they asked was that the government recognize their efforts and at least thank them. That is all they asked for.

This small motion could be passed immediately by the government. The government could pick it up and run with it. It could put it in its election platform. It would go a long way in saying thank you to the brave men and women of Canada.

I have appreciated the opportunity to speak on behalf of the over 8,000 volunteers in Nova Scotia alone. My party and I support the motion of the hon. member for Kings—Hants. I can only hope that the members in the Liberal government over there have been listening to every word I said, which of course they have not, and that they understand what we are trying to do.

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to participate in the debate on this simple but very important private member's motion. It will have an enormous impact on recognizing the contributions that take place on a pan-Canadian basis, from coast to coast to coast in every rural community.

I would like to preface my comments with the remarks of the finance minister who stated in 1998:

As witnessed over the past year in floods and the ice storm, it is important to recognize the extraordinary service provided by the thousands of Canadians who register as volunteers in our communities, mostly rural, and who provide essential emergency services like firefighting and first aid.

To be clear, the Progressive Conservative Party applauds the initiative taken by the finance minister at that time. But the current situation is that emergency service volunteers, including volunteer firefighters and emergency volunteer ambulance drivers as well, receive a \$1,000 tax deduction if they receive an honorarium from the municipality. This is punitive to those smaller municipalities that do not have the financial capacity to provide an honorarium in the first place. That is the issue at hand.

The approach taken by the Liberal government during the debate this evening has been nothing less than shameful. It is shameful in the regard that it equates different volunteers, as opposed to emergency volunteers and volunteer firefighters.

The comment was made that we would not want to give a credit to someone who responds only once or twice a year. The volunteer firefighters in my riding of Fundy—Royal, whether they be those in the community of Upham, the volunteer firefighters who participate with the professional firefighters in Rothesay, the volunteers in Hampton, New Brunswick, the volunteers in Cam-

bridge Narrows, all of them volunteer time and time again. They put themselves at risk. They are skilled professionals as well.

This is the minimum that the House should be doing. I applaud the member from the New Democratic Party who spoke from his heart saying that this was the right thing to do. Quite often when it comes to financial initiatives the NDP does not quite get it right. He wanted to actually raise it to a \$1,000 tax deduction for everyone. The Progressive Conservative Party is advocating is a \$500 tax credit for all emergency service volunteers, including volunteer firefighters. This credit is worth more than the \$1,000 deduction.

I am advocating that we recognize the immense contribution made by volunteer firefighters and ambulance drivers throughout the country. It is the minimum we owe the brave foot soldiers in our communities.

• (1915)

I also want to mention that volunteer firefighters go beyond just responding to fires. They volunteer for activities that fire departments get involved in, such as fundraising initiatives and being on hand for large public events, parades and community affairs. Having first aid training is also immensely important.

I applaud the previous efforts of Scott Brison, the former member for Kings—Hants, who will also be the future member for Kings—Hants. I also applaud the current right hon. member for Kings—Hants for bringing this forth on behalf of his constituents. It has been a pleasure to participate in today's debate.

Mr. Joe Comuzzi (Thunder Bay—Superior North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to give a very warm welcome back to my colleague, the right hon. member for Kings—Hants. We have had different debates in the House over the years and although we sit at different sides of the table at this particular time, as he well knows in politics things change rather rapidly. I was pleased to hear his remarks. I see that during his hiatus from the House he did not lose his sound logic and great eloquence in addressing important issues, not only to the House but to the country.

The issue before us is one that is very dear to my heart, which is why I felt compelled to get up and speak about it inasmuch as volunteer firefighters, men and women right across the country, especially those from a remote or rural community, are the lifeblood of the community.

I represent an area in Thunder Bay that is looked upon as the second or third largest riding in Ontario. Some of the places in my riding are Hurkett, Dorion, Pass Lake, McKenzie, Nipigon, Red Rock, Marathon, Terrace Bay, Schreiber, Nakina, Geraldton, Beardmore and Jellicoe. The one common denominator in all those places is that they all have a volunteer fire department. These

Private Members' Business

volunteers put in untold hours for the safety and protection of their fellow citizens. I say, without fear of contradiction, that whenever I am asked to do anything on their behalf or attend any function, I do everything I can because those members are so valuable to each and every community in the country.

I also heard the Parliamentary Secretary for the Minister of Finance respond to my friend's question about allowing a tax deduction for these workers. I hope the member understands that the only thing I can express to the Parliamentary Secretary for the Minister of Finance is the very important job that volunteer firefighters perform. I will also try to stress the amount of time given on a voluntary basis, the amount of training they go through and the amount of personal sacrifice that every volunteer firefighter gives to his community.

Hopefully we will be able to reconcile some of the little differences that we have in order to come to some arrangement so that these very important people will be honoured perhaps a little more than they are today.

Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak to the motion presented by the right hon. member for Kings—Hants. The motion reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Income Tax Act should be amended to provide a tax credit of \$500 to all emergency service volunteers.

