



House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 218

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, June 14, 1995

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 14, 1995

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

MUSICFEST CANADA

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the city of Calgary for hosting MusicFest Canada 95.

MusicFest Canada is the largest educational music festival in North America. With school choirs, jazz ensembles and concert bands from coast to coast, over 7,000 students were welcomed by the people of Calgary. Their warm hospitality was appreciated by all schools attending this event including Huron Heights Secondary School which is in my riding.

The Huron Jazz Ensembles conducted by Kevin Anderson represented Huron Heights with class in their role as ambassadors of the York—Simcoe region in this prestigious festival. Both c'est jazz, Huron's vocal jazz ensemble, and After Hours, the senior jazz band, were honoured with silver awards for their splendid performances.

In individual categories, Huron Heights again placed among the nation's best. Andrew Jones was named lead trombonist in the festival's Canadian All-Star Jazz Band. Andrew was also honoured with a prestigious General Motors award of excellence scholarship.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TELEFILM CANADA

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the cuts announced at Telefilm threaten successful festivals like the international film festival in Abitibi-Témiscamingue and the Carrousel festival in Rimouski, which will lose their subsidies entirely.

These festivals, however, have proven their success, often on shoestring budgets, with the quality of their events and their popularity with the public. They are local initiatives that are the pride of their region and of all of Quebec.

Telefilm's director, François Macerola, revealed his true colours with the dispassionate comment that the cuts had to be made somewhere. Clearly, the aim is to cut in the regions and concentrate everything in the major centres to benefit the money-making cultural events and industries. That is what it is all about. Quebecers cannot imagine their future as a people without the support and vitality of all the regions in Quebec.

This is another example of Quebec solidarity that the federal government fails to grasp. We wonder whether the directors should not attend one of the Minister of Canadian Heritage's \$2,000 a plate dinners to ensure the survival of the regional festivals. When is the minister's next dinner?

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS SECURITY SERVICES

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a select group of men and women we as parliamentarians have come to know on a professional basis. The people of whom I speak are the men and women of the House of Commons security services which is celebrating its 75th anniversary this year.

The history of the security services may be traced from the original two parliamentary door guards appointed to keep watch on the newly constructed departmental buildings in 1865 through the creation in 1868 of the Dominion Police Force which was absorbed into the Royal North West Mounted Police in 1920, to the creation of the House of Commons protective staff. In recent years, in recognition of the broader scope of its activities, the House changed the title to security services. It has and continues to provide an excellent service, not only to the members of this House, but to all who enter these buildings.

I invite all members of this House to join me in congratulating members of the House of Commons security services on a job well done as well as wishing them continued success in the years to come.

S. O. 31

INTEREST RATES

Mr. Jag Bhaduria (Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville, Ind. Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the battle lines continue to grow each day concerning who is right and who is wrong in analysing the Canadian economy. On one side people such as Lloyd Atkinson, former head economist at the Bank of Montreal, are saying that unless the Bank of Canada eases up on interest rates, our economy will be heading toward a recession within a year. On the other side is Bank of Canada Governor Gordon Thiessen who feared a move to decrease the interest rate because it would undermine his bank's inflation fighting credentials.

Still other noted economists strongly believe that the Bank of Canada will have no choice but to either lower interest rates or let the dollar weaken to keep the economy afloat. Yesterday's unexpected announcement by the Bank of Canada of a reduction rate by 19 basis points to 7.19 per cent was a welcome relief for Canadians. Our standard of living has steadily declined over the past four years. We need a made in Canada interest rate policy.

* * *

SPINA BIFIDA

Ms. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, bringing to the attention of the House the plight of lesser known diseases is neither exciting nor titillating, but the tragedies they leave in their wake are real.

This is Spina Bifida Week in Canada. This illness occurs within the first four weeks of pregnancy and causes various levels of permanent nerve damage and lower limb paralysis. One in every 750 children born in Canada has spina bifida.

We now know that giving folic acid to a woman during early pregnancy can reduce the risk of spina bifida in the fetus. The Spina Bifida Association would like to raise awareness of the benefits of folic acid among women of child bearing age and among the population in general.

In 1994-95 Health Canada contributed \$55,000 to assist the national level of the Spina Bifida Association of Canada in its many developmental, promotional and service activities across the country.

I congratulate the Spina Bifida Association and its many volunteers for their quiet but excellent work, and ask members to join me—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Perth—Wellington—Waterloo.

* * *

STRATFORD CHEFS SCHOOL

Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, culinary writer Marcella Hazan refers to it

as the best of its kind in the world. A Cornell University study called it the best all round training school.

The success story they are referring to is the Stratford Chefs School. The school is operated by Stratford restaurant owners James Morris and Eleanor Kane. From November to March, their restaurant kitchens are transformed into classrooms and their cooks into teachers.

By learning from professionals in a working atmosphere, graduates are able to make the transition to the workforce without missing a step. Today, graduates are being snapped up by the world's hottest restaurants in Germany, England, New York and Japan.

Considering the 100 per cent employment record of the school, there is little mystery surrounding the yearly flood of applications to fill the 65 available positions.

I congratulate the Stratford Chefs School and wish it continuing success in the international sphere.

* * *

[Translation]

TAINTED BLOOD

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, more damning revelations were made yesterday by Dr. Perrault in connection with the work of the Krever Commission. Dr. Perrault, formerly of the Red Cross, stated that only one national political authority could have resolved the impasse at the time and prevented the infection of hundreds of hemophiliacs.

For the first time, Dr. Perrault indicated that this political authority was the federal Minister of Health, since the products used by hemophiliacs were clearly under federal jurisdiction.

(1405)

Despite these allegations, Justice Krever still does not intend to ask the federal politicians involved in the matter to testify before the commission. Why this stubbornness? Whose interests are being served by not having this whole disturbing business come to light? The Bloc Quebecois is wondering about the real reasons keeping the whole truth on this terrible tragedy from coming out.

* * *

[English]

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Waterloo asked me when I was going to poll my constituents on Bill C-68 and follow the results. I did. The results of an impartial question were 84 per cent opposed to government legislation.

Last night after the Liberals rammed through the passage of Bill C-68, a CTV program held a phone in poll asking whether or not the public supported the government legislation. The program Canada Tonight which is broadcast from Vancouver to Toronto made use of two 1-900 numbers for the listening audience to phone in and cast their vote. Twenty-three thousand six hundred people made their wishes known. Eighty-four per cent opposed the government legislation.

For Liberal backbenchers who wanted to represent their constituents, the Prime Minister had a warning in caucus this morning. Vote against me once, that is once too often. Vote against me twice, you are out. That is Liberal democracy.

The Minister of Justice thought his problems were over last night. They are only just beginning.

* * *

ONTARIO ELECTION

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is usually not my style to rub salt in a wound, but after sitting in the House last week listening to all the Ontario Liberal MPs state how they were going to sweep the provincial election and wipe out the Conservatives, I feel it is time for me to have my say. Therefore, first and foremost, I am serving a special lunch tomorrow in my office. I invite all of them to come. They will eat crow as the entrée.

Also, it is truly sad to hear the Reform members taking credit for the Conservative party win when they did not get a single solitary Reform member candidate elected.

Let us give credit where credit is due. Let us congratulate Premier-elect Mike Harris and the PC party on such a decisive victory.

All I have to say to the Liberals and the Reformers is that in 1997 I will see them once again. I will be serving the entrée of crow.

* * *

BRIAN DUCHARME

Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today the Minister of Health presented Canada volunteer awards to several outstanding Canadians. Among them was Brian Ducharme of Tecumseh, Ontario in the riding of Windsor—St. Clair.

Brian Ducharme has served as a volunteer board member with Hiatus House in Windsor since 1981. Hiatus House is a shelter for battered women and their children. Because of the contributions of Brian Ducharme and others like him, it is a shelter with a difference. Indeed, it is the premier facility of its kind in Canada.

I am proud to be able to acknowledge Mr. Ducharme and his contributions in this House.

S. O. 31

PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week we paid tribute to the tremendous contribution of the federal Public Service of Canada. With all the pain associated with downsizing where many employees are deemed surplus and unnecessary, it is critical during this difficult period that we dispel the many stereotypes that exist about our public service.

It is also critical particularly at this time that we offer support to those public servants and their families who have been affected. We are at a crossroads in our history where the role and direction of government is being scrutinized.

Canada is a great nation that is making great strides to remain competitive in an ever changing global marketplace. Canada's public service is known as one of the best in the world. All Canadians benefit from the many services they deliver which makes Canada the number one country in which to live.

Today I salute the many public servants in my riding of Cumberland—Colchester. I thank them for their dedicated quality service and their commitment to finding better ways to improve Canada.

* * *

CLAIRE CULHANE

Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Mrs. Claire Culhane of Vancouver East has been selected as one of the 23 recipients of the 1995 Canada Volunteer Medal and Certificate of Honour.

Mrs. Culhane is a respected and admired Canadian who is a competent fighter for justice. Some of her campaigns against injustice include: anti-Franco activities in Spain in the 1930s; anti-poverty activities in Montreal in the 1940s; assisting her husband with the Shipyard Labour Organization in 1944; leading the Workers Education Association in 1945; and opposing Canada's involvement in the Vietnam war.

(1410)

She is currently forming the Association in Defence of the Wrongly Convicted. She became involved in the support group for the wrongful imprisonment of Christine Lamont in Brazil. She has written books which are required reading for criminology courses in many of Canada's universities.

Mrs. Culhane received the commemorative medal for the 125th anniversary of Canada's Confederation and is an honorary member of the British Columbia Humanist Association.

S. O. 31

I would like to thank Mrs. Culhane for her outstanding work and congratulate her for her many achievements.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOSNIA

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, twelve Canadian peacekeepers are among the hostages still being held by Bosnian Serbs, while several other UN peacekeepers and observers were released yesterday.

We hope that they will not be used as the ultimate bargaining chip and demand that they be released immediately and unconditionally.

We deeply regret the rather low key involvement of the Canadian government in this crisis. Not only is Canada not a member of the contact group, which considerably limits its influence, but it has no policy regarding a Canadian contribution to the new rapid reaction force.

Such a lack of leadership could harm not only Canada's reputation but also the efforts of peacekeepers on the site, as the Bosnian army prepares to launch an offensive north of Sarajevo, which could lead to another crisis.

* * *

[*English*]

SENTENCING LEGISLATION

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-41 destroys the principle that as Canadians we all stand equal before the law. Section 718.2 of this bill would have the courts administer greater penalties for violent crimes committed against certain groups identified by the justice minister in this bill.

The courts already take aggravating and mitigating circumstances into consideration when determining the penalty to impose on an offender. This section tells the court that some acts of violence are to be taken more seriously than others because of who the victims are. This creates special status and is unacceptable.

Section 718.2 serves absolutely no purpose other than to grant an opportunity for the justice minister to make a politically correct statement. The Criminal Code, the law of this land, is not the place for the government to be making politically correct statements. The Criminal Code must uphold the most fundamental principle of law: that all Canadians, all citizens must stand equal before the law.

NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Government of France has just announced that it plans to resume nuclear testing in the South Pacific, ending a moratorium on testing that has held since 1992.

The statement of principles from the nuclear non-proliferation treaty signed in May of this year commits all nuclear weapons states to exercise utmost restraint on nuclear testing pending the signing of a comprehensive test ban treaty. The French announcement is clearly a step in the opposite direction.

The Canadian government was one of the many nations that pushed to make this treaty binding and permanent. Now, just one month after that signing, the spirit of the agreement is threatened.

I call on the Canadian government to show that it means what it says by protesting France's decision and to restate this country's commitment to a ban on all nuclear testing.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DEPUTY PREMIER OF QUEBEC

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Deputy Premier of Quebec took the opportunity, while visiting the Parliament in Strasbourg, to make waves and try to discredit Canada over the issue that has become known as the turbot war.

"We were extremely disappointed", he said, "to see our country reduced to opening fire on fishing vessels from friendly countries".

Must we remind the Deputy Premier of Quebec of the extraordinary support received by Canada both at home and abroad in this conflict? Perhaps he should be reminded that the Bloc Quebecois and a very large majority of Quebecers also supported our position.

These remarks on the part of the PQ Deputy Premier are unjustified and reek of separatist expediency. A certain premier's personal totem is vibrant weasel; did we witness the birth of the thoughtful catfish, yesterday?

* * *

[*English*]

CAROL COLANGELO

Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on June 19 the city of St. Catharines will honour one of its own with a special certificate of merit for the heroic events of Carol Colangelo.

Last September a little girl fell into the water off the west pier in Port Dalhousie. The little girl's aunt who could not swim saw Carol Colangelo and her husband and ran to them for help.

(1415)

Carol kicked off her shoes and jumped in. Four-year old Kaitlyn Theobald was unconscious and sinking when Carol

Oral Questions

reached her. The heavy clothing Carol was wearing made it difficult to rescue Kaitlyn. With the help of her husband Ron, both Carol and Kaitlyn were pulled to safety.

I join with the city of St. Catharines in congratulating Carol Colangelo for her heroic actions.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Nepean.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

MEMBER FOR NEPEAN

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish you would have waited until I had finished my statement before you did that. It makes it more difficult for me.

I would like to publicly thank the members of the House and the constituency of Nepean for the many kindnesses shown to me these past few months during my surgery and illness. I have been overwhelmed with letters, phone calls, flowers and gifts, personal testimonies, prayers, love and good wishes. I have quickly come to realize how important it is to have friends like I have. For this I thank you.

I must also thank the surgical team headed by Dr. Rolando Del Maestro of Victoria Hospital in London, Ontario. I am so grateful that the professionalism of his team has allowed me to quickly return to this House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Welcome home, Beryl. I like your hat.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bouchard: Mr. Speaker, we all like the hat and the person under it. I am very happy and very proud that she is back in the House. Welcome.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

CANADA SOCIAL TRANSFER

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in a report published today, the National Council of Welfare launched a stinging condemnation of the Canada social transfer. According to the report, this brainchild of the Minister of Finance was the worst initiative in 30 years because it threatened to destroy the very foundation of social services and programs in Canada. According to the Council, the reform of transfer payments would inevitably lead to a reduction in spending on social assistance.

My question is of course directed to the father of this brainchild, the Minister of Finance.

Does the minister agree, as the Council stated, that by reducing federal contributions to social programs funding, the Canada social transfer will cause the provinces to reduce their budgets for social assistance and make the most vulnerable in our society even poorer?

[*English*]

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I liked the preamble much better than the question.

[*Translation*]

The fact is that the Canada social transfer as such will not involve any cuts in transfers to the provinces. What it does provide, whether there are cuts or not, is far more flexibility for the provinces in deciding how to meet the needs of their residents. I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition should complain that we are giving the provinces the flexibility they want.

(1420)

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Finance and its minister seem to live on another planet, because if they were right about this explanation, it would mean that the demand for health care has dropped and that to adjust to a changing world, in other words, to a reduction in the need for health care and social services, the Department of Finance would, very sensibly, have reduced its contribution.

That, however, is not the case and I wonder how the minister, who is unable to justify the reduction in the Canada social transfer, would be able to justify the new cuts totalling \$1.6 billion in the Unemployment Insurance Plan, cuts that will have a more severe impact on the regional economies of Quebec, which has more seasonal workers?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, there will be no cuts in the Canada social transfer concept. The transfer is a concept that will give the federal government a chance to maintain its transfers and at the same time give the provinces more flexibility.

I think the Prime Minister was very clear about this last week when he said, in referring to medicare, that it would put the federal government in a position where it could protect and also maintain cash transfers which, according to a timeframe established some years ago, will disappear if no action is taken immediately.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I know that political speeches and responses in the House may be somewhat complex and sometimes unnecessarily so, but this is a real masterpiece.

How can the federal government tell us that Canada transfers will help the federal government protect medicare, for instance,

Oral Questions

while in the same breath it says that it intends to make substantial cuts in the government's contribution to medicare? I would appreciate an answer.

[English]

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was very clear last week, as was the minister of HRD, as I was, that the cash contributions of the federal government are steadily declining, according to a schedule that was established a long time ago.

With this particular measure we have put the federal government in a position where it will be able to flat line those cash contributions over a period of time while maintaining the federal government's contribution to the very important social programs of the country.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a year ago, rumours were flying that the Canada assistance plan was headed for the chopping block. In the last budget, it was announced that the cash payments to the provinces for social programs would be cut by \$7 billion within two years, which was the amount previously allocated to social assistance.