It was not too long ago, in my riding of Markham, that we had volunteer firefighters, and I appreciated the services they provided for Markham. If we had to at that point in time bring them on, even as part time workers, it would have created considerable hardship on the municipality and would have driven taxes up. Like myself, the hon. parliamentary secretary who spoke and other members who live in urban ridings, we recognize that this is not a problem for most ridings because they have full time firefighters and it is incorporated into their tax base. However, in small and more rural type ridings if they had to pay for this type of service they could not afford it.

• (1920)

What we are talking about here is a \$500 tax credit. If a small urban riding had to pay for a full time firefighter we would be talking about 60 to 100 times more in cost to the municipality. These people give of their service willingly and do a tremendous job. They volunteer not only as firefighters but in many other ways for their municipalities. When they are putting their lives at risk right beside full time firefighters, then it is important that we honour their services.

From that standpoint, I will recommend to my party that we support the motion put forward by the hon. member for Kings—Hants. I think it is a great motion.

Private Members' Business

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today we are discussing a motion that proposes to provide all emergency service volunteers with a new tax credit in the amount of \$500 a year.

I want to preface my comments by saying that when it comes to public safety officers, I myself have had a number of initiatives with regard to police officers, firefighters and other public service safety officers whom I believe serve Canada very well.

The Income Tax Act already provides an exemption for emergency service volunteers in respect of honorariums or other amounts they may receive from a municipality or other public authority in the course of their volunteer duty. Prior to 1998 this exemption was restricted to volunteer firefighters and could not exceed \$500 per year.

However, to help recognize the invaluable contributions of the brave men and women who give so freely of their time and expertise in their communities, often at significant personal risk, the government doubled the maximum exemption to \$1,000 in the 1998 budget. At the same time, the exemption was extended to other emergency service volunteers such as ambulance technicians who also provide invaluable services to their communities.

The right hon. member for Kings—Hants, in bringing this motion before us, has rightly pointed out that the benefits of the \$1,000 tax free amount are currently limited to those volunteers who receive an honorarium or other nominal amounts. There is currently no tax relief for those volunteers who do not receive any compensation. We acknowledge that point.

However, the motion before us seeks to address this perceived inequity by extending a tax credit to all emergency service volunteers. I am not sure exactly how that is defined but I believe that since this is a motion it is for consideration.

At first blush there is merit in the idea that all emergency service volunteers should be treated the same. I appreciate the position expressed in the motion that those volunteers who do not receive any compensation for their time and expenses should also receive some tax recognition.

However, it is important to keep in mind that the tax assistance for volunteers has in the past been restricted to amounts actually received by eligible volunteers from public authorities. This has been a longstanding policy extending back nearly 40 years and I believe there are strong arguments for maintaining that.

To begin with, the current policy recognizes that emergency service volunteers often receive small amounts to help defray the expenses that they incur in carrying out their duties. Clearly, where a public authority chooses to offer this nominal compensation to its

dedicated volunteers, it would be very difficult to justify taxing these amounts as income. The \$1,000 maximum helps to ensure that only reasonable amounts can be paid out on a tax free basis.

However, it is a very different matter when it comes to a general credit or deduction for individuals engaged in a particular volunteer activity. This principle applies to any tax exemption or deduction where it is an across-the-board item. It is a very expensive proposition. Such a provision would have the effect of favouring a particular group of volunteers or others whether or not they actually incur any extraordinary expenses or even participate in any emergency situations. That kind of thing would have to be resolved to keep within the spirit of the motion.

• (1925)

From that policy standpoint, I am not sure whether this situation would be appropriate. I think everyone here today will agree that all volunteers are to be commended and that their various contributions are equally important. In this context, it would be very difficult to justify providing a general fixed tax credit to one group of volunteers and not to others. We could expect there would be many volunteer groups who would ask why their contributions were not similarly recognized and they would be justified in doing so, I believe.

One solution to this quandary that some have suggested would be to extend the proposed tax credit to all volunteers. Of course all volunteers would then be treated equally, and I think the member is trying to establish a measure of equity. However, I strongly suspect that such a provision would be impossible to sustain. Not only would it be very expensive for the government in terms of forgone revenues, it would also be subject to considerable abuse because it would be impossible to ensure that only bona fide volunteers claim the credit. This would be because tax assistance would no longer be restricted to amounts paid by the municipality for which the taxpayer is doing volunteer work, and would leave it up to each individual to determine whether they qualify. That is problematic.

Of course individuals could be required to prove in some fashion that they were in fact volunteers. However, I suspect that such an approach would place a significant compliance burden on non-profit organizations and volunteers alike and would be very costly for the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency to enforce. This would especially be true considering the large volumes of claims that likely would be made.

I would note that the current treatment largely avoids this problem because tax assistance is restricted to amounts actually paid by the municipalities. I think the member would concede that the enforcement is better in terms of the current mechanism than what is being proposed by the motion.

Private Members' Business

Even if these problems could be overcome, I am concerned about the message that we as a government would be sending by implementing such a provision. We should remember that a volunteer is an individual who performs a particular service without expectation of personal financial gain. In contrast, introducing a tax credit for volunteer activities would need to provide a monetary benefit to individuals for becoming volunteers. This would be an odd result indeed and one that we would find very difficult to accept.