Does the Minister of Finance confirm that the Canada social transfer's sole objective is to progressively reduce to zero the federal government's contribution to social assistance funding, while preserving its ability to continue setting national standards?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's premise is totally wrong. First of all, the provinces, including Quebec, started to cut well before the federal government tabled its budget.

Second, for this year and next year, not only does the budget not prescribe any cuts but it actually increases federal transfers.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin: I must tell you that the hon. member's figures are wrong. I cannot answer a question based on an invalid premise.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am speechless. In case he forgot, the Minister of Finance announced \$7 billion in cuts in his last budget. Today, he tells us that there are no cuts.

An hon. member: No, he says there are increases.

Mr. Gauthier: Well, I am dumbfounded. Mr. Speaker, I will give the minister a second chance.

(1425)

Since the funds allocated to the provinces for social assistance will dry up in two years because of the federal cuts announced in his budget, will the Minister of Finance frankly admit that it would have been impossible for him to impose federal standards on the provinces had he not invented the Canada social transfer ruse?

[English]

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member says he has a little difficulty understanding French, a little difficulty understanding Latin. My Latin is not too good either.

Let me say it again in English. The Leader of the Opposition says his colleague has no difficulty understanding math. He now says I have got the wrong person.

Since the government took office, transfers to the provinces have increased. Transfers to the provinces have not been cut for this year and in fact are going up.

Ultimately there will be a cut but that is no excuse for provincial action. The fact is any province, including the province of Quebec, has as much money to work with today as it did when we took office. Let us be very clear about that.

As far as social programs are concerned, a mechanism has been put in place that stops their continuous erosion all the way down to zero. There have been reductions but we have set in place a mechanism and any province that wants to sit down with us or the minister of HRD and is prepared to look at national values, that mechanism is in place.

There is a pre-condition to all of that. That is the goodwill and the understanding that this is one country and that this country wants to build, not destroy.

* * *

MINISTER OF CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, another day and yet another troubling revelation about the heritage minister and his dollars for contracts dinner in Montreal.

André Bureau, the former head of the CRTC and the current president of The Astral Broadcasting Group, has now revealed that he received an invitation to the minister's private money gathering event, as did his business partner, Harold Greenberg. Astral has direct business dealings with both the CRTC and with the heritage department. Mr. Bureau and Mr. Greenberg, however, could see a potential conflict of interest in the dinner and to their credit declined the invitation.

If André Bureau, a former and respected public servant, aware of the federal code of ethics, could clearly see the potential for a conflict of interest in the minister's dinner, why is it that the minister, the Prime Minister and the government cannot see that conflict?

Oral Questions

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I could ask the leader of the Reform Party in return why the hon. member cannot see that this is an open and transparent event because of the way the donations are reported according to the election law of Canada. Therefore what the hon. member is looking for is simply not there.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are wondering why the government pretends it cannot see the ethical issue which is involved here. Legitimate political fundraisers involving a minister do not target clients having business or regulatory dealings with the minister's department.

The heritage minister was clearly in the wrong and the government is making matters worse by pretending that it does not see the wrong.

By the ethical standards of the red book, is it right or is it wrong for ministers to participate in political fundraisers targeted to clients having business or regulatory dealings with their departments? Is it right or is it wrong?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the premise of the hon. member's question.

Ministers take part in fundraising activities just as the leader of that party takes part in fundraising activities. It is a normal part of the political process in this country to take part in fundraising activities.

(1430)

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, no Prime Minister or Deputy Prime Minister or House leader can present themselves to this House as the guardians of ethics in government unless they can tell right from wrong and unless they are willing to act on discernments of that kind. That is what ethics are all about.

I ask the government House leader one more time, and I will say it slowly so it is clear. Is it right or wrong for ministers to participate in political fundraisers targeted to people having business or regulatory dealings with their departments? If it is wrong, will the heritage minister resign?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again I do not accept the premise of the hon. member's question. It is clear when it comes to this topic that it is not the hon. member's strong suit.

[Translation]

EDUCATION AND SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development. In its recently tabled report on Bill C-76, the Liberal majority on the finance committee states, and I quote: "The Committee recognizes the obligation of the Minister of Human Resources Development to develop, through mutual consent with the provinces, principles and objectives for the social assistance and post-secondary education components of the CHST".

What does the minister intend to do with the finance committee's recommendation, which insists on his obligation to develop national standards for education and social assistance?

[English]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we set out very clearly in the budget what the process would be.

We will be inviting the provinces to meet with us to discuss how we can arrive through mutual consent at a useful and effective set of principles that will help guide the country in a united, co-operative, integrated way to reach our social goals. It is really based upon good faith that there is a real willingness by all provinces and the federal government to come together and arrive at a way in which we can effectively combine our resources to target them to the groups of people who are in most serious need and at the same time make sure we can protect and maintain the fundamental principles underlying our system of health care and social assistance.

[Translation]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the minister has yet to get together with his provincial counterparts, will he now pledge not to impose new principles or national standards if a province objects to them?

[English]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody should prejudice the process. As I read the recollections, I was very interested in the comments of the minister in Quebec who is responsible for employment matters, who talked about the need to come together to look at more active programming for employment and to try to find ways in which we can facilitate investment in individuals.

This is the same thing we have been saying for a year and a half. It is nice to see that there is now a coming together of minds on this matter from the Government of Quebec and that it now shares the point of view that we need reform and reorganization.

Oral Questions

I am sure that if we can organize the goodwill we will find effective ways to give Canadians a common, co-operative, united framework to approach some of our most important social concerns.

* * *

SOMALIA INQUIRY

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was revealed that Private David Brocklebank, who was acquitted of all charges in the death of Shidane Arone, was charged because of his conduct in the First Airborne video.

Despite the minister's promises of openness, these new charges were kept secret from the public and even from the Somalia commission itself.

How can the public have any confidence in the government's commitment to the Somalia inquiry when it insists on acting behind its back?

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Private Brocklebank was informed, as was his counsel, on April 7 that two charges were to be laid under the National Defence Act for conduct unbecoming a member of the Canadian military.

(1435)

Those charges were held in abeyance pending a legal review of the case to see whether or not proceeding with that disciplinary action would prejudice the commission.

The legal opinion was that proceeding with this would not prejudice the commission. As a result, the charge was allowed to go on in conformity with the normal practices of the National Defence Act and the nature of this particular offence, which in no way related directly to the criminal charges and others related to the death of Mr. Arone.

Therefore, this particular matter was allowed to proceed and a summary hearing was heard. This was all in accordance with normal practices. It is not anyone's intention to go behind anyone's back. We did this in the normal way.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this was a weapons handling charge. If such charges are not included in the Somalia commission inquiry, they should be.

The minister has frequently told this House, and yesterday said it to the face of a tearful wife and mother, that he cannot prejudice the inquiry. In my view, keeping the Brocklebank charges secret for two months prejudices the inquiry. Mark Boland's imprisonment prejudices the inquiry. Barry Armstrong's sudden deployment to Bosnia prejudices the inquiry.

How can the minister defend the contradiction between his professed wish for openness and his department's policy to lock up, shut down, or ship off eyewitnesses to the events in Somalia?

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I reject categorically all of the accusations contained in the hon. member's question.

It seems that the hon. member, for whom I have great respect as an individual, and the members of his party are more interested in putting partisan considerations before justice.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA SOCIAL TRANSFER

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

During the year and a half that the federal government has been in power, the reforms it has proposed have had only one purpose: to increase its inefficient intervention in several of the provinces' jurisdictions. More than ever, flexible federalism means that Ottawa decrees and the provinces must accommodate.

Will the minister acknowledge that the Canada social transfer not only offers nothing new or of interest to Quebecers, but also, on the contrary, that it brings the federal government closer and closer to its dream of creating a highly centralized Canada, which is unacceptable to Quebecers?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has contradicted himself in his own question. What we are in the process of doing with the Canada social transfer is, first of all, keeping the fiscal burden under control, which will enable the federal government to continue transferring money for social programs to the provinces.

Second, what we are trying to do is give the provinces the flexibility they need to adapt their own programs to the needs of the people. I must say that I find it utterly absurd that a Bloc Québécois member is actually criticizing the federal government for having given more power and flexibility to the provinces.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the real contradiction lies in the fact that it is irresponsible to impose national standards without pledging the corresponding funds.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Crête: Will the minister not admit that everything that his government has done since it was elected, the single window

concept, the rationalization of employment centres and the creation of the human resources investment fund, goes totally and utterly against the consensus in Quebec, which is that Quebec must gain full power over labour?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): On the contrary, Mr. Speaker. Everything we have done, everything we have said, whether it was regarding single window service, the fund for entrepreneurs or community initiatives, has addressed the requests and wishes of local communities.

Not only are we in the process of decentralizing, but we are doing it because that is what the regions have requested.

[English]

Let us be very clear what the member said in the preamble to his statement. He said that he, on behalf of his party, was against national standards in the CHST. The most important national standards in the CHST are the principles of the Canada Health Act. This government stands behind the Canada Health Act and so do the people of Quebec. He had better learn that.

* * *

(1440)

TRANSPORT

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this highway 104 controversy is not going to go away, much to the dismay of the minister of public works. As I stand here, a lawsuit is being initiated by the Citizens for Fairness in the Wentworth Valley of Nova Scotia naming the minister of public works as a defendant. This moves us not only into morally and ethically wrong behaviour but also illegal actions.

Since the Prime Minister refuses to call in the ethics counsellor, why will this government not cut its losses on this mess now and commit to returning the misappropriated funds back to the Wentworth Valley bypass project on highway 104?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the question of allocation of funds to highway construction, as the hon. member should know by now, is a provincial responsibility.

In the event that the Government of Nova Scotia or any other government in the country wishes to discuss the reallocation of funds, we will be prepared to do that, as we have done on dozens of occasions as a federal government over the past 10 years.

The case in question the hon. member refers to is a situation that arose when the Government of Nova Scotia decided to reallocate funds within the existing agreement. Section 12 of that agreement allows for the reallocation of funds by consensus.

Oral Questions

If the Government of Nova Scotia wishes to reallocate funds to this or any other highway, as is the case with any other province where a similar agreement exists, we will look at it, because that is what the hon. member often refers to as being flexible federalism.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's ethics counsellor gets about as much work as the Maytag repairman. The only difference is the Liberal machine is in desperate need of repair.

I wonder if corruption is a federal or a provincial responsibility.

Since the Minister of Transport is also going to be named as a defendant, I will place the question to him. Will he recommend to the Prime Minister that he tell the public works minister to return the money he diverted to buy votes in his riding or at least step down pending the results—

The Speaker: Colleagues, I would urge you not to impugn motives of any kind in your questions.

I would ask the hon. member perhaps if he could rephrase that question, but just the question with no preamble.

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to suggest the minister of public works would buy votes.

Would the Prime Minister be willing to look at the situation and ask the minister of public works to step down pending the investigation of the auditor general's report, pending litigation, pending the complaints from the Reform Party, pending Liberal—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transport.

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to have the hon. member stand in this House and lecture us on ethics is somewhat akin to listening to a tom cat talk about morality.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

* * *

(1445)

[Translation]

JOB CREATION

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House in response to a question from the official opposition, the Minister of Finance admitted, for the first time and publicly, that Canada's economy is in a slowdown and might not recover until next year.

My question is for the Minister of Finance.

Given that, for the first time, the minister is admitting that the economy has slowed down and that, furthermore, there has been no net creation of jobs in the past six months, is the minister

Oral Questions

prepared to drop his lax approach and come up with some concrete support and job creation measures?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I said the economy had clearly slowed down, I did not say that the slowdown would last the entire year. In the opinion of most economists, it is a pause, and we should see a recovery in the third and fourth quarters.

Having said that, as I repeated yesterday, I point out that over 220,000 jobs were created in the private sector, for example, in the past year—a fairly substantial number.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of the Minister of Finance, the economy is in a slowdown at the moment. In his recent budget, he predicted that the 1996 slowdown would be even worse than this year's. Most economists are talking about a possible recession in Canada for 1997.

I would ask the Minister of Finance where the unemployed should look for hope.

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, hope may be found in the infrastructure program the government has set up. Hope may be found in the job creation programs of the Minister of Human Resources Development. Hope may be found in the programs of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and of the Minister of Agriculture. Hope may be found in the high tech policies of the Minister of Industry. Hope may be found in the policy of this government, which reversed the policies of the previous government in order to give Canada a real future.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. Cliff Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the director of the mountain parks division of the department of heritage recently accepted a Japanese junket courtesy of CP Hotels. Canadian Pacific, it turns out, has major development plans in the Jasper and Banff national parks, which come under the mountain parks division of the heritage department.

Why was a top Parks Canada official allowed to accept a nine day junket from a corporation which has direct business dealings with his division?

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to take note of the question and get back to the hon. member.

Is the hon. member suggesting that parks officials should not be promoting tourism in his region?

Mr. Cliff Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, given the ethical standards set by the minister it is a wonder public servants did not ask CP for a donation to the heritage minister's dinner.

The actions of the director of mountain parks clearly violate Treasury Board guidelines and seriously compromise the heritage department's objectivity.

Will the ethics counsellor be investigating the matter or is the Prime Minister planning to handle this one personally?

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am doubtful the health budget can cover the cost of therapy for all the conspiracy syndromes members of the Reform Party have.

I understand the deputy minister is reviewing the matter to which the hon. member has referred and I will be happy to inform him of the results as soon as they arrive.

* * *

[Translation]

OVERFISHING

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, during his visit to the European Parliament, Quebec's deputy premier openly condemned Canada for its action against Spain in the turbot dispute. This new change of direction by Mr. Landry goes against the support expressed by his leader, Mr. Parizeau, regarding our intervention, as well as by the Bloc Québécois.

My question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

Can the minister assure Canadian fishermen, particularly those in Quebec, that Mr. Landry's change of direction will have little impact on the issue of overfishing off Canada's coasts?

(1450)

[English]

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his excellent question.

On behalf of all members in the House, including I am sure members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, we are shocked at the statement of the deputy premier.

An hon. member: Over here in the Reform Party.

Mr. Tobin: Nobody would take the risk of speaking for you fellows.

We are shocked that the deputy premier of Quebec in Strasbourg condemned the Canadian government position in the

turbot dispute when it is clear all members of the House in all parties strongly support these measures to protect Canadian fishermen.

[*Translation*]

It is clear to me, and to Canadian and Quebec fishermen, that Mr. Landry's positions—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Tobin: Just a second, please. This is very important. Mr. Landry seems to be talking out of both sides of his mouth.

* * *

AMF TECHNO TRANSPORT

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

When he appeared before the transport committee, the minister refused to guarantee the survival of CN's subsidiary, AMF, which employs over 1,300 workers in Pointe-Saint-Charles, one of the poorest areas in Canada. The minister even said that AMF's situation was precarious.

Given the economic situation which currently prevails in Montreal, and particularly in Pointe-Saint-Charles, will the minister tell us why he refuses to guarantee that AMF will survive and that its 1,300 employees will not lose their jobs?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that AMF's situation is precarious. I hope that the hon. member will realize that other regions in the country have experienced the same situation. As a New Brunswick native, I can tell you that we had the same problem in Moncton, when CN decided to pull out of there, a decision which affected over 1,000 employees.

AMF's best chance of survival is to find a solution to CN's current problem in its negotiations with an international company interested in moving there. A solution must not only be found to the impasse related to the acquisition costs, but also to the productivity of that plant.

We all recognize the problem which exists at AMF, and I hope that CN and the eventual buyer will find a solution to the difficulties which, so far, have been a major obstacle.

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Finance, who is responsible for regional development in Quebec, agree that saving 1,300 jobs in Pointe-Saint-Charles should be at least as important for the federal government as buying capital assets to make CN more interesting for its future buyers? Beyond the minister's rhetoric, where is the hope for these 1,300 workers?

Oral Questions

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the possibility of commercializing CN is a very serious issue. So is, of course, the future of AMF, both for its workers and for greater Montreal. We are all aware of that, and every effort is being made to try to find a solution.

We will continue to co-operate with CN, in the hope of finding a way to reach an agreement which would ensure the sale and survival of AMF, which is a very important industry for the Montreal region.

* * *

[*English*]

HUGHES AIRCRAFT

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last week it was revealed the government is prepared to allow Hughes Aircraft to delete three main features of its contract to provide a new automated air traffic control system and stick Transport Canada with the cost of training and installation which was included in the original contract and lease us the equipment we were supposed to own.

(1455)

Also, the completion date has been pushed back two years. To add insult to injury Hughes wants more money, and the government is actually considering giving it.

Will the minister please tell the House why Hughes was not told to live up to its original contract or have it cancelled?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member of the Reform Party who is critic in matters of transport obviously lives an exciting life. On one hand for months in the House he has talked about the cancellation of the Pearson contract as an example of what governments should not do. Now in the case of the Hughes contract he wants it cancelled.

We have to do the best we can in any commercial undertaking to arrive at a solution in the best interests of the Canadian taxpayers.

I have said that with respect to the Hughes contract and all of the CAATS arrangements so far the government is extremely concerned about them. We are concerned about cost overruns, about glitches. We are attempting to find a solution in the best interests of both air safety and the Canadian taxpayer.

The hon. member will have to decide whether he wants to cancel contracts, support contracts or try to negotiate out of a specific contract. In the case of Hughes I wish the hon. member would decide which way he wants to go.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my position is quite clear. It is the minister who is very inconsistent.

Oral Questions

No value has been placed on the deleted items. No value has been placed on transport's new obligations and no figure has been given on how much transport is asking the Treasury Board for.

Knowledgeable air traffic controllers are now questioning the value of the diminished system. Will the minister agree to hold off on any amendments to the contract and have the Standing Committee on Transport review the whole issue and make a recommendation to the minister?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if there were a knowledgeable air controller on that committee I might consider it.

Because we have to deal with this issue in a fairly short order we will proceed as best we can to deal with finding a solution to this problem. We will make sure whatever deal is arrived at is absolutely transparent.

As this matter came to my attention I immediately advised the auditor general of our concerns with respect to it. We will try to resolve a very serious problem.

The hon. member should recognize that our intention to commercialize the air navigation system, which I hope he will support, should avoid any problems like this occurring in the future.

* * *

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

In spite of laws regarding safe storage of guns in Canada there are a lot of guns sitting behind kitchen doors. In order to flush a lot of those weapons out of the system and therefore reduce the need for compliance with the law, would the Minister of Justice in dialogue with the Minister of Finance consider an incentive, perhaps a small tax credit, for each gun turned into police as a way of making our communities safer?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to dialogue with the Minister of Finance, particularly in light of the suggestion for tax credit to rely on the legendary generosity of the Department of Finance.

The point the hon. member raises is important with respect to the safe storage of firearms. Registration aspects contained in Bill C-68 passed in the House last night are intended among other things to encourage compliance by owners with those very safe storage obligations.

With respect to firearms no longer wanted or where an owner wants to dispose of them, Bill C-68 provides that even in the case of prohibited firearms those who own those firearms can

sell them to others in the same class. That was a change introduced on the recommendation of members of the Liberal caucus. Furthermore, firearms that are unwanted can always be surrendered at an amnesty or delivered to museums for a credit.

The suggestion made by the hon. member is an innovative one. I will be happy to take it up with the Minister of Finance and pursue it.

* * *

(1500)

*[Translation]***BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN**

Mr. Jean Landry (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

Last year, the Minister of Agriculture declared a moratorium on the use of bovine somatotropin, or BST, to allow the dairy industry to adjust and to give the public the information it needs. Although these two requirements have still not been met, the minister indicated in this House yesterday that he had no intention of extending his moratorium.

Does the minister recognize that the public still does not have the information it needs on BST and that the dairy industry is in no position to meet consumers' demands for a way to distinguish dairy products with BST from those without?

[English]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while not necessarily accepting all the suggestions made in the hon. member's question, I would point out to him that a tremendous amount of information has been made available. There is obviously a difference of opinion with respect to this product.

Might I say that in all the very legitimate questioning about rBST we should be careful not to feed unfounded doubts and fears. We do not yet have the scientific analysis that is presently being conducted by the Department of Health. I think we should wait for it and we should get all the facts on the table.

In the meantime we should not engage in comments or allegations that question the safety of Canadian milk. To do so would be to harm the Canadian dairy industry, including that very significant portion of the industry in the province of Quebec.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last week's election in Ontario spelled the end of employment equity in the province because the new government is going to scrap this discriminatory legislation.

During the election the leader of Ontario's Liberal Party called employment equity outrageous and said that numerical targets in employment meant the same thing as hiring quotas.

The minister knows that Bill C-64 includes these same outrageous numerical targets. If the minister will not listen to Canadians, will he at least listen to his Liberal friends and scrap his own version of a quota bill, Bill C-64?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member possibly knows—it is not always easy to tell whether the Reform Party knows what is going on in Parliament—the committee has been holding hearings for the past four months on the employment equity bill and has listened to well over a couple of hundred representations from a wide variety of Canadians. One thing they all understand, except the hon. member, is that there is no quota system in the bill.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, the political minister for Newfoundland.

Last week I met in St. John's with executive officers of the Newfoundland Dockyard Trades and Labour Council as well as Mike Apostilidis, president of the dockyard.

In view of the uncertainty about the future of the dockyard which employed 850 people last year, will the minister agree to a full independent review of the books of Marine Atlantic? Will he finally meet with the dockyard workers and not pass this off to his colleague, the Minister of Transport from New Brunswick? Will the minister finally stand up for the dockyard workers just as much as he stood up for the turbot in Newfoundland?

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the member from the other side of the country, from the great province of British Columbia, finally had an opportunity to visit Newfoundland. It is regrettable that it took a large convention and a sought after position to bring him to this part of the land, but we welcome him to the island.

I met with the dockyard workers and with the management this week in a meeting arranged by my colleague, the Minister of Transport. We had a very frank and open discussion about the future of the dockyard. There is currently an ongoing negotiation between an interested party and the dockyard management on a possible purchase of the dockyard. We will have an answer on the negotiation within a matter of days. Following that negotiation we will see whether or not it is successful. Other discussions are under way with the workers.

Routine Proceedings

This problem requires careful attention, careful consideration, and will not be solved by unduly raising expectations or setting out simplistic solutions. I know my colleague who wants to assume the leadership of his party would agree with those criteria.

* * *

PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery today of the members of the Select Committee on Foreign Affairs of the British House of Commons, led by the Right Hon. David Howell.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

(1505)

The Speaker: Also I draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of Mr. Ola Ullsten, present head of the World Commission on Forestry and Sustainable Development and former Prime Minister of Sweden.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

FRESHWATER FISH MARKETING CORPORATION

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 109, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to the report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans on the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (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 13 petitions.

* * *

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 82nd report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding a change to Standing Order 36 in relation to the acceptability of petitions.

Routine Proceedings

If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the 82nd report later this day.

I also have the honour to table the 83rd report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs relating to the selection of votable items in accordance with Standing Order 92.

In accordance with that standing order the report is deemed adopted on presentation.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food which deals with Bill C-86, an act to amend the Canadian Dairy Commission Act.

It is reported with amendments.

* * *

OCEANS ACT

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-98, an act respecting the oceans of Canada.

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

* * *

(1510)

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE TO INDONESIA ACT

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-333, an act to terminate Canadian assistance to Indonesia.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to introduce this bill which would terminate Canadian bilateral government to government aid and multilateral aid to Indonesia. Aid to NGOs that work in Indonesia and humanitarian assistance would be exempt.

To explain the purpose of the bill, I would note that human rights abuses in East Timor perpetrated by the Indonesian government are indisputable. Human rights organizations have reported evidence of gross violations, including repression of freedom of expression, arbitrary arrests, torture and killings. Similar human rights abuses go on elsewhere throughout Indonesia, including appalling labour conditions, the banning of the country's only free trade union, and the shutting down of Indonesian weekly newspapers.

Finally I would note that the Government of Indonesia has continually flouted international law and ignored United Nations General Assembly and Security Council resolutions calling for Indonesia's immediate withdrawal from East Timor.

For these reasons I believe the Government of Canada should terminate its bilateral and multilateral aid to Indonesia and call for respect of human rights.

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

* * *

CANADA-UNITED STATES TAX CONVENTION ACT,
1984

Hon. Raymond Chan (for the Minister of Finance, Lib.) moved that Bill S-9, an act to amend the Canada-United States Tax Convention Act, 1984, be read the first time.

(Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.)

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move that the 82nd report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

I may say, just by way of explanation, that this very modest change to the standing orders of the House simply makes it possible to file petitions where there has been an interlineation on the petition but not in the text of it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Does the hon. parliamentary secretary have the unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

PETITIONS

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I rise to present three petitions on behalf of over 200 constituents from my riding of Fredericton—York—Sunbury.

The petitioners call on Parliament to oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which provide for the inclusion of the phrase sexual orientation.

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition that has been circulating across Canada. This petition comes from the Calgary, Alberta, area.

The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to our society.

They also state that the Income Tax Act discriminates against families who make the choice to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

The petitioners therefore pray and call upon Parliament to pursue initiatives to eliminate tax discrimination against families who decide to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Harry Verran (South West Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and the privilege to present three petitions on behalf of the constituents from the Middleton and Margaretsville areas of Annapolis county, Nova Scotia.

(1515)

One petition comes from the Digby and Weymouth area of Digby county in the federal riding of South West Nova.

The petitioners pray and request that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

[Translation]

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present two petitions.

[English]

The first petition is from 60 Canadians, some of whom reside in the riding of Ottawa—Vanier. The petitioners call on Parliament to act quickly to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and to adopt all necessary measures to recognize the full equality of same sex relationships in federal law.

RIGHTS OF GRANDPARENTS

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition which I would like to present is from 37 constituents of Ottawa—Vanier.

They call on Parliament to amend the Divorce Act to include a provision similar to article 611 of the Quebec civil code, which states that in no case may a father or mother, without serious cause, place obstacles between the child and grandparents. Failing agreement between the parties the modalities of the relations are settled by the courts.

Routine Proceedings

POLITICAL PARTIES

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituent Valerie Morrow I would like to present two petitions under Standing Order 36.

The first petition protests the appointment of co-chairs to a political party.

ARSON

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition calls for stronger enforcement of the section of the Criminal Code which deals with arson.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present petitions signed by residents of my constituency of Burnaby—Kingsway as well as residents elsewhere in British Columbia and in Saskatchewan.

The petitioners draw to the attention of the House the fact that the current Criminal Code denies people who are suffering from terminal or irreversible and debilitating illness the right to choose freely and voluntarily to end their lives with the assistance of a physician.

Therefore the petitioners call on Parliament to amend the Criminal Code to ensure the right of all Canadians to die with dignity by allowing people with terminal or irreversible and debilitating illness the right to the assistance of a physician in ending their lives at the time of their choice, subject to strict safeguards to prevent abuse and to ensure that the decision is free, informed, competent and voluntary.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from Canadians who point out that acts of discrimination against lesbian, gay and bisexual Canadians are an every day reality in all regions of Canada, that this kind of discrimination is unacceptable in a country known for its commitment to human rights, equality and dignity for all citizens and that the citizens who are so discriminated against pay taxes and make contributions to employee benefit plans and are entitled to the same rights and responsibilities as other citizens.

Therefore, the petitioners call on Parliament to act quickly to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and to adopt all necessary measures to recognize the full equality of same sex relationships in federal law.

Ms. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from 777 people of British Columbia. I concur with the petition.

Routine Proceedings

The petition states that we the undersigned residents of the province of British Columbia draw the attention of the House to the following: that discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is a real and hurtful form of discrimination in this country; that all forms of families in this country, those based on financial and emotional interdependency, are equally meaningful and important to the social well-being of Canada; and that both protection against discrimination and recognition of relationships based on financial and emotional interdependency are necessary to ensure the equal treatment of gays, lesbians and bisexuals under the law.

Therefore your petitioners request that the Parliament of Canada amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to include sexual orientation as a basis for protection against discrimination and to include recognition of relationships based on financial and emotional interdependency.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition from constituents from Fraser Valley West.

The petitioners ask that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

(1520)

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have four petitions to present today on behalf of the constituents of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt.

The first petition requests that Parliament not amend the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the Canadian Human Rights Act to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase, sexual orientation.

FIREARMS

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): The second petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by 296 petitioners which will add to the total which I have presented in this House of 4,324 signatures opposing the gun legislation.

DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the third petition is from 161 of my constituents. They state that dangerous sex offenders and paedophiles should be locked up for life, that statutory releases should be revoked, that stiffer sentences should be imposed on violent offenders, that violent criminals should serve their full sentences and have

time added for bad behaviour, and that a central registry of the names and addresses of violent offenders should be established.

INCOME TAX

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): The final petition, Mr. Speaker, is from 783 constituents who send the message to the government: “no new taxes”.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. John Godfrey (Don Valley West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions, both asking Parliament to act quickly to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prevent discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and they have my full support.

ALCOHOL

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, these petitioners point out that alcohol is a drug and is addictive. They believe there is risk to the foetus when taken by women who are pregnant. They point out that drinking alcohol is a leading cause of death among young people. They also underline the fact that seniors can get into difficulties when there is an interaction between alcohol and medication taken. They believe that alcohol can lead to health problems and chronic illnesses. They point out that alcohol is toxic if it is taken too quickly in great quantity.

The petitioners want warning labels on containers in order to alert the population to this effect.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition points out that unnecessary violence and abuse in all forms, be it verbal, physical or other, in society in general on radio, television or by other means have become a major concern of the Canadian population. The petitioners point out that abuse and violence is not necessary to inform or to entertain.

They want government to ensure that the CRTC regulates violence and abuse. They point out that there have been some efforts and some accomplishments, but they encourage the government and the CRTC to do even more.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions. The petitioners call on Parliament to act quickly to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and to adopt all necessary measures to recognize the full equality of same sex relationships in federal law.

This is a petition which I wholeheartedly support.

DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to present six petitions adding 2,944 names to the already 14,549 names that have been placed before the House requesting that Parliament do something to keep dangerous offenders off the streets of our nation and in support of Bill C-240 which allows for post-sentence detention of dangerous offenders.

It is my pleasure to add more names to that growing list of concerned Canadians.

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present a petition from my constituents calling on Parliament to enact legislation against serious personal injury crimes being committed by high risk offenders by permitting the use of post-sentence detention orders and specifically by passing Bill C-240.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 174 and 178.

[Text]

Question No. 174—Mr. Robinson:

Does the government plan to participate with NORAD or NATO allies in joint research initiatives examining ballistic missile defence as proposed in the 1994 defence white paper and, if so, (a) what previous Canadian defence research, will the government propose to use as a basis for such joint research (b) will the Canadian government use previous research into an EHF space-based radar system as a basis for further joint research, and (c) what kind of new research will the government propose to initiate as a part of such joint research efforts?

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): (a), (b) and (c) As outlined in the 1994 defence white paper, Canada is interested in gaining a better understanding of missile defence through research and consultation with like-minded nations. We expect that these consultations will address both limited missile defence for North America and theatre missile defence within Europe. Whether Canada will choose to participate in joint research initiatives will depend on what opportunities arise, and most significantly, whether these joint initiatives are cost effective, affordable, and make an unambiguous contribution to Canada's defence needs.

In the NORAD context, the NORAD renewal negotiations are set to begin this year. Joint research with the U.S. in ballistic missile defence will be discussed during the negotiations, however, the outcome of these discussions cannot be prejudged.

Routine Proceedings

Accordingly, it would be premature to speculate on the specific form and content of possible joint research activities in the absence of any agreement that such research should in fact take place.

Question No. 178—**Mr. McClelland:**

With respect to the October 24, 1994 signing of a treaty between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Republic of India on mutual assistance in criminal matters, (a) when the treaty was signed, was the government aware that India has in place a law known as TADA (Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Act) and (b) can Canadians of Indian origin be threatened or prosecuted by Indian law as a result of TADA legislation?

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): (a) The preamble of the treaty between Canada and India on mutual assistance in criminal matters makes specific reference to Canada and India desiring to improve the effectiveness of both countries in the investigation, prosecution and suppression of crime, including terrorism related crime.

The Minister of Justice is unable to comment on the full scope of India's Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act (TADA) and on the extent of its extraterritorial reach, if any.

(b) The mutual assistance treaty does not make India's TADA legislation part of Canadian law. The treaty generally provides for assistance relating to the gathering of evidence for the purpose of a criminal investigation or prosecution pending in the state requesting assistance. The assistance contemplated under this treaty does not include the arrest of persons for the purpose of their return to the requesting state through deportation or extradition.

Requests for assistance made to Canada under the mutual assistance treaty are executed in accordance with Canadian law once their execution has been authorized by the Minister of Justice. For this purpose the requests must contain information prescribed by the treaty. This includes the relevant law of the state requesting assistance.

There is no requirement under the treaty that an offence under investigation or prosecution in India also exist in Canada (referred to as double criminality requirement). This is common in mutual assistance treaties.