We should remember that we are talking about a principle, and the motion before this place is to consider the advisability. This is not a bill. It is to put ideas on the floor to identify areas which have to be explored further. I think the reason all hon. members come to this place during private members' business is to certainly express their views and to raise points for consideration, which is all I am attempting to do. I am sorry I have upset the member but I want to put my position on the floor.

I feel that the motion before us would do little to improve equity within the income tax system while significantly increasing the complexity and cost of compliance in administration. If implemented, the tax provision advocated by the motion proposed by the right hon. member would also put governments in an untenable position of compensating taxpayers for their personal choice to become volunteers. This, in my view, would steer us away from the notion of what volunteer activities are all about and it would not be appropriate.

For those reasons, I do not believe that the motion as it stands should be supported. I urge colleagues to rise in this place in the time remaining and put forward their points of view. That is exactly what private members' hour is all about.

I thank the right hon. member for raising the motion. When it comes to our public service safety officers, dealing with them and others who provide same or similar services should always have the attention of members of parliament.

• (1930)

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, we just heard not what were the comments of a private member but perhaps the official government position on the motion. If there was ever a bureaucratic analysis of a motion we just heard it with every typical government response and every reason in the world why something cannot be done. Instead of finding a way to make sure it can be done, let us find every angle there is to keep a benefit away from people who serve us all and get absolutely nothing.

I would be remiss if I did not speak on this motion because I come from a district that covers large rural sections. Each rural area

has a fire brigade. Years ago they had many more fire brigades. When I served in the local fire brigade in my home town each community had a fire brigade. Each community managed to come up with a small fire truck. Each community had a fire pump and enough hose to get to most houses around. Living near the ocean, we always had a supply of water.

However over the last few years, mainly because of government cutbacks in funding to municipalities, federal government cutbacks in infrastructure funding to provinces and provincial cutbacks in funding to municipalities, local fire brigades have found themselves trying to survive on their own merits.

They have done that in two ways. One way is to amalgamate. What that means is the people who volunteer now have to serve areas much larger than their own home region. They cover areas many miles from the base of their current fire station or the fire truck which they might have. These people are on call all hours of the day or night. Many of us are looking at our watches and saying "It has been a long day". Many of those people are also going home after long day not knowing what hour tonight or tomorrow morning they will be called to go fight a fire.

What do they get paid? The right hon. member who introduced the motion quoted an excerpt from an advertisement in a British Columbia paper which said they get smiles and occasional thanks. That is about what the volunteer firefighter gets.

In the area that I mentioned, the summer is not so bad. In winter, when we have to plough through snowbanks and shovel lanes to get to fires, these people do double duty. Nobody recognizes the amount of effort volunteer firefighters make except the firefighters themselves, their families and the people who they assist.

In many rural areas we hear stories of lives saved, premises saved and losses diminished simply because of the quick and efficient work of fire brigades. These people ask for nothing. They volunteer their time, efforts and energy for for all of us so that we can go to bed knowing that if anything happens somebody will come to our rescue. What do we say to them? We smile and say thanks.

As members of this honourable House can do a little more. We can approve the motion. We can pass the motion introduced in the House to at least show them that we recognize the work they do. The \$500 tax credit that we are suggesting is very little. In relation to their time and effort it means absolutely nothing in the monetary sense. However, there is a sense of principle, a sense of recognition and is of some assistance to these people. Many of these people who live in rural areas, and that is where we have our volunteer fire brigades, live in areas where there is very little employment which means that their incomes are exceptionally small. As small as this little gesture might seem, to them it is beneficial.

Private Members' Business

• (1935)

To hear people talk about how we can connive to prevent the passage of a motion that would deliver this small token of appreciation to people who give their time and effort for our safety and the safety of our families is an insult to the House. Hopefully by the time we vote on the motion the hon. members opposite will see the light. They can listen to one of their colleagues who stood up and volunteered to educate the financiers in the government and to explain to them the reality between dealing with numbers and dealing with people.

We are not talking about saving a few dollars. We are talking about people who save lives. There is quite a difference. In the larger areas of the country we have our fire departments staffed by great firefighters but for them it is a job. It is a trying job, it is a job that not many people would want to have but at least they get paid for it.

The volunteer firefighter in reality does the very same work under adverse and trying circumstances. What does he get? He or she might get our thanks or a smile and sometimes perhaps not even that. We have a chance to do something for them. We have a chance to at least acknowledge the work that they do.

I feel proud to stand as a former volunteer firefighter who has many friends who are volunteer firefighters. I saw their work when they saved the house of a family member of mine. I saw lives saved because of their efforts. I saw volunteer firefighters push their way through snowstorms, through hailstorms and through all kinds of adverse situations in order to be where they were needed. Perhaps now it is time for us to stand up when we are needed and be there for them.

With that, I congratulate the right hon. member for introducing the motion on behalf of one of our colleagues who previously proposed the motion and who will be here again to do a repeat after the next election. I ask hon. members on the other side of the House to reconsider their stance, to listen to their colleagues who have agreed to educate them, to listen to the members of the NDP who have supported this motion and to vote accordingly when the time comes.

Mr. Bill Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on the motion brought forward by the right hon. member for Kings—Hants which proposes to introduce a tax credit for individuals engaged as emergency service volunteers in the amount of \$500 a year.

I have attentively listened to the debate. I listened particularly to what the right hon. member for Kings—Hants, the hon. member for Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore and the member from Thunder Bay had to say about the value of the contribution made by firefighters in our communities.

As one of the members pointed out, those of us who live in urban communities do not have the same problems as those who live in rural communities. Speaking as someone from an urban community, the House might forgive me however if I speak to this issue as a taxpayer and as someone who has to look at the fairness and equity of the system of taxes which govern all of us. Taxes are not designed to apply to individual specific cases as much as they are designed, as the hon. member knows perhaps better than most, to the country as a whole. We must make sure that the system is equitable for all if it is going to be respected and accepted by all.

• (1940)

The idea that the tax system should in some way promote volunteer activities or other activities of a selfless nature is hardly a new one in our tax system. In fact the government understands the importance of supporting individuals who have contributed to their communities and has taken steps to help through the tax system.

[*Translation*]

As we know, the Income Tax Act, as the parliamentary secretary pointed out, already provides for volunteer firefighters to earn an annual amount tax free. That provision was substantially strengthened in the 1998 budget, when the amount was increased from \$500 to \$1,000 a year, and the provision was extended to other emergency service volunteers, whose contributions are no less important.

The government has also improved other tax provisions, such as tax credits for charitable donations, in order to facilitate things for individual taxpayers who want to make donations to their communities. For example, charitable donations of up to 75% of a taxpayer's annual net income now qualify for a credit for charitable donations, compared with 20% in 1995. The ceiling does not apply to certain donations or certain cultural property, or to donations of ecologically sensitive lands made after 1994. Our government has already seen how important the issue was and has improved the tax system to deal with it accordingly.

[*English*]

In addition, the government's 1997 budget moved to ensure that individuals who donate certain marketable securities need only include one-half of the usual proportion of the resulting capital gains in their income. Following the reduction in the general capital gains inclusion rate from three-quarters to two-thirds in the 2000 budget, this inclusion rate now stands at only one-third.

Why do I refer to these? These are important initiatives which relate to this debate. They demonstrate the government's commitment to supporting volunteers, generous givers and non-profit organizations.

Private Members' Business

The motion before us proposes to go beyond these existing measures by extending a tax credit to all emergency service volunteers. This would presume to include those volunteers benefiting from the existing tax-free amount, as well as those emergency service volunteers who currently receive no amounts whatsoever.

While the proposal I described would certainly provide greater assistance to emergency service volunteers than is currently the case, it raises a very thorny issue, not the least of which is the cost to the public accounts referred to by the parliamentary secretary and by my colleague who spoke before me in the House.

Therefore it falls upon us as responsible members of the House, as has been pointed out, to consider that dimension. We cannot just rush in and say, as one of the members reasonably said, "Yes, we must find a solution to this issue". Yes, we must find a solution but we must find a solution that is balanced within the tax framework that applies to all citizens and all members of the country. That is what we are called upon to do in the House, not adopt ad hoc solutions to questions which are going to bring inequity and problems to the tax administration and the way it is going to apply that.

That is why I would contrast the proposition with the other charitable donation situation because this proposal goes significantly beyond the scope of the current tax proposition. It contemplates providing a tax credit to all individuals engaged in a particular volunteer activity without regard to time spent or expenses actually incurred.

The charitable donations credit, which provides tax assistance in proportion to the amount donated by taxpayers, is a totally different matter. Similarly the tax-free amount for emergency service volunteers is restricted to these amounts received by eligible volunteers from a public authority, typically to compensate them for the expenses they incur in fulfilling their duties.

It is also interesting to note that the proposed tax credit would apply in equal measure to an individual who volunteered all year round and an individual who volunteered perhaps just once or twice during the year.

• (1945)

While this would be difficult to justify, it would be even more difficult to explain why the tax system should provide assistance to an individual who provided volunteer emergency services on a single occasion and not to a dedicated year round volunteer who performed other services.

I would go back to my urban roots, if I may say, for the example of reading to sick children in hospital, helping the blind, or

providing other services which many people in other communities do on a regular basis without a necessity to be compensated but with a sense of the community devotion which we heard properly extolling the firefighters who are the subject matter of this motion. The unfortunate distinction that I referred to could well result if the motion were carried by the House.

I know the parliamentary secretary is extremely sensitive to matters of achieving balance in the tax act. I am sure he is as concerned as I am about favouring a particular group of volunteers over another, whether or not they incur actual expenses, extraordinary expenses, or even participate in specific emergency situations. Surely it would be difficult to justify providing a tax credit to one group of volunteers, while denying tax assistance to all other volunteers.