Canada may refuse or delay assistance based on grounds set out in the treaty. The treaty provides that assistance may be refused where executing the request would impair Canada's sovereignty, security, or public order and that assistance may be postponed where executing the request would interfere with ongoing investigations or prosecutions. These grounds are intended to protect the fundamental interests of Canada, where Canada is the requested state. They can be relied on in appropriate cases based on a consideration of the circumstances of each case in view of the treaty and the relevant law and could apply to

Government Orders

a request by India pertaining to an investigation under the TADA legislation.

[English]

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Shall all remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

(1525)

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is an important weekly event but I would ask that all motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from June 13 consideration of Bill C-41, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and on Motions No. 5 to 17 inclusive.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to speak on this section of Bill C-41.

Coming to this House has been really quite instructive. One can learn from many members. I have learned from the member for Burnaby—Kingsway that it does one good to express exactly where one is coming from in terms of one's own personal perspective.

In keeping with that, before I speak specifically to section 718.2, I might state to the House very clearly where I am coming from. I stand clearly, unequivocally and in a very straightforward way in favour of and in full support of the traditional family unit as generally understood within society.

To that end, it might be of interest to the House for me to very briefly read something that is in the public domain that I wrote to an editor at the Calgary *Sun* last March. The editor had stated:

“Decision targets family values” and “marriage and family, as we all know, are not only cornerstones of our society, but are the bedrock of our civilization”.

I wrote:

I tend to agree with him.

The preferential treatment given to mom, dad and the kids, I believe is reflective of the value that our society places on the biological reality of propagation.

There are many instances of cohabitation in our society: The single parent and child, siblings living together or good, long time friends of the same or opposite sex. They may choose not to become involved in physical sexual contact. To extend spousal benefits to homosexual partnerships and not to other couples would be a grave act of discrimination.

A redefinition of family unit that would step outside of the obvious biological relationships to include same sex or opposite sex couples must include all relationships. It must not have reference to sexual orientation or activity. Otherwise, we would be extending a financial reward for sexual involvement between people who cohabit.

Max Yalden, Canadian Human Rights Commissioner, has stated the Human Rights Act should be amended “to reflect today's reality” by prohibiting discrimination against gays, lesbians, bisexuals on the basis of sexual orientation. He is wrong. If we extend spousal benefits to people who cohabit on the basis of sexual orientation and not to all couples, we have truly engaged in an act of discrimination.

fooling around and ignoring the obvious reasons for spousal benefits will cost our society much more than countless millions or billions of dollars. It has the potential of costing society its cornerstone and the bedrock of our civilization.

I give that as a background because it is true that all of us arrive at this House with predisposed attitudes and values that come from our very soul. I want to make it clear what my motivation is in taking a look, hopefully, at the deletion of section 718.2 from this bill.

In reading the notes that were given to the Liberal members I was interested to see that they say: “We will keep our campaign commitments and send a strong message against hate crimes. As an election promise and a matter of fundamental human rights, Bill C-41 will not be subject to a free vote”.

(1530)

The heavy hand of the whip is coming down on all of the Liberal members in this House, and we have seen the devastation that will do to their political careers as long as they toil within the Liberal Party. However, that does not change the fact that there are many people within the Liberal Party who have a serious concern about this issue, I suggest perhaps because of the same reasons that I have stated from my own personal background and belief.

It is also interesting that this document given to the Liberal members includes what I consider to be some terribly erroneous advice. It reads:

It is essential to list the grounds in Bill C-41. The hate crime section is meaningless without the list. In several court rulings, the Supreme Court of Canada has warned that any hate-related legislation must be very precise and must

Government Orders

identify target groups it intends to protect, otherwise it may be subject to constitutional challenge.

I think it passing strange that in exactly the same legislation the government is bringing forward a total patchwork in terms of alternative measures. In other words, it is saying in one section of the act we will not have any national standards and in the other section of the act saying that we must have precise standards. The question must be asked: Which is it?

Last evening I was very interested to listen in the debate to the hon. member from York South—Weston, who is a lawyer. I respect the fact that he would be able to read this bill as it is presently before the House and I concur totally with his perspective. In part, from *Hansard*, page 13767, he says:

What are those alternative measures? We do not in this legislation describe what those alternative measures are, what crimes will be subject to those alternative measures. In fact it says any crime. We do not know. Does that mean that a rapist, someone who is alleged to have committed a rape, can for example be diverted out of the criminal justice system and into some alternative measures? What can those alternative measures be? We do not know. This bill does not define what alternative measures are. The bill leaves it up to the attorneys general of the provinces.

For sake of time, I will not read further, but he went on to say—again, I concur with him totally—that what we have here is a total patchwork.

I ask the Liberals, I ask the justice department, I ask the parliamentary secretary: How can we have within Bill C-41 on one side of the coin an absolute patchwork and on the other side of the coin something that has to be very specific and very precise? The two things in the same bill do not make any sense.

I suggest to the Liberal members that in fact the advice they have received in their documentation, in their talking notes when they stand to talk on this act, is simply not good advice.

I suggest very strongly that section 718.2 is unnecessary. In the judgment of many Canadians, it is put in specifically so that the undefined term sexual orientation may be put into federal legislation. This is the first step of putting that undefined term into federal legislation. It is not an innocuous thing. It is not an inconsequential thing. It actually is the first step in a logical legal sequence for that undefined term to be included in the charter of rights and freedoms.

Again, I read from the Liberals' documentation. They tell their members:

We've heard a lot lately about the myths of "special rights". C-41 does not confer special rights. No one is "left out". C-41 protects all Canadians. Every Canadian has a nationality, a race, an age, a gender, a sexual orientation.

We've heard that C-41 will result in sweeping changes, including the recognition of same-sex marriages. That is nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, in the strictest sense of the term, that is nonsense. Bill C-41 will not achieve that objective on its own. I submit that the reason Canadians are concerned about Bill C-41 is because they see this very clearly as a very transparent, thin edge of a wedge that is an important stepping stone in order to get the undefined term sexual orientation included.

(1535)

The Liberals know this. The justice department has received over 70,000 letters opposing this bill. Furthermore, until yesterday there had been 7,250 names in favour of the inclusion of sexual orientation in petitions presented to this House. That is 7,250 for, and 83,471 against. These are people in Canada who take the time to put their names on petitions, to gather these petitions together. Yet this government is prepared to absolutely turn its back on these representations from ordinary Canadians.

Mr. Keyes: Based on misrepresentation.

Mr. Abbott: It is interesting that a member opposite has said based on misrepresentation. May I suggest to that member that exactly the same statistics were used to theoretically justify the imposition of Bill C-68, the gun control, which was based on lack of information. Those polls are being quoted and were being quoted as justification by the justice minister.

Here we have 83,000 people taking the time to sign petitions and send them to this House, and they say those polls do not count, they are not based on good information.

There are none so blind as those who will not see. But for those who have eyes, I implore them to vote for the exclusion of section 718.2.

Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honour to rise in the House to speak to Bill C-41.

There has been a great deal of confusion and misinformation being disseminated about this bill. Unfortunately, a lot of the verbal shadow boxing around Bill C-41 has almost entirely focused on one phrase in one clause in the overall bill. The term sexual orientation seems to have piqued the interest of many narrow minded individuals whose sense of reason has been drowned out by the self-righteous pontificating about the so called provision of special rights to designated groups and individuals.

Last week an impatient man approached me in my constituency office. He asked me whether I was going to vote yes or no for that "same sex benefits bill and special rights for gays". I proceeded to try to explain to the gentleman that he had it all wrong, that the legislation was not about same sex spousal

Government Orders

benefits or special rights for gays and that it had more to do with protecting individuals from hate motivated violence. The man stormed out of my office before I could get a further word in edgewise. That is exactly the kind of intolerance and confusion that underlines most of the opposition—especially from the third party in this House—to provisions in Bill C-41.

For the edification of the man who stormed out of my office last week and for many others like him, many to be found in the third party opposite, who may have forgotten or perhaps never took the time to find out what Bill C-41 was actually all about in the first place, I want to highlight for them the main objectives of this legislation along with some of the compelling yet often misunderstood and ignored portions of this bill.

Some of the most significant provisions of Bill C-41 are those related to enhancing the rights of the victim. This bill includes an unprecedented amendment to section 745 of the Criminal Code that would provide victims of violence with the opportunity to make a meaningful impact on the criminal justice system by presenting victim impact statements when convicted criminals apply for early parole consideration. This would ensure that victims of violent crimes have the opportunity to speak out about the harm done by the offender.

Quite frankly for me, and I know for another member at least in this House, maybe that is not enough. To my way of thinking, section 745 should be rescinded. But that is what is in the bill today, and it has gone a lot further than what members opposite, especially in the third party, are proposing. Therefore, the victim's experience will now be taken into account at the very least when deciding whether the parole ineligibility period of an offender should be reduced.

(1540)

The bill also encourages tougher sentences for the abuses by offenders in positions of trust or authority. It encourages alternatives to fines for those unable to pay them and provides for stricter penalties for offenders who breach probation and provides cost effective alternatives to those expensive and often unnecessary formal court proceedings. Furthermore, the bill will allow judges greater leeway to impose certain conditions on an offender to ensure that the punishment fits the crime.

This bill follows through on the government's commitment to Canadians who have so passionately expressed the need for meaningful and progressive criminal justice reform. It should be noted that Bill C-41 adds a statement to the Criminal Code that provides clear direction from Parliament on the purpose and principles of sentencing.

The reforms provide a balanced and sensible range of options that address the public's need for safety, the victim's desire for restitution, and the important principle that serious offenders should be dealt with more severely than minor or first time offenders.

This legislation clearly indicates that the purpose of sentencing is to contribute to the maintenance of a just, peaceful, and safe society and to promote respect for the law by imposing just sanctions.

The statement sets out objectives for sentencing, which include protection of the public, rehabilitation, promoting a sense of responsibility among offenders, making reparations to victims and the community, and deterring crime. These objectives are guided by the idea that a sentence must reflect the seriousness of the offence and the degree of responsibility of the offender. In this regard, the courts will be required to consider aggravating and mitigating circumstances associated with a particular crime.

Accordingly, the proposed statement of principles indicates that when an offence is motivated by hate based on the race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation of the victim, this must be considered as an aggravating circumstance. On this point, people have asked why hate motivated crimes warrant harsher sentences than non-hate motivated crimes, suggesting that such provisions and the use of the term sexual orientation would grant special rights and magical privileges to non-heterosexuals. Some people have even gone so far as to suggest that use of the term sexual orientation would encourage a homosexualist agenda, if you can believe it. Quite frankly, this is surely and simply ludicrous.

As stated by my colleague, the Minister of Justice, we are talking about the criminal law here. We are talking about crimes motivated by hate. To say that including sexual orientation in Bill C-41 is encouraging a lifestyle is like saying that because we have included religion we are encouraging people to become Catholics.

Hate crimes are distinct in that they are not only an attack on a single individual, they are also an attack on an entire group in our society. For example, if someone paints graffiti on someone's house, that person would probably be charged with mischief and the house owner would likely be the only victim. But if someone were to paint swastikas on one of the five synagogues in my riding of Hamilton West, the victims would include all members of the Jewish faith. Try to understand that, members opposite.

Mr. Stinson: Yes, tell us about the bar association. Come on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. I would ask colleagues for the co-operation of the House on this subject matter, which has certain sensitivities. I certainly want to be able to hear the interventions of all members.

Government Orders

Mr. Keyes: Mr. Speaker, targeting members of a single group and attacking them simply because they belong to that particular group is loathsome, deplorable, and must be taken into consideration at sentencing.

With regard to the notion of special rights, perhaps someone can explain to me how protecting Canadians who are victimized by hatred and harassment constitutes special rights. Perhaps someone can explain to me how seriously punishing a neo-Nazi for splitting a person's head open with a baseball bat just because they are gay constitutes special rights.

(1545)

Maybe someone can tell me how a humane government can simply ignore the plight of the innocent law-abiding Canadians who are sadly victimized by violent attacks just because of their skin colour, religion, gender, age, sexual orientation or mental or physical ability.

I wonder if someone can show me how renegeing on our commitment to the overwhelming majority of Canadian voters, who elected me and my colleagues on this side of the House on a solid platform advocating equality for all Canadians and cracking down on crimes motivated by hatred, would advance the principles of Canadian democracy.

When we told Canadians that the sentencing practices in Canada must be responsive to their concerns and social values, we meant it. When we said heinous crimes motivated by pure hatred would not be condoned by a Liberal government, we meant it. When we said that we would protect the rights of all Canadians and strengthen justice in our nation by coming down hard on those who chose to victimize Canadian communities, we meant it.

As a member who was elected on a platform that emphasized the need for criminal justice reform, I am proud to stand on this side of the House with the right hon. Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and all my colleagues in support of this legislation and the Liberal notion of a humane and anti-violent society.

In closing, I move:

That Motion No. 17 be amended by striking out all of the words after "mitting the offence," and substituting the following therefor:

abused the offender's spouse or child, or

(i.1) evidence that the offender, in committing the offence, abused a position of

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I sat here until 11.30 last night. I just sat and listened to all of the debate. I laid my speech aside.

We often refer to this place as the highest court in the land. We should all be setting aside our ideology and our politics. We should be examining every bill to see whether it is good legislation. We are making the laws of the land in this place. As I sat and listened to the debate last night, I attempted to do it with an unbiased mind which is difficult to do but that is what should be happening in this place.

I am not an expert on all of the things that are going on here, it is impossible. I have been working a lot on Bill C-68. However, I listened to the various experts, people who analysed Bill C-41. Many of them come from the other side of the House and I listened to what they had to say. There is a variety of people in this place and there are some very serious concerns with this bill which have not been addressed.

Having listened to the debate and the arguments, I have come to some conclusions which I am going to share with the House. We really need to have democratic reform in this place. I have come to that conclusion in the last few weeks as I see the processes which are taking place. That is something which is desperately needed.

We stand and debate these laws. We look at them. Recently there has been the attitude to just get through with the debate; summer is coming so let us get this stuff through the House. Millions of Canadians out there will have to live with these laws forever more. We should not have the attitude of simply getting this done, having an arrogant, almost cavalier attitude about what is taking place here and just getting it out.

(1550)

The negative impacts about this legislation were related yesterday. Canadians have expressed many concerns to us. Even people in the legal profession who have analysed this bill, lawyers at the top of the justice system, have seen the flaws and we continue to push this bill through. That causes me grave concern.

As I listened to the debate last night I saw some of the members opposite trying to portray themselves as being more compassionate than some of the other people in this House. They were trying to show that they were more tolerant.

In the end we have to look at the nitty-gritty, the facts, the very reasonable things people are saying about this legislation. We must not let ideology or politics blind us. Common sense must not be thrown out the window. We cannot play on people's emotions.

When the dust settles we are going to have to live with the facts. We are going to have to live with the content of Bill C-41. We are trying to explain our intentions in this bill, but good intentions do not necessarily make good legislation. That is why we are here discussing this and debating it and doing all the things we are doing. We have to listen to each other.

Government Orders

I have a question for the last speaker. I was listening to the debate his colleagues presented yesterday. The hon. member said that we are protecting the rights of all Canadians. If we are protecting the rights of all Canadians, why do we need a list of categories? Why do we need to even include this? It does not make sense to me. Do not all victims deserve equal protection? Why do we have to have categories of victims? If someone is assaulted by someone who is doing it just for fun, that is no different from doing it for some other motive.

I am going to speak on behalf of my constituents this afternoon on some of the things they have told me. I have received hundreds and hundreds of letters over the last year and a half on the issue of including the term sexual orientation and many other concerns. That is not the only concern they have with this bill but it is one that keeps coming up again and again. We need to listen. I have the honour and the privilege to speak on their behalf as I believe all members in this House should have.

To limit this debate to six hours is a travesty of justice and of democracy. I hope it is not an example of an arrogant dictatorial Liberal government, but I am afraid that is the way it is coming across.

I said I have the privilege of representing my constituents in this debate on Bill C-41. Many members of Parliament will be denied that so I consider it to be a privilege.

Voters have sent me to Ottawa to be their voice in Parliament. What we do is very important. We must not take anti-democratic measures as has been done. We would all be willing to go well into the summer to listen and analyse all of the aspects of this Bill C-41 debate. It makes me very sad. It should make every Liberal member who did not oppose this abuse of power sad as well.

The Liberals have the majority. They can use that majority to do almost anything they want to and voters can do nothing to stop them, until the next election. By forcing time allocation the Liberal government has declared its highest priorities to be gun control, MPs pensions and including the term sexual orientation in the sentencing legislation.

Personally I do not believe these controversial issues are priorities with the people of Canada. I am sure that if people knew how democracy was getting a kick in the teeth here in Ottawa today, a lot more concern would be expressed. Most people are not following all the debate here. I wonder if Liberals are hoping that voters will forget this by the time the next election rolls around.

There are some provisions of this bill for which I give my conditional support. I heard the reasons behind them and they are good. I support them particularly with respect to the restitution orders and victim impact statements. There are some excellent aspects to the bill.

(1555)

Unfortunately, we have a long way to go before the victims of crime are treated with as much respect as the criminals. To this end I will continue to work on my victims bill of rights which I spoke about previously.

I support the Reform amendments to delete section 717 regarding alternative measures and to delete section 745.6 regarding the application for judicial review for premeditated murders.

The most controversial idea we are talking about is section 718.2(a)(i) and the reason the Liberal government has waited so long to get the bill before the House and why it had to invoke closure in order to get the bill through the House of Commons. This provision will call for greater penalties to be imposed if there is evidence the crime was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate.

We complained a lot about the term hate, but what about bias and prejudice? These things can be construed in many different ways. We do not know five or ten years down the road what will happen with bias, prejudice or hate based on the race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, or sexual orientation of the victim.

My first choice would be to support the Reform amendment to delete the section entirely. Reformers believe that the courts already take aggravating or mitigating circumstances into consideration when determining the length of the sentence to be imposed on a convicted offender. I agree with my colleagues that this is an attempt by the Minister of Justice to get the unnecessary and undefined term sexual orientation into a piece of legislation so it can be used as justification for amending the Canadian Human Rights Act.

Reformers believe in true equality and that all Canadians are equal before the law. Every time the government divides us into different categories it creates the politics of envy, which divide us rather than unite us. We should not have all of these groups mentioned in our legislation.

Back on March 24 the *Globe and Mail* editorial writers made the statement: "The real problem with section 718.2 is not that it refers to homosexuals but that it is proposed at all". They go on to give many other valid points.

Because of the time allocation I will not have a chance to finish my remarks.

We need to take a serious second look at this matter. The Liberals are opening a door with this legislation which should remain shut. We should take more time to look at this because the concerns which Canadians have expressed to me are real and legitimate ones which need to be addressed. I wish I had more time to do that.

Hon. Raymond Chan (Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-41 covers a wide range of sentencing initiatives, including provisions aimed at assisting victims of crime, improving the administration of justice in Canada and

Government Orders

tougher sentences for those offenders who abuse a position of trust or authority. The bill also includes harsher sentences for crimes based on hate for a particular race, nationality, colour, religion, gender, age or sexual orientation.

In discussions with constituents, by correspondence and through the electronic media I have heard from many opponents of Bill C-41. Most of the opposition regards the inclusion of the term sexual orientation in the bill. Opposition to the bill seems to be based upon fundamental misunderstandings about the intent and also the consequences of passing Bill C-41 into federal law.

Bill C-41 asks the court to take into consideration not only that a crime was committed, but that the offender was motivated by hatred against the victim based on the listed grounds which, as I have stated, include race, nationality, religion, age, gender or sexual orientation.

(1600)

I have emphasized to concerned Canadians this provision of the bill comes into effect only once a crime has been committed. Bill C-41 does not create any new crimes. It does not make moral opposition to homosexuality a crime and it does not affect freedom of expression.

I have worked hard to correct the spread of misinformation by explaining to religious communities Bill C-41 will not prevent churches and religious instructors from talking about their beliefs regarding the morality of homosexuality. The bill is not creating any new hate crimes or expanding hate provisions in law.

The other major concern with Bill C-41 is that by including the term sexual orientation in federal legislation we are setting a major legal precedent. As the Minister of Justice has told the House, sexual orientation is not a new term and has been in use in Canadian legislation since 1977. It appears in provincial human rights legislation in eight jurisdictions within Canada.

Another misconception I have encountered is that by not defining the term sexual orientation, Bill C-41 will open legal loopholes that will legitimize the actions of paedophiles. Once again, the Minister of Justice has listened to this concern and has assured Canadians the term sexual orientation is included in provincial human rights legislation and that Canadian courts and tribunals have never had trouble understanding or interpreting the term which is unambiguous and does not include acts set out in the Criminal Code.

The bill makes an important statement that society will not tolerate crimes committed against individuals simply because of their race, religion, colour, gender, age or sexual orientation. Bill C-41 protects all Canadians. All Canadians have a nationality, a race, a gender, an age, a religion and a sexual orientation. Bill C-41 is an important part of the government's efforts to

improve public safety, enhance the rights of victims and protect the rights of all Canadians to participate fully in the social and economic life of their country.

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to address the issue of the statement of purpose and principles in Bill C-41.

I fear the government is misguided on this issue. The bill instructs judges to consider as aggravating circumstances in sentencing any evidence the offence was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on the race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation of the victim.

Judges have latitude already in sentencing. They have been known to use it to hand out harsher sentences for crimes they consider particularly harmful to society. Why pass a law that asks them to be tougher in a few select categories? All crime and violence should be condemned and the punishment should be in proportion to the crime.

I agree with my colleague from Central Nova that respect for our justice system stems from the notion we are all equal before the law. I do not see that principle reflected in the statement of purpose and principles of Bill C-41.

I hope none of us disagrees that it is completely unacceptable and abhorrent that anyone should be the object of violent attack for any reason. Why should one form of assault be judged or condemned as more unacceptable than another?

(1605)

In my mind any assault is completely unacceptable and should not be tolerated regardless of motivating factors. It is the crime that needs to be judged, not whether the accused held a personal bias toward the victim.

Any type of act based on hatred for a group for whatever reason should be recognized as something intolerable in society. Section 15(1) of the Constitution Act, 1982 states that every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to equal protection.

I believe Bill C-41 will to change this. It will say certain crimes against certain victims are worse than the same crime against any other victim. That is against the fundamental principles of the charter of rights, that every Canadian has the same equal right to protection under the law of Canada.

I also fear the inclusion of the words sexual orientation in the statement of principle is a back door attempt at eventually legalizing same sex benefits and same sex marriages. It has been reported that on March 30, 1995 in New York City at a UN meeting the top Canadian officials at the United Nations were pushing for homosexual rights internationally so they can

Government Orders

compel domestic compliance in Canada and justify the route they are taking with Bill C-41.

The government should be up front about its agenda and should also listen to Canadians. The hon. member for Scarborough West recently shared some telling information with other members about the statement of principles on Bill C-41 and the government's intention to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act. According to the member for Scarborough West 631 petitions have been presented in the House on the issue of sexual orientation. Of these petitions 87 per cent were against the sexual orientation amendment to the CHRA and/or against including the phrase sexual orientation in the statement of purpose and principles of bill C-41.

My feelings on this matter are the same as those of the members for Scarborough West and Central Nova. In the face of this overwhelming opposition why is the government not listening to Canadians, for this is a slippery slope for Canada, a slippery slope the government is taking for the traditional family unit, and it is a dangerous route that will eventually become an avalanche if it is adopted in the House.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while there is much that is laudable in Bill C-41, public concern has focused on one issue, the inclusion of the words sexual orientation as one of the categories for which crimes motivated by hatred would merit stricter sentencing in section 718.2 of the bill.

I have listened to those concerns from my constituents who have spoken to me personally and hundreds who have written letters to me, and I share their views. I do not feel the words sexual orientation should appear in the bill and I support the amendment proposed by the member for Ontario to remove the list of categories altogether.

It is important to explain the basis of my objections as there is a misconception that opposition to including sexual orientation as a category in this bill is in itself motivated by hatred of homosexuals. Nothing could be further from the truth.

My riding contains a significant gay community. I have met with some of its organizations and have been very active in trying to address its concerns. I am also strongly opposed to so-called gay bashing or any crimes motivated by hatred against a minority group in society. That is why I support the bill in requiring stricter sentencing for assault and other crimes motivated by hatred.

Yet I cannot bring myself to support the inclusion of sexual orientation as a legal category in the bill, as it seems to me there may be unintended consequences of this inclusion that may affect our definition of the family, freedom of speech and freedom of religion.

(1610)

When the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms was being drafted the then justice minister, the current Prime Minister, said the term sexual orientation had not been included in section 15 because of the problem of the definition of those words. Speaking of sexual orientation he then stated: "Do not ask me to tell you what it is because those concepts are difficult to interpret, to define, and that is why we do not want them in the Constitution".

Why should a term too vague for the Constitution of Canada in 1981 suddenly be clear as day in 1995? Some hon. members have proposed amendments to define this term for greater clarity but I think the wiser approach is to avoid the problem altogether by striking the list of terms from the bill.

I fear that by including the words sexual orientation in federal law for the first time without clarification or definition, we are extending an invitation to the courts to read sexual orientation into other statutes as they have done with the Canadian and Alberta bill of rights in previous provincial court decisions. The legitimacy of this reading in has not yet been ruled on by the Supreme Court of Canada. By including these words in a section 15 like list in a federal statute we are saying as federal legislators that what we did not want to include in 1981 we want to include today.

The courts may well turn to this wording for guidance on other matters. What we have already seen is not encouraging. The Alberta Court of Queen's Bench ruled the Alberta human rights code had to be read as if sexual orientation was included in the Vriend case, which meant a private Christian Reformed college had to hire a teacher who was a practising homosexual despite its religious objections to his behaviour.

In recent years we have seen attempts to deny the Salvation Army the right to use municipal property in the city of Toronto as it will not hire openly homosexual employees or clergy.

We have seen Catholic school boards in Montreal forced to rent property to homosexual organizations all on the basis of including sexual orientation in human rights legislation and despite freedom of religion and freedom of association.

Two weeks ago in Ontario a provincial court judge ruled homosexual couples were eligible to adopt children despite the fact that the legislators had defeated a similar measure only a few months before.

If we as federal parliamentarians choose to include the words sexual orientation in federal law for the first time we will only encourage the courts in this practice at a time when many Canadians are questioning whether the courts are being too swift in striking down the decisions of elected legislators.

While this bill may be a simple sentencing bill, not the charter or a human rights bill, our use of this language sends a message to the courts they may choose to interpret in ways we had not intended.

We may not want to prevent a Salvation Army band from playing a Christmas concert for the poor on public property. We may not want private religious schools to be forced to hire openly homosexual teachers despite their religious teachings. We may not want paedophilia to be accepted as a legitimate sexual orientation. That is what may happen not because of this bill but because of what the courts may choose to do in applying this statutory language in other unrelated contexts.

I hope I have made it clear why I, without any personal disrespect or malice toward homosexual persons, do not feel it would be prudent to include the words sexual orientation in this legislation. We are opening the door to the use of this language in other contexts that may lead to legitimizing other forms of sexual orientation we would not want to approve or to the use of the concept of sexual orientation to harm the rights of religious and other groups to freedom of religion, freedom of expression and freedom of association.

The whole problem can be avoided by accepting the amendment by the member for Ontario and eliminating this contentious list of categories altogether.

If the purpose of the bill is to ensure crimes motivated by hatred are more severely assessed in sentencing, let us leave it at that. If the purpose is to create a precedent of recognition of the concept of sexual orientation, a concept the Prime Minister felt was too ambiguous to include in the Constitution of 1981, one that might be used in other contexts we would not approve of as legislators, then this section of Bill C-41 does not deserve the support of the House.

(1615)

Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be addressing Parliament today on Bill C-41. To say the least, the legislation has caused quite a stir.

The government has introduced close to 100 bills since the election but next to Bill C-68, the gun bill, no other bill has raised the kind of attention this one has.

Although the bill is extensive the focus has been on just one small section. However the implications of this one section are great and could create a social shift in the Criminal Code. The general intent of the bill is reasonable. The Criminal Code needs to be overhauled in terms of its sentencing guidelines. The code is rather weak and soft as I know all Canadians will attest.

Government Orders

Canadians want a code that will protect them and keep our streets safer.

On the first day the bill was brought before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, November 17, 1994, the minister was present as a witness. I was at that hearing and listened closely to what the minister had to say. In particular I listened to his reasoning behind section 718.2, the clause that would increase penalties for those who commit crimes while at the same time they might have thought about someone's sexual orientation or religion or whatever.

With regard to section 718.2 the minister stated:

It's there, provided that a court that imposes a sentence shall take into account both aggravating and mitigating circumstances. In connection with aggravating circumstances, the court must consider evidence that the offence was motivated with bias, prejudice or hate based on race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or the sexual orientation of the victim.

As a court officer for over 20 years I have sat through enough court cases to know that judges already take into account all these factors in sentencing. I ask the justice minister, if something is already being done in the courts on a regular basis with innovation and flexibility, why it is necessary or appropriate to write them into the code and thereby stultify what is presently working. Where are the events in the community of such a pervasive nature that begs this kind of legislative response?

I refer to another piece of testimony given by the minister on that day. The minister stated:

I'm asked why not define the term "sexual orientation"—there's no need to add a definition. It's perfectly clear what the intention of the legislation is.

The minister in that committee finally stated what he thought was a definition of the term sexual orientation. He said:

That interpretation of that provision has been that sexual orientation encompasses homosexuality, heterosexuality and bisexuality.

Fine, I can understand that definition. Why is it then that when an amendment is proposed at the clause by clause stage to add such a definition to the term sexual orientation—and I may say the identical definition the minister stated at the committee—every Liberal member except three voted against it?

Witnesses had come before the justice committee and stated that sexual orientation could mean anything, including transsexuality and even pedophilia. Canadians need to know the direction the government is taking. I think they are observing that it is downhill. This type of leadership is unacceptable and must be highlighted so that the public can see. Then it can infer what kind of government we have.

I quote from the minutes of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs a question I asked of John Conroy from the Canadian Bar Association on the definition of sexual orientation. I said to him:

Government Orders

—to my mind, the term “sexual orientation” is pretty broad. It could involve all kinds of repugnant possibilities, even those that are illegal. So could you address your mind to the definition of the term “sexual orientation” and support what you are saying when you say that it is carefully and narrowly drafted? I ask this because my assertion is that the term “sexual orientation” is not defined and is too broad.

Here is the response that was given to my question:

I would take the definition that you raised a minute ago. That has certainly been the definition I've always understood: homosexual, heterosexual, or some other sexual orientation. It could be any kind of sexual orientation, and it could be something that, as you say, is illegal.

The definition could be any kind of sexual orientation. One would assume from this that someone who practises bestiality, pedophilia or transsexuality would be considered under this section. The minister says no, but he is unwilling to define the term sexual orientation. His social agenda is clear and it has little to do with getting tough on crime.

(1620)

The proposed sentencing guidelines are redundant and ill considered, injecting politics and social fashion into the administration of criminal law. Judges already have wide discretion in sentencing within limits provided by the courts of appeal. They often use this discretion to hand out particularly harsh sentences for crimes they consider harmful to society.

As far as I can determine, the government has presented no evidence that judges are being unduly lenient with criminals motivated by hate as compared to the leniency for other offences. Why pass a law that in effect asks judges to conform in accordance with a fashionable list?

The Criminal Code is not a toy or a political manifesto. Nor should it be a showcase for the government's style. It is the law of the land, the moral border of tolerance where the state will intervene. Before the government makes any changes to the Criminal Code it should show first that there is a problem and, further, a problem that can be effectively addressed by the criminal law. Demonstrate, then legislate.

The problem contemplated by section 718.2 of Bill C-41 relates to an important principle. I said from the very beginning, and I will continue to say it, that the legislation ignores the fundamental principle that everyone is equal before the law. It suggests that violence against one person is less or more significant than against others, and that it provides special recognitions and advantages to select groups of people. I do not believe it is a wise course for the administration of justice.

Several years ago a boy was murdered in Calgary by a young offender. His reasoning: the victim was overweight, shy and too brainy for his liking so he stabbed him to death. Not one of these characteristics is in the listed schedule in Bill C-41. Clearly the young boy was victimized based on discrimination of aforethought. Where does the list of discriminating characteristics end? The list is indefinite and that is why the Reform Party

wants clause 718.2 of the bill removed to keep all persons equal before the law.

The courts already take into account the surrounding circumstances of the offence at the time of sentencing. If someone commits assault causing bodily harm that person is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 10 years. The judge makes the decision concerning the length of the sentence not exceeding 10 years.