Right Hon. Joe Clark: This is a shameful ignorance of rural Canada.

Mr. Bill Graham: I do not know why the right hon. member says this is shameful. It is perhaps shameful to the right hon. member that we would want equity between all volunteers, but I do not find it shameful. I find it to be just common logic.

We can certainly expect that many volunteer groups would reasonably ask why their contributions were not equally worthy of recognition. No doubt the right hon. member would rush into the House with a motion for them as well. Eventually we would add one system on top of another system instead of having what I think the parliamentary secretary was addressing in his remarks, integrity in the tax system.

I cannot believe that I am accused of being shameful when I speak to members of the House about having a tax system which is equitable, which avoids complexity, and which enables us all to have an application that would fairly apply to all volunteers across the country. What is shameful about that?

What is shameful, I would suggest, is proposing a motion that plays to a certain audience for a certain electoral advantage at a certain moment in time without looking at the integrity of the tax system as a whole.

The government has demonstrated it is willing, able and actively pursues the need for all volunteers to be recognized. It has not ignored rural Canada. It has done its best for firefighters as has already been pointed out by many speakers in the House.

I end my remarks by echoing the words of the parliamentary secretary to which I subscribe entirely. Let us have a tax system that is fair, equitable and as least complex as possible. This would aid not only all volunteers. It would aid the volunteers which the right hon. member is seeking to help and we could all work on having such a tax system.

*Adjournment Debate**[Translation]*

The Deputy Speaker: The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired and the item is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the order paper.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to address a very important issue I raised last week.

My question dealt with the infrastructure of our colleges and universities, and providing our students with the necessary infrastructure to allow them to receive the best education possible in this great country of ours.

- (1950)

I was disappointed by the minister's answer to my question. Canadians across the country believe post-secondary education must be a priority. It is certainly a priority for the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada.

I am disappointed when I read the minister's answer; I am disappointed not only as a Canadian, but also on behalf of those who go to university every year. I am disappointed for professors in colleges and universities, and also for all those who try to give our young people the best education possible.

The minister said:

This is where most citizens' priorities lie—

This government's priorities are roads and sewers. Honestly, should our young people not have precedence over that? Students are the backbone of a strong society. An educated society is a healthy society. When I heard the minister's comments last week, I could not believe my ears.

[English]

I asked the minister about it and we heard about infrastructure programs for municipalities for roads and water. I wholeheartedly agree but I think our education system, our universities and colleges throughout Canada are also in need of infrastructure money. I was very disappointed to see that the minister and the government did not have the same priorities as many Canadians and families.

Does the House know how much money the U.S. government invests per student for post-secondary education? It is more than \$500 per student, and here in Canada it is \$144. I call on the government to review this policy and take a look at infrastructure for post-secondary education.

[Translation]

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to explain the government's initiatives in the area of post-secondary education.

As far as academic research is concerned, we have increased the university research councils' budgets to the highest levels ever.

[English]

Also we have created the Canada Foundation for Innovation by investing \$1.9 billion to help meet the demand for research infrastructure. We have created the Canadian Institutes for Health Research with an annual budget this year totalling \$402 million. We have made the networks of centres of excellence a permanent program, and the Canada research chairs program will establish and maintain 2,000 chairs with investment of \$900 million.

When it concerns students individually and their education, as a government we have invested \$2.5 billion in the Canadian millennium scholarships program, which the Prime Minister was proud to announce on our behalf. We have invested a further \$2.5 billion in the Canada health and social transfer, direct payments made to provincial governments for them to reinvest in the areas of post-secondary education and health. Further, we have provided new Canada study grants of up to \$3,000 for over 25,000 students and that is over and above the present \$45 million in grants that are available.

- (1955)

On the tax side, we have lessened the tax burden on students through a number of measures including a federal tax credit of 17% on payments of the interest portion of federal and provincial student loans. We have increased the amount of scholarship and fellowship income that is exempt from \$500 to \$3,000. For the first time, part time students with dependents can now deduct child care expenses from their income tax.

The government is acting. I appreciate the opportunity—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques.

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on September 25, I

asked the Minister of Human Resources Development to take concrete measures to ensure decent conditions for seasonal workers as far as employment insurance benefits are concerned. The minister answered:

—we believe that the best employment insurance program is a job.

It is obvious that having a job is the best way to earn an income, but it is not an employment insurance program. Employment insurance should provide an income to people who are not working, who are between jobs. Since that time, the minister's position has evolved a little. The intensity rule has disappeared, but the seasonal workers' situation is far from being permanently settled.

Should people, wherever they live in Canada, not have the same status when they are seasonal workers, that is, having to work 420 hours to qualify for employment insurance and receiving 35 weeks of benefits, to ensure they will not be affected by the changes in unemployment rates in the areas where they live? Would this not be a way to recognize the work of these people and to get rid, once and for all, of the bad principle that led to the reform, which is that seasonal workers were not working because they were lazy or did not want to work?

This is somewhat what the Prime Minister stated last week. The government had a big deficit of \$42 billion and had to find a way to cover it. The way it found was to attack the poorest, the most disadvantaged. It will attack students, it will ensure that people cannot qualify and pay premiums, or if they qualify, it will greatly reduce their benefits.

Today, we saw during the debate that the minister herself was unable to defend her bill. Could the government not take advantage of the fact that we are in the middle of debate on Bill C-44 to propose a series of amendments that would allow for a real reform of the employment insurance system, and not a few measures that will cost no more than \$500 million in total, while there will be a surplus of \$32 billion in the employment insurance fund as of December 31, 2000? This represents one sixty-fourth of the surplus.

I think the Liberal government has to make an extra effort if it is talking about compassion and if it wants to call an election soon. I challenge the government to go to the people and to say that they did all they could to reinvigorate the EI system.

Moreover, last week at the press conference, three times the minister refused to answer this question: "Will your proposed changes solve all problems?" She was unable to answer the question because these are changes that have been requested for a long time but are far from sufficient.

Can we expect the government to act so as to resolve this matter before the next election? Otherwise, the government will find us on the fora, showing once again to the people that we were right about

Adjournment Debate

the measures which have been corrected by the government as well as about those which have not yet been corrected.

Can the government give us a dynamic answer that will restore its true role to the EI system, which is to ensure a decent living to the unemployed who meet acceptable conditions in the economic situation we live in?

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques is very astute. However, I want to challenge some of the negative comments he made about the bill.

Our government cares about our seasonal workers and has taken specific measures to help them. For instance, on September 13, we announced measures to gradually phase in changes to the boundaries in the Lower St. Lawrence region of Quebec and in northwestern New Brunswick.

● (2000)

We just introduced Bill C-44, which includes many measures designed to benefit seasonal workers.

But I want to point out that long term solutions to the problems of seasonal workers call for improved work opportunities. I think the member opposite would agree with us on that. This in turn requires better co-operation between governments, businesses, community leaders and individuals.

That is why we are working at the local level and with the provincial and territorial governments to develop long term solutions that would improve access to training for seasonal workers, promote greater economic diversity in regions relying on seasonal work—and that is very important for these areas—and develop the capacity of our communities, so that they can decide on their own what changes are best for them. There is nothing like helping communities to help themselves.

Those are real solutions to help seasonal workers. Employment insurance is just one of them.

[*English*]

HEALTH

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, let me just begin by saying something that may seem self-evident but needs to be reiterated in these times of political turbulence and countervailing forces.

The truth is that Canadians believe in medicare. They want deeply to maintain a universal public health care system in Canada today. They know there are difficulties. They experience on an all

Adjournment Debate

too frequent basis in very real ways the lineups, the waiting lists and the uncertainties, but they also know that the system itself, the model of medicare, is fundamentally sound. This is something government needs to know.

The government needs to realize that Canadians fought very hard to get medicare and they will fight to keep it. They just want the government to fix it before it is too late, before the champions of privatization and deregulation, who really see health care as an \$82 billion golden egg, get any more hold over health care delivery than they already have now.

Let me also say that Canadians are fully aware the inaction and passivity of the government in the face of these formidable forces are as dangerous to the future of medicare as the outright support by Alliance members in the House for private, for profit care.

Canadians are rightfully asking what is the real difference between what Liberals are doing and what Alliance members are saying. Is there really a difference when it comes to such things as national standards ensuring that the Canada Health Act is enforced and is moving forward with a vision?

Canadians want a vision, a plan and leadership. On September 11 the government had an opportunity to demonstrate a vision and to present a plan that would take medicare into the future. In this context, given the enormity of the task at hand and the high stakes involved, I have to say, and I am sure history will acknowledge it, that the Liberal government blew it. It missed a golden opportunity to put back the money it had taken out of health care, even though it does not come into effect for another whole year and even though we will still only be at 1994 levels. They did make a start and that has to be acknowledged, but what they did not do was give Canadians a vision, a plan for the future.

There is no home care. There is no pharmacare. Contrary to everything the Prime Minister said in the House today, this was not an historic deal in terms of where we go in the future and how we ensure that medicare takes us into the millennium. The government has let Canadians down and owes it to the people to present a plan that will ensure we go forward absolutely confident that medicare will be there in the future and that quality health care will be accessible wherever Canadians live, no matter how much money they make and no matter what circumstances they find themselves in.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Charbonneau (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my

colleague for Winnipeg North Centre for the opportunity to emphasize just how firm the government's resolve is to assure Canadians that they will have access to the health care they need, when and where they need it.

• (2005)

[English]

On September 11 the first ministers gave their unanimous agreement to a landmark health action plan. This represents a comprehensive commitment to strengthen and renew Canada's publicly funded health system. With this action plan, all governments recognize that home and community care is a priority, particularly in light of the growing demands of an aging population and a shift toward more community based care.

[Translation]

The federal government is prepared to reinforce its contribution by working actively with the provinces and territories in order to meet future home care needs.

[English]

Another priority agreed to by first ministers is pharmaceutical management. Drug costs are the fastest growing component of provincial health care budgets. It is essential that more be done to ensure that Canadians continue to have equitable and affordable access to new, appropriate and cost effective drugs.