As it currently stands, if the judge feels that a person was assaulted because of religion, the accused could be given a term of up to 10 years in prison. What many do not understand is that even if the amendments to Bill C-41 come into force, the maximum penalty the judge can give in such a case is still 10 years. The legislation will not strengthen the limits of the Criminal Code.

It is evident that section 718.2 is not presented for any criminal justice purpose but rather to mollify some loud political voices. This section of the Criminal Code is for a social fashion purpose, what is currently politically and socially correct as defined by the Liberals.

By slipping section 718.2 into Bill C-41 the government manoeuvres one step closer to its overall agenda to include homosexuals in the Canadian Human Rights Act, which would then enable gay couples to claim spousal benefits and perhaps overturn by legal challenge any pro-traditional family social policy of the federal government. All in all section 718.2 should be deleted from Bill C-41. Deleting it would make it a better piece of legislation and more in line with the true will of the Canadian people.

I want to address another amendment that we as a party have proposed. It is simply to delete anything to do with section 745 of the Criminal Code. The clause has no right to be part of the code at all. Bill C-41 should not be referring to it. I know the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce feels differently as this had become his legacy when he was the solicitor general. Liberals see section 745 as the glimmer of hope. Reformers see a life sentence as just that, a life sentence. Life should mean life.

Today a court in Ontario is in the midst of the very disturbing trial of Paul Bernardo. He is charged with the murders of two young girls. If convicted he could receive a life sentence, but because of section 745 he could be walking our streets in 15 years. I cannot even bear to think of the possibility of this occurring. Yet the bleeding hearts condemn Reformers for even thinking of repealing this offensive section.

The member for York South—Weston has a private member's bill at committee stage that would get rid of section 745. If clear heads prevail, the bill will pass through the committee stage. The bill passed second reading and I believe that 74 members of the Liberal caucus supported it. We have hope then that our amendment will have similar results when it comes to a vote. When 74 Liberal members vote differently than the justice minister and the Prime Minister, one can only come to the

Government Orders

conclusion that these members are simply doing what is right for the justice system in our society.

(1625)

Repeal of section 745 represents what the majority of Canadians want. It is a bellwether issue to measure the appropriateness of the social philosophy of the section 745 defenders. Who could ever even vote for and support in Parliament any MP who has the kind of mind that would continue to defend section 745? Canadians want it repealed. I hope the government is listening.

In conclusion I am saying that the underlying social philosophy of Bill C-41 is a measure of the basic value structure of the Prime Minister. He alone is ultimately responsible and accountable for the devalued tone of the bill's inherent message. Everything in the bill has his stamp of approval.

The Prime Minister sometimes appears as a likeable guy. However his legislation and values represented in the bill are not very likeable. The bill does not represent mainstream Canadian values. Consequently it is revealed that neither does the Prime Minister. Improvement will only come with a new government.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would love to tell you today that I rejoice in participating in this debate. I must confess that I do not. Like many members I suppose I hesitated before doing so.

I speak in the House as a practising Roman Catholic, a pro-life supporter against euthanasia. I believe strongly in what hon. members would consider to be family values. I also speak in favour of the bill before us today. I suppose it would be far easier to keep quiet.

However the debate I have heard over the last couple of days has put me in a position where I feel I have to speak. Lest any member think that I am wearing my MP hat as opposed to my whip hat and so on, I say to the House and to all hon. members that there is no difference. I cannot take off the jacket and tie and put on the team jersey when I feel like it. I have to reconcile the fact that I operate in both roles at the same time and all the time.

Some of the things I have heard make it such that I feel compelled to express my views on the issue. I want to address two topics: first youth offenders and second the hate crime provision.

[*Translation*]

On the topic of young offenders, I must say that I was disappointed with some of the speeches I heard yesterday. I am the father of two teenagers and the remarks made by the hon. member for Wild Rose yesterday aroused in me a feeling of helplessness to see what I would call a generalized inclination to tar young people in this country with the same brush by

ascribing criminal tendencies to all, most or at least a large number of 16- and 17-year olds.

[*English*]

Paragraph after paragraph of the speech of the member for Wild Rose—and I have a copy of *Hansard* before me—describe 16 and 17-year-old hooligans. They indicate that sentences are inappropriate for young criminals, that youths raised in poverty have no excuse for adhering to a life of crime; that alleged dysfunctionality was not a reason to be a criminal; and that 16 and 17-year-old butchers have to be treated like their victims and so on.

All of us want sentences that are appropriate and that fit the crime.

(1630)

Each one of us has a moral responsibility in the Chamber when we speak to ensure what we say does not create more misery than the good we are pretending to espouse in our views.

[*Translation*]

Which brings me to my second topic: hate crimes. Never, since first arriving in this House a long time ago, have I read letters from constituents and others expressing such disturbing grievances.

[*English*]

Let us remember the bill is about sentencing with regard to crimes already committed.

[*Translation*]

I received letters and preprinted cards from people in other ridings, like this one, which talk about the government wanting to legitimize the lifestyle of a group that undermines basic family values.

I have here another letter I have received.

[*English*]

Another letter says Bill C-41 would harm the rights of parents to protect their children, the rights of institutions to have a preference over adoption policy, historical rights of freedom of religion, the right of religious institutions to have hiring practices consistent with their religious belief and so on.

I am not mocking anyone, I say to the hon. member across, and if he had listened carefully the letter I am reading does not come from a constituent. The hon. member may make fun of what I have to say but I do not believe anything we do which in any way shows that kind of intolerance is beneficial to any of us. If the hon. member will be patient, once I finish my speech he can give us his wisdom.

Government Orders

The B'nai Brith of Canada, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the chief of police of the Ottawa–Carleton regional police force, the Canadian Jewish Congress and others have all asked us to support this legislation. I have in hand a letter from the United Church of Canada talking about the bill and the need to have it, talking about hate crimes, crimes are motivated by the vulnerability of certain individuals and groups within society. It urges these groups to be explicitly included.

I must say with regret that my church did not send a letter of support of this kind. I do not wish to elaborate on that but I have to state it because it is a fact. That does not change what I believe to be intolerance on the part of some, lack of knowledge on the part of others and selfish motives on the part of yet others making it such that the debate today has taken on the ugly tangent I see attached to it.

[*Translation*]

It is unfortunate that, as we sit here asking questions on a bill partly aimed at protecting hate crime victims, there is so much controversy surrounding this bill.

[*English*]

One amendment says that for greater certainty, referring to sexual orientation, it does not include preference toward any sexual act or activity that would constitute an offence under this act. That is to clarify that presumably a sexual activity that would be criminal would not be legal by virtue of passing the bill.

(1635)

The minister indicated there was no need for such an amendment. Notwithstanding that, for greater certainty he put one in. If they are clear in their conscience members opposite will look at group No. 7, Motion No. 24:

For greater certainty, conduct that constituted an offence under the Criminal Code before the date on which this section comes into force constitutes the same offence after that date.

In other words, for greater certainty anything that was criminal before is reaffirmed this way in the same way as we reaffirm through a greater certainty clause in the gun bill with respect to a certain group. We have done it again here just to ensure there was no doubt.

Will that make the members who are heckling right now vote for the bill? I regret to say that probably will not happen.

[*Translation*]

What we must do in this House, if we see ourselves as living in a mature democracy that has embraced certain basic rights, is not only to believe in these rights but also to ensure that some groups in our society do not become the victims of intolerance. The least we can do is not to make speeches in this House which promote intolerance against others.

[*English*]

Today we are not having a debate or a speech about family values, about the promotion of gay rights or anything like that. They have nothing to do with the bill. They could have something to do with other bills and we will deal with those when the time comes if and when it does. Those are not the issues before us today. The issue before us today is the protection of victims when crimes have been committed. That is what we have to remember. To twist that in order to achieve some other objective is not correct. It is not the kind of tolerance I was brought up to live with and to live by. I ask my colleagues to share with me in that kind of tolerance toward other people, as I was taught to do in the church of which I am a member.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Davenport, the environment.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on Bill C-41.

I begin by voicing my absolute disgust with the government in its move to invoke time allocation on the bill. Bill C-41 is an important bill with serious implications. My constituents of Comox—Alberni deserve to have their opinions heard through their representative in the House. The government's move to silence MPs by preventing reasonable debate of legislation is undemocratic and unprincipled.

Bill C-41 proposes to amend the Criminal Code to restructure sentencing provisions contained in the Criminal Code and rules for evidence and procedure for use in the sentencing process. Bill C-41 ensures harsher penalties are imposed for crimes motivated by hatred based on race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation.

I agree with the concept that legislation should provide for victim impact statements to be used in court proceedings. The Reform Party has also been a strong advocate of victims' rights and it is high time this be given priority by the government. However, the bill before us hardly addresses the issue. Bill C-41 does little to protect victims' rights.

The bill provides only for written statements to be filed with the court, which is simply not adequate. The bill fails to provide for oral or written statements to be made directly to the court by the victim or by the victim's representative. With this provision the legislative proposals are virtually meaningless.

If the government is serious about victims' rights, provision to allow for both oral and written statements to be made directly to the court by either the victim or the victim's representative should be provided for.

When the Reform Party suggested a number of amendments to the bill at committee stage which would provide for these provisions, the lack of commitment by the government was demonstrated when all amendments were voted down by the Liberal majority in committee.

(1640)

As much as I support provisions for victim's rights, I am dismayed to note that passing this legislation will hardly change the status quo.

The implications of victims' rights within the bill may be insignificant. However, I have serious reservations about the implications of section 717, which requires serious revision before it is passed by the House.

Section 717 proposes to make provisions for allowance to bypass court proceedings for those accused of offences. If an accused person admits to committing or to having involvement in an offence this section would eliminate the use of the courts to determine guilt or sentencing.

Reform supports the use of alternative measures for specific offences, particularly non-violent offences, but this clause is too open ended. Offences punishable by alternate measures are not specified and this needs to be spelled out more.

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police recommended section 717 be amended to restrict the availability of the program to persons who have committed less serious offences as well as first time offenders. I support such an amendment before the bill becomes law.

In addition, the bill fails to give any indication of what will constitute an alternative measure. This must be spelled out. It is not enough to delegate responsibility to the provinces because even though provinces are given authority to design their own system there will be vast differences in measures from province to province.

When Reform proposed an amendment to clarify the situation the Liberal majority voted it down in committee. Without clarification the bill leaves the system of fair trial and punishment wide open to abuse.

I cannot support section 717 without the necessary amendments, which the government is unwilling to make. As it stands, section 717 should be scrapped.

Another section which needs serious revision is the controversial hate section 718.2. It has raised the ire and concern of many Canadians. Section 718.2 stipulates that a court which imposes a sentence shall also take into consideration that sentences should be increased or reduced to account for any relevant, aggravating or mitigating circumstances relating to the offence or the offender.

Furthermore, the bill goes on to propose that sentences take into account that evidence the offence was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on race, nationality, colour, religion,

Government Orders

sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation of the victim shall be deemed aggravating circumstances.

One problem with this section which has been raised by many Canadians is the loosely defined use of the term sexual orientation. Canadians have repeatedly attempted to get their concerns regarding this section heard by the government. Numerous petitions and calls in the House for a legal definition of the term sexual orientation in the bill have fallen on deaf ears. The government still insists proceeding with the section as it stands; so much for consulting the people.

Without a definition of sexual orientation the government is leaving itself wide open to a whole new era of legal challenges. The bill opens the door for the public and courts to define sexual orientation as they see fit. This could include legitimizing paedophiles' engaging in sexual activities with young children, suggesting that because it is their sexual orientation it is a legitimate activity. This is nonsense. It is a major concern. Canadians are aware there has been an active movement for paedophilia to be considered a legitimate sexual orientation. This has to be addressed.

Another problem with section 718.2 is it opens the door for all kinds of confusion before the courts. If a person who fits into any one of the categories has been assaulted, this person will have the right to insist the crown attorney show the offence was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on sexual orientation of the victim.

Clearly bias, hate and prejudice against another person should not be tolerated. However, opening up this section as a basis for increased penalties opens a can of worms the government will not be able to close.

(1645)

In determining appropriate sentences for crimes, courts should only consider the nature of the offence: Was it a robbery or a sexual assault? Was violence involved? Whether or not the offence was directed against a heterosexual or a homosexual, a Catholic or an atheist, a Caucasian or non-Caucasian is simply irrelevant. The whole concept of adding hatred threatens equal treatment under the law.

Hatred, bias and prejudice cannot be defined. The nature of the crime should be judged and punished accordingly, not the race, religion or sexual orientation of the victim or the perpetrator. It should not matter who or what kind of person the victim or perpetrator is when a crime is brought before the courts. Law has no business investigating or questioning these attributes. In doing so the proposed law will infringe on the civil rights and liberties of individuals.

Just as this government proposes to impose on civil rights and liberties of Canadians with its prejudicial hiring quotas in Bill C-64, the act to impose hiring equity, the government also proposes to entrench inequities through this bill. Just as all

Government Orders

Canadians should be able to compete equally for jobs irrespective of race, religion, gender or disability, so should all Canadians be able to defend themselves in a court of law regardless of race, religion, gender or sexual orientation.

Canadians will not tolerate the big brother attitude of this government. The Liberals may be able to hide from Canadians the contents of their bills now by invoking closure on debate but Canadians will not be silent when their rights and liberties are threatened.

Over 71,000 Canadians have petitioned this House not to pass Bill C-41 as it stands. Over 10,000 letters opposing this bill were delivered to the justice minister last week. The justice minister has received over 70,000 letters opposing this bill. There is no question Canadians clearly do not agree with the Liberal government on this issue.

The minister states that he consulted with Canadians before implementing legislation, but with whom did he consult on Bill C-41? The growing arrogance of this government is becoming very apparent and Canadians simply will not continue to tolerate it.

Come next election the message of Canadians will be loud and clear. Just as the people spoke in the 1993 election, so they will speak in 1997. The government may be able to ignore and silence the will of Canadians today but no government is above the democratic voice of the people. The Liberals, like the Conservatives before them who did not listen to the people, will go down in flames.

[Translation]

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, originally, my speech was supposed to be in French but as you know, this is an issue that has caused some controversy in many parts of English Canada and especially among representatives of the third party here in the House.

[English]

There is only one part of this bill which is controversial. Let us cut to the chase and talk about that one part, namely crimes motivated by hatred, particularly hatred of a person's sexual orientation.

In this debate, we have heard that sexual orientation is an ambiguous term. Not only is this term in the bills of rights in almost all of our provinces, but only two weeks ago the Supreme Court of Canada acknowledged that sexual orientation was a form of discrimination and used those specific legally definable words.

We have heard talk about special rights being given to one segment of society. This bill does not give anyone special rights. It tries to restore basic human rights which are being stolen from some segments of our society.

Gangs of neo-Nazis are not prowling the streets looking for straight, white males to beat up and throw off cliffs. There are however gangs of neo-Nazis beating up and killing gays.

We have heard that looking at intent sets a dangerous precedent for our criminal justice system. Intent is the basis of our entire criminal justice system. After all, what is the difference between manslaughter and first degree murder if it is not the intent of the perpetrator? The sentence for the latter is life in prison, yet both deal with killing.

(1650)

We have heard the argument that a crime is a crime and that punishment for beating and killing should be the same for all people. There are different crimes and the punishment should fit the crime.

When a Jewish cemetery is desecrated the damage is not to property, it is to the entire community. As a result Jewish people feel unsafe in their homes as they recall their history and an entire segment of our society is scarred. That is exactly what the neo-Nazis want. When a gay person is beaten or killed it is not simply that person who is murdered but the entire community is victimized. This is exactly what the neo-Nazis and bigots of all kinds want.

We have heard the right wingers talk of conspiracy and agendas. The only agenda is that of the radical religious right trying to advance religious beliefs on the Canadian public. After all, this is not about new rights but about saving lives. The polls show that the Canadian public overwhelmingly wants this legislation, more than those who wanted gun control and that was well over 70 per cent.

I realize there are some members in this House who feel their personal religious beliefs are more important than either their constituents' views or an individual's fundamental rights and freedoms. However I would urge them to follow the lead of Quebec, the only province in Canada which has an official religion and the first province in Canada to acknowledge that there is widespread discrimination based on sexual orientation.

I would also urge these members to remember what we are talking about here. We are not talking about same sex benefits. We are not talking about adoption. We are talking about stopping gay people from getting systematically beaten and killed by bigots of all kinds.

Not too long ago a person walking across the bridge out here from Hull to Ottawa was seized upon by a gang of so-called neo-Nazis. His crime was only that these bigots thought he looked gay. The media later made a point of saying he was not gay but that should not have been relevant. This young man was thrown to his death at the foot of the cliff beneath these Parliament Buildings because the neo-Nazis thought it was good and right to kill gays.

Government Orders

I know some of my colleagues believe that their religion prohibits homosexuality. I also know that their religion prohibits killing. In Christianity the basis for the former is an obscure passage written in prose and the latter is one of God's Ten Commandments. I sincerely hope they will see their duty clear and join us in trying to stop these killings once and for all.

As a Roman Catholic and as a married man, I fully recognize the obligation of this House to recognize equal rights for all. All we are asking is that these fundamental rights which we hold especially on the government side be extended to all Canadians and that includes gays and lesbians.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to enter into the public debate on Bill C-41. I was just having a private debate with one of the government members on the controversial section 718.2.

There are some good points in this bill as well as the bad ones. The emphasis has been on section 718.2 regarding the phrase of sexual orientation. I wish to go on the record as being totally and absolutely opposed to the point that we would introduce that phrase and give the protection under the Criminal Code.

I may be wrong but I think this is the first time the House has given to people the protection of sexual orientation which is totally undefined, whatever their sexual orientation may be and however repulsive that may be to a large number of people. They will now be protected under the Criminal Code.

If we go back to the charter of rights and freedoms that was passed in 1980 at that time the House specifically said that sexual orientation shall be left out. Then we found that the courts have introduced it. They said it shall be read in. I wonder who gave them the power to read it in when this House said it shall not be in there.

(1655)

Thousands and thousands of petitions have been presented in this House and the government has not listened to any one of them. There is an article in today's *Ottawa Sun* regarding some members of the Reform Party who delivered to Parliament in a wheelbarrow thousands and thousands of letters objecting to the term sexual orientation. Not one of them was listened to by this government.

I do hope government members took note of what happened in this province last Thursday when the government was thrown out for not listening to the people. A new government was introduced which promised some serious policy, not only in balanced budgets but also in social reform.

Most unfortunately, perhaps the Liberals will pay more attention to that than the tens of thousands of Canadians who have registered their strong disapproval to this clause. It has identified certain segments of society and has given them

special protection. That special protection is not available to anybody else. We pride ourselves as Canadians for being fair, treating everybody equally, that no one is better or worse than anybody else.

Yet because of a person's sexual orientation, which is undefined and may be reprehensible and disgusting, that person is not only protected but we are also going to mete out a more severe punishment to people who are victims within those groups than those who are victims of a group not mentioned in the section. That is why I find it repulsive. It is not only the fact that sexual orientation is in here which I find repulsive, but also the fact that a few Canadians have been identified and are being told that they are entitled to special treatment but nobody else is. All of us are supposed to be equal in the eyes of the law but we now find that is not the case.

I fully expect the citizens of Canada will remember this at the next election. They will ask MPs how they voted on June 14, 1995 on Bill C-41 when this type of amendment to the Criminal Code was introduced for the first time. I am fairly sure a large number of people who voted Liberal last time will not be voting Liberal the next time based on the fact that the Liberals have totally ignored the wishes of Canadians and have pushed this through much against their will.

Moving on to other sections, section 745.1 deals with people under the age of 18. Because we have focused on section 718.2 we have not talked about the other sections. Section 745.1 deals with the sentencing of people under the age of 18 convicted of first degree murder and second degree murder who shall be eligible for parole between five and ten years.

No more than 10 years shall the person spend in jail if he or she commits a murder in this country while under the age of 18. No more. What is the value of human life when we let our young people run through the streets committing murder and violent crime and we say the maximum is 10 years in jail for the crime?

There is a trial going on at this very moment which has despicable and heinous videotapes of the most repulsive crimes that perhaps have ever been committed in this country. Had these people been under the age of 18, the sentence would have been no more than 10 years in jail.

Where is this country going when it comes to criminal justice? Canadians from coast to coast are saying that they want safer streets and safer communities. And we turn around and pat those criminals on the head saying: "Do not do it any more. Perhaps you should know better".

It is time we got tough on crime, time that we told criminals we do not want to see them back in court again. The sentence should be appropriate. It should give them the message that we are serious about being serious on crime.

Government Orders

Section 717 regarding alternative measures and sentencing allows more appropriate sentencing. A couple of weeks ago we heard that a court in Saskatchewan banished a native for one year to live in isolation because he raped and humiliated someone. That is not sufficient.

(1700)

If we are going to give the courts the right to alternative measures then we should have some real serious messages built into the system that the punishment must fit the crime. To banish someone to the wilderness who is perfectly capable and acquainted with living in the wilderness is basically to tell him to go home for a year and stay there. When this country is totally and absolutely fed up with violence against women and everybody, we find that a sentence like that is repulsive.

We already have a private member's bill to try to repeal section 745.6. That is the open door for people who are sentenced to life in prison with no parole for 15 years. It used to be the faint last hope and now we find it is the open door to get back on the street. That also has to be closed.

I have one final point, on section 722. We have to applaud that one, because it now gives victims the right to be heard in court. We must say that is an advancement, because victims need to be heard. We need to hear the pain they have suffered. It is time that criminals realized they are destroying our society and society is going to speak back and hit back to ensure that criminals get the message once and for all that we have had enough with crime and criminals. We want to do what we can through tougher sentencing and tougher laws to ensure that crime statistics start going down rather than up.

I could speak all day on this particular subject, but I think I have put my point across. There are five bad points and one good point in this bill. Therefore, I think Reform and everybody else in this country wants this bill defeated.

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-41 has proven to be a very controversial bill based exclusively on the inclusion of the term sexual orientation in section 718.2, two words in a bill that runs 75 pages in length. These objections, even with a cursory study, do not stand up to scrutiny.

First I want to briefly deal with what the rest of C-41 talks about. C-41 provides the courts with a clear statement of principles and guidelines to be considered when sentencing offenders. Sentencing is a very delicate balance between competing principles. There is far more to consider than simply locking up the offender and separating him from society. This is not to say that the safety of society must not be the paramount goal, but we must also rehabilitate where we can and use our limited financial correctional resources in the wisest possible fashion.

Canada has one of the highest rates of incarceration in the western world. This is not because we are a violent or lawless people. On the contrary, only 10 per cent of crime in this country actually involves violence. Over half of all crimes involve property, not people. And frequently offenders are locked up not because they represent in any way a threat to society but because we simply do not know what to do with them. We do not have the resources at present in our code.

For example, nearly a third of the people liable to incarceration in our provincial jails are in that situation because they could not pay fines. Particularly hard hit of course are aboriginal and poor Canadians. The bill provides measures to help the provinces collect outstanding fines through the civil court system or levy community service or withhold provincial licences or permits in lieu of fines.

The bill also takes into much greater account the victims of crime, the people so often overlooked in the sentencing process. The new law will revise the parole provisions of the code. Henceforth, when an offender brings an application for an earlier parole eligibility date the court will specifically be required to take into account the perspective and evidence of the victim or the victim's family in deciding whether permission should be granted to the applicant to seek early parole.

(1705)

The bill also gives priority to the principle of restitution. Offenders must be made to understand the consequences of their crimes. To do this, the code will be amended to ensure that restitution orders can be enforced through civil courts like any other court order, through garnishment of wages, seizure, sale or otherwise. At the same time, the restitution order will not preclude the victim from suing for damages in the civil courts in that province.

Jails should be reserved for those who need them. Bill C-41 proposes alternatives to create a more equitable, less costly, and more effective system which Canadians can trust. It introduces a diversion program for adults guilty of minor crimes, for instance shoplifting, that will allow the courts to divert the offender into a program of community service and counselling to deal with the problem in a more humane and less costly manner.

Another new aspect of the bill is the conditional sentence. This provision will give authorities the discretion to have the offender serve his or her sentence in the community where—and I want to stress this—the court is satisfied that the offender would not endanger the safety of the community. If the offender does not comply with the conditions imposed as part of that sentence, he or she is brought back before the court to explain. If the court is not satisfied, it can order that the remainder of the sentence be served in custody.

Government Orders

Last, Bill C-41 will require that a judge passing sentence state her or his reasons and enter those reasons in the record of proceeding. This will increase public understanding of the judicial decision making process, encouraging judges to make consistent, well-informed, reasoned decisions based on the principles enunciated in the bill.

Now to section 718. Hate crime is increasingly manifest in Canada. There are over 40 organized hate groups operating in Canada today, and there is no evidence that the number is abating. It is with this in mind that the Liberal government has moved to toughen up the Criminal Code to crack down on crime and to make it known in absolutely unequivocal terms that we cannot and will not allow hatred and prejudice to tear us apart in this country. This was our promise to the Canadian people during the election campaign. We say now that crimes motivated by hate will be and indeed must be more severely punished.

Hatred comes in many guises. There is neo-Nazism, anti-Semitism, racism. They are only the obvious forms. Prejudice based on sexual orientation is just as real and one of the most common forms of discrimination we encounter today.

Some studies estimate that as much as 12 per cent of the population is gay, lesbian, or bisexual. Others purport to put the number as low as 3 per cent. Whatever the percentage, be it 1 per cent or 50 per cent, the fact is that we cannot tolerate prejudice and hate motivated crimes against any segment of our population, no matter how small. In fact, I will argue that if it is smaller then they need our protection more, since they do not have the numbers to protect themselves.

Studies show that as many as one-third of the people we are talking about here—or they are talking about, that great they over on the other side—have been threatened or subjected to violence simply because of who they are. According to the Metro Toronto police force, hate crimes motivated by sexual orientation today represent the third largest category of hate related offences.

The evidence all points to a steady increase in hate crime, particularly in the United States. It is naive to think that this does not spill over to Canada. If we condemn hatred, we must condemn all hatred, not just against some groups, but against all groups equally.

Some people have expressed a concern that the new law would legalize pedophilia. Let us be perfectly clear here. This legislation does not legalize any sexual activity that is currently outlawed, and the bill explicitly states so. A person's sexual orientation no more includes pedophilia than it does sexual assault or incest. I wonder how many heterosexuals think of themselves as rapists.

People who violate the sexual offences in the existing Criminal Code will continue to be punished to the full extent of the law. In fact, section 718.2.(ii) of the bill will allow for even

harsher sentences to be imposed on sex offenders where the victim is in a relationship of trust to the offender, for example, where a doctor molests a patient, a teacher a young student, a babysitter his or her charge, or a priest his parishioner.

I have also heard it said that the new bill will make it a crime to speak out publicly against homosexuality. Again, let us be perfectly clear. It is the right of every Canadian to be able to speak his or her mind. A church sermon expressing a moral view is not a crime. Freedom of speech and religion are both specifically protected under our charter of rights and freedoms.

(1710)

Bill C-41 as a sentencing bill will become operative only after someone is found guilty of a crime. Only at the sentencing hearing may a judge hear evidence that the crime was motivated by hatred, and only then may the judge take it into account in passing sentence.

Some critics have expressed concern that the bill will open the door to sweeping changes leading to the recognition of same sex families or gay and lesbian spouses. Bill C-41 does not and will not have this effect. You are in the wrong act, people. It does nothing more than what it appears to do. It is a bill to give the court guidance in determining a sentence where a crime has been committed. The bill does not advocate or encourage any life-style, nor does it undermine in any way the traditional family. It does not even speak to the subject. It is relevant only to the criminal law.

Bill C-41 is about many things. It is about the right of everyone to live as they choose within the law and to live their lives free from fear. It is far more than a debate on sexual orientation. It is about sentencing. It is designed to restore faith in our courts, faith in our system of justice, and faith in our communities, where people need to be reintegrated.

I urge all members of the House to give their support to this important bill.

I must say that I have felt ashamed in the last two days about statements of intolerance I have heard in the debate. I hope I never rise again saying that I feel ashamed about statements of intolerance in the greatest democracy in the world today, Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 5.12 p.m., pursuant to order made Thursday, June 8, 1995, and in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, in the interest of avoiding reading the list of motions aloud, I think you might find a disposition on the part of the House to consider that all the motions have been put, the division demanded and deferred, so

Government Orders

that we can proceed at once with the ringing of the bells for the division.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, if we could have unanimous agreement that after the vote on Bill C-41 is complete the House would adjourn for the evening, we would be agreeable. Otherwise we will not give unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I will not partake in the negotiations. I will simply put the motion as proposed by the parliamentary secretary and await the decision of the House.

The proposal of the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader is that the House deem moved and seconded, deem read, deem deferred for a recorded division. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There is not unanimous consent.

The question is on Motion No. 5. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-41, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing line 39, on page 16, with the following:

“amined that substance and stating the result of”.

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-41, in Clause 6, be amended in the French version, by replacing line 40, on page 33, with the following:

“garde d'enfant auxquels s'expose une”.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The question is on Motion No. 18. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion negatived.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The question is on Motion No. 20. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*English*]

We will now move to Group No. 4, Motion No. 19.

Hon. Raymond Chan (for Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-41, in Clause 6, be amended

(a) by striking out line 4, on page 26, and substituting the following:

“prison calculated in accordance with regulations made under subsection (7), and”;

(b) by adding, immediately after line 21, on page 26, the following:

“(7) The Lieutenant Governor in Council of a province may make regulations respecting the calculation of the costs and charges referred to in Clause (5)(a)(i)(B) and in paragraph 734.8(1)(b).”; and

(c) by striking out line 5 on page 30 and substituting the following:

“conveying the defaulter to prison, calculated in accordance with regulations made under subsection 734(7).”

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 76, a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): We will now move to Group No. 5, Motion No. 21.

(1720)

[Translation]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-41, in Clause 6, be amended by

(a) replacing line 9, on page 44, with the following:

“743.6 Notwithstanding subsection”; and

(b) by deleting lines 27 to 32, on page 44.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

Government Orders

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion negatived.)

[English]

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-41, in Clause 6, be amended:

(a) by deleting lines 26 to 49, on page 47, lines 1 to 45, on page 48 and lines 1 to 24, on page 49; and

(b) by replacing lines 26 and 27, on page 49, with the following:

“ment served for the purposes of section 745 or 745.4, there shall be included any”.

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-41, in Clause 24, be amended:

(a) by replacing lines 41 and 42, on page 62, with the following:

“ences to “745”, “745.1”, “745.4” and “745.5”, respectively; or”; and

(b) by replacing line 3, on page 63, with the following:

“745.1, 745.4 or 745.5, there shall be”.

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-41, in Schedule IV, be amended by deleting item 44, on page 74.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The question is on Motion No. 22. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 76, a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 23 and 25.

Hon. Raymond Chan (for Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-41 be amended by adding immediately after line 28, on page 63, the following:

“25.1 For greater certainty, conduct that constituted an offence under the Criminal Code before the date on which this section comes into force constitutes the same offence after that date.”

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The question is on Motion No. 24. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at the report stage of the bill now before the House.

Call in the members.

(1740)

And the bells having rung:

The Speaker: Colleagues, we are going to have a few votes this afternoon. We are going to take it nice and easy so that everyone understands what is going on. We are not going to rush at all. Here we go.

The first question is on Motion No. 3. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 3 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motion No. 4. A negative vote on Motion No. 3 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 4.

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 278)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Cummins	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McTeague
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Nunziata
Ramsay	Ringma
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson

White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—47

White (North Vancouver)

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Arseneault
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélanger
Bélisle	Caccia
Campbell	Cannis
Caron	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen	Comuzzi
Cowling	Crête
de Savoye	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromisky	Dubé
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey	Godin
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Harb	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jacob	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Paré	Patry
Payne	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Pomerleau
Reed	Rideout
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Simmons
ISolomon	

Government Orders

Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wells
Young

St-Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wayne
Wood
Zed—179

Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Johnston
Langlois
Lebel
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Mayfield
McLaughlin
Meredith
Morrison
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay
Robinson
Schmidt
Silye
Solomon
St-Laurent
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—87

Gilmour
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (MacLeod)
Hoepfner
Jennings
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lefebvre
Loubier
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Pomerleau
Ringma
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Speaker
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copp
Dalphond—Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Asselin
Blondin—Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

(1750)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(Division No. 279)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Caron
Crête
de Savoye
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion

Ablonczy
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Dubé
Dumas
Epp
Forseth

Adams
Allmand
Arseneault
Augustine
Barnes
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Cohen
Cowling
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guamieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Anawak
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beaumier
Bethel
Bhaduria
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Comuzzi
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Ifody
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague

Government Orders

Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
Nunziata	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Reed	Rideout
Robillard	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Simmons
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Wood
Young	Zed—140

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dingwall	Dupuy
East	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Plamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

(1800)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 5. We are now in Group No. 2. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 5 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motion Nos. 6 to 17 inclusive. A negative vote on Motion No. 5 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 6.