[Translation]

The Government of Canada also recognizes the need for additional resources in support of its priorities.

Over the next five years, the government will contribute an additional \$23 billion to help the provinces and territories implement this action plan. This is on top of the extra \$14 billion already made available to them in the past two years.

Canadians can rest assured that the federal government will be a strong and active partner in renewing and strengthening Canada's public health care system.

The Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 8.07 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, October 4, 2000

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

The Late Right Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau	
Mr. Kilger	8847
Taxation	
Mr. Elley	8847
Canada Olympic Team	
Mr. Cotler	8847
Economic Development	
Mr. Drouin	8848
Biennale de Montréal 2000	
Ms. Folco	8848
Prostate Cancer	
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	8848
World March of Women	
Mrs. Picard	8848
Ralph Shonk	
Ms. Torsney	8848
Franco-Ontarian Flag	
Mr. Bellemare	8849
Daniel Igali	
Mr. Cadman	8849
World March of Women	
Ms. Bakopanos	8849
Banking	
Ms. Wasylycia-Leis	8849
Organized Crime	
Mr. Bellehumeur	8850
Shipbuilding Industry	
Mrs. Wayne	8850
Social Programs	
Ms. Carroll	8850

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Human Resources Development	
Mr. Day	8850
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	8851
Mr. Day	8851
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	8851
Mr. Day	8851
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	8851
Miss Grey	8851
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	8851
Miss Grey	8851
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	8851
Budget Surpluses	
Mr. Duceppe	8851
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	8852
Mr. Duceppe	8852
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	8852

Mr. Loubier	8852
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	8852
Mr. Loubier	8852
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	8852
Health	
Ms. McDonough	8852
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	8852
Ms. McDonough	8852
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	8853
Auditor General's Report	
Mr. Clark	8853
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	8853
Health	
Mr. Clark	8853
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	8853
Human Resources Development	
Mrs. Ablonczy	8853
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	8853
Mrs. Ablonczy	8853
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	8853
Women's March	
Ms. St-Hilaire	8854
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	8854
Ms. St-Hilaire	8854
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	8854
Human Resources Development	
Mr. Solberg	8854
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	8854
Mr. Solberg	8854
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	8854
Shipping	
Mr. Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	8854
Mr. Manley	8855
Mr. Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	8855
Mr. Manley	8855
Human Resources Development	
Mr. Kenney	8855
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	8855
Mr. Kenney	8855
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	8855
Mr. Bigras	8855
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	8855
Middle East	
Mr. Fontana	8855
Mr. Axworthy	8856
Human Resources Development	
Mr. Williams	8856
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	8856
Mr. Williams	8856
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	8856
The Environment	
Mr. Gruending	8856
Mr. Anderson	8856

Mr. Gruending	8856
Mr. Anderson	8857
Employment Insurance	
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	8857
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	8857
Mr. Hearn	8857
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	8857
Children	
Mrs. Karetak—Lindell	8857
Ms. Blondin—Andrew	8857
Human Resources Development	
Mrs. Ablonczy	8857
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	8857
Mr. Bigras	8857
Mr. Bigras	8858
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	8858
Auto Industry	
Mr. Blaikie	8858
Mr. Pettigrew	8858
Health Care	
Mr. Doyle	8858
Mr. Charbonneau	8858
Prisons and Penitentiaries	
Ms. Sgro	8858
Mr. Myers	8858
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	8858
Business of the House	
Mr. Boudria	8859
Mr. MacKay	8859

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Lee	8859
Ways and Means	
Notice of motion	
Mr. Peterson	8859
Canada Health Care, Early Childhood Development and Other Social Services Funding Act	
Bill C-45. Introduction and first reading	8859
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	8859
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	8859
Canada Foundation for Sustainable Development Technology Act	
Bill C-46. Introduction and first reading	8859
Mr. Goodale	8859
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	8859
Food and Drugs Act	
Bill C-500. Introduction and first reading	8859
Mr. Caccia	8859
Mr. Riis	8859
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	8860

Committees of the House	
Official Languages	
Mr. Bélanger	8860
Petitions	
Marriage	
Mr. Reynolds	8860
Food Labelling	
Mr. Reynolds	8860
Taxation	
Mr. Reynolds	8860
Child Pornography	
Mr. Reynolds	8860
Iraq	
Ms. Beaumier	8860
Energy Prices	
Mr. Solomon	8860
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	
Mr. Solomon	8860
Missile Defence Program	
Mr. Lincoln	8861
Seal Hunt	
Ms. Davies	8861
Health Care	
Ms. Davies	8861
Nuclear Arms	
Ms. Davies	8861
World Trade Organization	
Ms. Davies	8861
Gasoline Additives	
Mrs. Ur	8861
Health Care	
Mr. Mancini	8861
Canada Post Corporation	
Mr. Drouin	8861
Health Care	
Mr. Earle	8861
Mr. Riis	8861
National Highways	
Mr. Riis	8862
Criminal Code	
Mr. Riis	8862
Pensions	
Mr. Gruending	8862
Health Care	
Mr. Gruending	8862
World Trade Organization	
Mr. Gruending	8862
Question passed as order for return	
Mr. Lee	8862
Motions for Papers	
Mr. Lee	8863
Transferred for Debate	8863

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Employment Insurance Act	
Bill C-44. Second reading	8863
Mr. Pettigrew	8863
Ms. Folco	8863
Business of the House	
Mr. Lee	8864
Motion	8864
(Motion agreed to)	8865

Employment Insurance Act

Bill C-44. Second Reading	8865
Mrs. Ablonczy	8865
Mr. Crête	8869
Mr. Canuel	8875
Mr. Crête	8875
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8875
Mr. Bernier	8877
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8877
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	8877
Mr. Keyes	8879
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	8879
Mr. Keyes	8879
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	8880
Mr. Morrison	8880
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	8880
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	8880

Privacy Commissioner

Motion	8881
Motion agreed to	8882

Marine Conservation Areas Act

Bill C-8. Report stage	8882
Mr. Kilger	8883
Mr. Reynolds	8883
Mr. Bergeron	8883
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8883
Mr. Doyle	8883
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	8883
Mr. Ramsay	8883
Mr. Hoepfner	8883
Motion No. 1 negatived	8884
Mr. Kilger	8884
Motions Nos. 4, 8, 10, 14, 21, 30, 38, 51, 16 and 49 negatived	8894
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8894
Mr. Kilger	8894
Mr. Reynolds	8894
Mr. Bergeron	8894
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8894
Mr. Doyle	8894
Mr. Ramsay	8894
Mr. Hoepfner	8894
Motion No. 5 negatived	8895
Mr. Kilger	8895
Motions Nos. 9, 11, 23, 24, 31, 32 and 52 negatived	8902
Mr. Kilger	8902
Mr. Reynolds	8902
Mr. Bergeron	8902
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8902
Mr. Doyle	8902
Mr. Ramsay	8902
Mr. Hoepfner	8902
Motion No. 6 agreed to	8903
Mr. Kilger	8903
Mr. Reynolds	8903
Mr. Bergeron	8903
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8903
Mr. Doyle	8903
Mr. Ramsay	8903
Mr. Hoepfner	8903
Motion No. 15 agreed to	8904
Mr. Kilger	8904

Mr. Reynolds	8905
Mr. Bergeron	8905
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8905
Mr. Doyle	8905
Mr. Ramsay	8905
Mr. Hoepfner	8905
Motion No. 22 negatived	8906
Mr. Kilger	8906
Mr. Reynolds	8906
Mr. Bergeron	8906
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8906
Mr. Doyle	8906
Mr. Ramsay	8906
Mr. Hoepfner	8906
Motion No. 25 negatived	8907
Mr. Kilger	8907
Mr. Reynolds	8907
Mr. Bergeron	8907
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8907
Mr. Doyle	8907
Mr. Ramsay	8907
Mr. Hoepfner	8907
Motion No. 35 negatived	8908
Mr. Kilger	8908
Mr. Reynolds	8908
Mr. Bergeron	8908
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8908
Mr. Doyle	8908
Mr. Ramsay	8908
Mr. Hoepfner	8908
Mr. Bergeron	8908
Motion No. 36 agreed to	8909
Mr. Kilger	8909
Mr. Reynolds	8909
Mr. Bergeron	8909
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8909
Mr. Doyle	8909
Mr. Ramsay	8910
Mr. Hoepfner	8910
Motion No. 39 agreed to	8911
Mr. Kilger	8911
Mr. Reynolds	8911
Mr. Bergeron	8911
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8911
Mr. Doyle	8911
Mr. Ramsay	8911
Mr. Hoepfner	8911
Motion No. 54 negatived	8912
Mr. Kilger	8912
Motion No. 50 negatived	8913
Mr. Kilger	8913
Mr. Reynolds	8913
Mr. Bergeron	8913
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8913
Mr. Doyle	8913
Mr. Ramsay	8913
Mr. Hoepfner	8913
Motion No. 17 negatived	8914
Motion for concurrence	8914
Ms. Copps	8914
Mr. Kilger	8914
Mr. Reynolds	8914
Mr. Bergeron	8914
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	8914

Mr. Doyle	8914
Mr. Ramsay	8914
Mr. Hoepfner	8914
Motion agreed to	8915

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Cultural Industry

Motion	8915
Motion negatived	8916

Emergency Service Volunteers

Mr. Clark	8917
Motion	8917
Mr. Cullen	8918
Mr. Stoffer	8919
Mr. Herron	8920
Mr. Comuzzi	8921

Mr. Jones	8921
Mr. Szabo	8922
Mr. Hearn	8923
Mr. Graham	8924
Mr. Clark	8925
Mr. Graham	8925

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Post-secondary Education

Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	8926
Mr. St. Denis	8926

Employment Insurance

Mr. Crête	8926
Ms. Folco	8927

Health

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis	8927
Mr. Charbonneau	8928

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