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

(Division No. 280)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Cummins	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Hermanson

Hill (MacLeod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Nunziata	Ramsay
Ringma	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Skoke	Solberg
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson
Wayne	White (Fraser Valley West)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—48

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Arseneault
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélanger
Bélisle	Caccia
Campbell	Cannis
Caron	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen	Comezzi
Cowling	Crête
Culbert	de Savoye
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jacob
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Landry
Langlois	Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lefebvre	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	Nunez

*Government Orders**And more than five members having risen:*

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

*(Division No. 281)***YEAS****Members**

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (MacLeod)
Hoepfner
Jennings
Manning
Mayfield
McTeague
Mills (Red Deer)
Ramsay
Schmidt
Serré
Skoke
Speaker
Stinson
Thompson
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)
Wood—53

Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Duncan
Forseth
Gouk
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Iftody
Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Silye
Solberg
Steckle
Strahl
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams

NAYS**Members**

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beaumur
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel
Bhaduria
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Cowling
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham

Alcock
Althouse
Arseneault
Augustine
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Comuzzi
Crête
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)

O'Brien
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Serré
Sheridan
Solomon
St-Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Young

Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Rideout
Robinson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wood
Zed—180

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copp
Dalphond—Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Asselin
Blondin—Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Davialt
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

(1810)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 6. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 6 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions Nos. 7 and 17. A negative vote on Motion No. 6 necessitates the question being put on Motions Nos. 7 and 17. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Government Orders

Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jacob	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
Nunziata	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Paré
Patry	Payne
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Reed
Rideout	Robillard
Robinson	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Sheridan
Simmons	Solomon
Speller	St-Laurent
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wells
Young	Zed—174

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dingwall	Dupuy
Easter	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Plamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

(1820)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 6 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 7. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 7 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions 8 to 16. A negative vote on Motion No. 7 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 8.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Some hon. members: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 282)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Bhaduria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hermanson	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoeppner
Hubbard	Iftody
Jennings	Johnston
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McTeague	Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Nunziata
Payne	Ramsay
Ringma	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Serré
Shepherd	Silye
Skoke	Solberg
Speaker	Steckle
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson	Wappel
Wayne	White (Fraser Valley West)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams
Wood—59	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Arseneault
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Béclair
Bélangier	Bélisle
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Cohen
Comuzzi	Cowling
Crête	Culbert
de Savoye	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromisky	Dubé
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey	Godin
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Harb	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Ianno	Jackson
Jacob	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Langlois	Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Leroux (Sheffield)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Paré
Patry	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Pomerleau
Reed	Rideout
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan	Simmons
Solomon	St-Laurent
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wells
Young	Zed—166

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphonde—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dingwall	Dupuy
Easter	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Plamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

(1830)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 lost.

We are still on Group No. 2. The next question is on Motion No. 8. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 8 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions 9 to 16. A negative vote on Motion No. 8 necessitates the question being put on Motions 9 to 11.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.**Some hon. members:** No.**The Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.**Some hon. members:** Yea.**The Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.**Some hon. members:** Nay.**The Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.*And more than five members having risen:*

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

(Division No. 283)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Arseneault	Benoit
Bhaduria	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Cummins	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Hermanson
Hill (MacLeod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Iftody
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Loney
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McTeague	Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Nunziata

Government Orders

Payne
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd
Skoke
Speaker
Stinson
Szabo
Volpe
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)
Wood—65

Ramsay
Schmidt
Serré
Silye
Solberg
Steckle
Strahl
Thompson
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams

Rocheleau
Rompkey
Sheridan
St-Laurent
Stewart (Brant)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Wells
Zed—157

Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Walker
Young

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Augustine
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Comuzzi
Crête
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Gagliano
Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Jackson
Keys
Knutson
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard

Alcock
Althouse
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beaumier
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Cowling
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Easter
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harvard
Ianno
Jacob
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Paré
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Rideout
Robinson

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Coppes
Dalphond—Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Asselin
Blondin—Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Davault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

(1840)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 8 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 9. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.**Some hon. members:** No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.**The Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.**Some hon. members:** Nay.**The Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.*And more than five members having risen:*

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

(Division No. 284)

YEAS

Members

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Brien
Caron
Crête
Dubé
Dumas
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Langlois
Lebel
Loubier

Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
de Savoye
Duceppe
Fillion
Godin
Jacob
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier

Ménard
Paré
Pomerleau
St-Laurent
Venne—33

Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rosemont)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allmand
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bélair
Catterall
Comuzzi
Dhaliwal
Duncan
English
Finestone
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Harvard
Hill (Macleod)
Hoepfner
Jennings
Jordan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Manning
Marleau
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McLaughlin
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nault
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Rideout
Robillard
Rock
Schmidt
Silye
Solberg
Speaker
Stinson
Thompson
Walker
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)
Wood

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anawak
Augustine
Benoit
Bhaduria
Blondin—Andrew
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Caccia
Chan
Cummins
Duhamel
Eggleton
Epp
Flis
Forseth
Gagliano
Gilmour
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Johnston
Keyes
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Morrison
Pagtakhan
Phinney
Ramsay
Ringma
Robinson
Rompkey
Scott (Skeena)
Skoke
Solomon
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Vanclief
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams
Young —114

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel

Asselin
Blondin—Andrew
Calder
Clancy

Government Orders

Copps
Dalphond—Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Crawford
Davialt
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

(1850)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 9 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 10. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(Division No. 285)

YEAS

Members

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
de Savoye
Dumas
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Langlois
Lebel
Loubier
Mercier
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Robinson
Solomon
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne—37

Bergeron
Bernier (Mégaric—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien
Caron
Crête
Dubé
Fillion
Godin
Jacob
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Shefford)
McLaughlin
Ménard
Paré
Pomerleau
Rocheleau
St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rosemont)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allmand
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Benoit
Bethel

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anawak
Augustine
Beaumier
Bertrand
Bevilacqua

Government Orders

Bhaduria	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Caccia
Campbell	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Cohen
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	Cummins
De Villers	Dhaliwal
Discepolo	Dromisky
Duhamel	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grey (Beaver River)
Grose	Grubel
Guarnieri	Hanrahan
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Harvard
Hermanson	Hickey
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Johnston
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Massé
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
Meredith	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Ramsay
Reed	Rideout
Ringma	Robillard
Rock	Rompkey
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Scott (Skeena)	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Silye	Skoke
Solberg	Speaker
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Terrana
Thalheimer	Thompson
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wayne	Wells
White (Fraser Valley West)	White (North Vancouver)
Williams	Wood
Young	Zed—178

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphonde—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dingwall	Dupuy
Easter	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Plamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 lost.

We are still on Group No. 2.

(1900)

The next question is on Motion No. 11. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 11 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions Nos. 12 to 16. A negative vote on Motion No. 11 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 12.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(Division No. 286)

YEAS

Members	
Cummins	Forseth
Gouk	Hanrahan
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Jordan	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McTeague	Meredith
Morrison	Scott (Skeena)
Serré	Shepherd
Silye	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Volpe	Wappel
White (North Vancouver)	Wood—24

Government Orders

NAYS

(1905)

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Bélair
Bélisle	Caccia
Catterall	Chan
Comuzzi	Crête
Dhaliwal	Duceppe
Duhamel	Duncan
Eggleton	English
Epp	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gilmour
Goodale	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings	Johnston
Keyes	Langlois
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Manley
Manning	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé	Mayfield
McLaughlin	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Nault
Nunez	Nunziata
Pagtakhan	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Ramsay
Rideout	Ringma
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Rompkey
Schmidt	Skoke
Solomon	Speaker
Speller	Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Vanclief
Venne	Wayne
White (Fraser Valley West)	Williams
Young —105	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphon—Gural	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dingwall	Dupuy
Easter	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Plamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 12 in Group No. 2. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 12 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions Nos. 13 to 16. A negative vote on Motion No. 12 necessitates the question being put on Motions Nos. 13 and 15.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.**Some hon. members:** No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.**The Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.**Some hon. members:** Nay.**The Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.*And more than five members having risen:*

(The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 287)

YEAS

Members

Cummins	Fontana
Forseath	Harper (Calgary West)
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hopkins	Hubbard
Jordan	Lee
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McTeague
Meredith	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Morrison	Nault
Serré	Shepherd
Silye	Wappel
White (North Vancouver)	Wood—22

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Allmand	Althouse
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Benoit
Bergeron	Bhaduria
Blaikie	Blondin—Andrew
Boudria	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Brien	Bélair
Caccia	Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac)	de Savoye
Duhamel	Duncan
Eggleton	Epp
Finestone	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilmour	Goodale
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jacob	Jennings
Johnston	Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loney	MacAulay

Government Orders

MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Manley
Manning	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Massé
Mayfield	Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata	Peters
Peterson	Ramsay
Rideout	Ringma
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Schmidt
Simmons	Skoke
Solberg	Speaker
Stewart (Northumberland)	Strahl
Thompson	Wayne
Williams	Young —74

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dingwall	Dupuy
Easter	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Plamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

(1910)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 12 lost.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like you to clarify two things for me. I have noticed that a lot of government members are going in and out of their seats. I believe—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: The hon. whip of the Reform Party has the floor.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I rose to ask you to please check the record on the last vote on Motion No. 12. I believe you will find the minister of immigration cast his vote and should be in that total, but before the totals were given he left his seat. That vote should not count.

The Speaker: Colleagues, you will recall earlier in the night I asked you to kindly stay in your seats from the beginning to the end of each vote. Perhaps one or two members did leave a bit earlier. I cannot see all members at the same time. I appeal to you that when a vote begins, once you vote please stay in your seat until the vote is terminated.

I will do it this one time. Because an hon. member questioned another hon. member's presence, it is very simple, did the hon. minister of immigration leave his seat during the vote?

(1920)

Mr. Marchi: Yes.

The Speaker: There it is. His vote in this instance I rule will not count by his own admission.

I ask members to please abide by the rules. We will get through these votes, they will just take a little while.

The next question is on Motion No. 13. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 13 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motion No. 14. A negative vote on Motion No. 13 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 14.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was negatived on division:)

(Division No. 288)

YEAS

Members

McTeague	Serré
Skoke	Steckle
Wappel	Wayne—6

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Allmand
Althouse	Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Barnes
Beaumier	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Bhaduria
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Caccia	Caron
Discepola	Dromisky
Dubé	Epp
Fillion	Forseth
Godin	Goodale
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Hopkins	Jennings
Johnston	Keyes
Loney	Manley
Manning	Marchi
Marleau	Mayfield
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard	Nunziata
Paré	Peterson
Ramsay	Rideout

Government Orders

Ringma
Schmidt
Simmons
Solomon
Thompson
White (North Vancouver)
Young —67

Rompkey
Silye
Solberg
Speaker
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Coppes
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Asselin
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Davialt
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

(1925)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 13 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 14. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(Division No. 289)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anawak	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bertrand	Bhaduria
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Boudria	Bélangier
Caccia	Chan
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
English	Fewchuk
Finestone	Flis
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Grose
Guarnieri	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson

Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Marleau
McCormick
McKinnon
Mifflin
Murray
Petry
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Rideout
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Ur
Verran
Walker
Wells
Young —91

Lastewka
Lee
Loney
Malhi
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Parrish
Payne
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Robillard
Rompkey
Serré
Sheridan
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Terrana
Torsney
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Althouse
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Brien	Bélisle
Caron	Crête
de Savoye	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Epp	Fillion
Forsyth	Gilmour
Godin	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Guay	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hermanson
Hill (MacLeod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jacob
Jennings	Johnston
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Loubier	Manning
Mayfield	Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)	Ménard
Nunziata	Paré
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Skoke	Solberg
Solomon	Speaker
Steckle	Stinson
Thompson	Venne
White (Fraser Valley West)	White (North Vancouver)—62

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Coppes
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dingwall

Asselin
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Davialt
Deshaies
Dupuy

Government Orders

Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

(1935)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 14 carried.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I seek some clarification from the Chair. My understanding is that the effect of Motion No. 14 by the member for Scarborough West is to insert a comma into the legislation. Can you confirm that, please, or can the author confirm the effect of that amendment?

Mr. Wappel: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to confirm that the amendment adds a comma. I am very happy that the government supported it.

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 15. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 15 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motion No. 16. A negative vote on Motion No. 15 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 16.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(Division No. 290)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie
Bélisle
Crête
Dubé
Dumas
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Jacob
Lebel
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mercier
Paré
Pomerleau
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wayne—33

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien
Caron
de Savoye
Duceppe
Fillion
Godin
Harris
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Loubier
McLaughlin
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Venne

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew
Bridgman
Caccia
Chan
Cummins
English
Finestone
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Goodale
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hill (Macleod)
Lincoln
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McGuire
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Nault
Phinney
Ramsay
Ringma
Rock
Scott (Skeena)
Simmons
Speaker
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Volpe
Wappel
Wood—79

Ablonczy
Anawak
Augustine
Benoit
Bhaduria
Boudria
Bélair
Catterall
Comuzzi
Duhamel
Epp
Fiis
Forsyth
Gagliano
Gilmour
Gray (Windsor West)
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Harvard
Lee
Loney
Manning
Marleau
Mayfield
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Milliken
Morrison
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Rideout
Robillard
Rompkey
Silye
Solberg
Speller
Stinson
Vanclief
Walker
White (Fraser Valley West)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copp
Dalphond—Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Asselin
Blondin—Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Davialt
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

(1940)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 15 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 16.

Mr. Szabo: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My Motion No. 16 calls for stiffer sentences against spousal abusers. Today in debate a motion was put by the hon. member for Hamilton West to amend Motion No. 17 that had been moved by the Minister of Justice.

I am pleased that Motion No. 17, as amended, would very nicely cover the intent of my motion. Therefore I ask for unanimous consent of the House to withdraw Motion No. 16.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion No. 16 withdrawn.)

(1945)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(Division No. 291)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Anawak
Arseneault	Assadourian
Barnes	Beaumier
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brien	Bryden
Bélair	Bélangier
Bélisle	Caccia
Campbell	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen	Comuzzi
Crête	Culbert
Cummins	DeVillers
Discepola	Dromisky
Dubé	Duhamel
English	Epp
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godfrey
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Guarnieri	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Harvard
Hickey	Hill (MacLeod)
Hubbard	Ianno

Iftody
Kirkby
Lastewka
Lebel
Leroux (Shefford)
Maloney
Marchi
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mercier
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Rideout
Robinson
Rock
Sheridan
Simmons
Solomon
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wayne
White (Fraser Valley West)

Government Orders

Jackson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lee
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Manning
Marleau
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard
Rocheleau
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Silye
Skoke
Speaker
St-Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wells
Wood—150

NAYS

Members

Benoit	Bridgman
Duncan	Gilmour
Hart	Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Ramsay
Ringma	Solberg
Strahl	Williams—12

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral	Daviaut
Debien	Deshaies
Dingwall	Dupuy
Easter	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Plamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

Government Orders

(1950)

The Speaker: I declare the amendment carried.

This is the last question, my colleagues, in Group No. 2. The question is on Motion No. 17 as amended. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 17, as amended, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 292)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Assadourian	Barnes
Beaumier	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Bélair	Bélangier
Caccia	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Cohen
Comuzzi	Crête
Culbert	Cummins
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepolo	Dromisky
Dubé	Duhamel
Duncan	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godfrey
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Guarnieri	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Harvard
Hermanson	Hickey
Hill (Macleod)	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Langlois
Lastewka	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Lee
Leroux (Shefford)	Loney
MacAulay	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Maloney
Manning	Marchi
Marleau	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
Mercier	Meredith
Mifflin	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell

Morrison	Murphy
Murray	Nunez
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Paré	Patry
Payne	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Reed
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan	Silye
Simmons	Skoke
Solomon	Speaker
Speller	St-Laurent
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wayne	Wells
White (Fraser Valley West)	Wood—158

NAYS

Members

Benoit	Bridgman
Epp	Gilmour
Hart	Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
Ramsay	Ringma
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Strahl	Williams—14

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dingwall	Dupuy
Easter	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Plamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

(1955)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 17, as amended, carried.

We are now beginning Group No. 3. The next question is on Motion No. 20.

(The House divided on Motion No. 20, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 293)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins	Dubé
Duceppe	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Hermanson
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Leroux (Shefford)
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McLaughlin	Mercier
Meredith	Morrison
Nunez	Paré
Pomerleau	Ramsay
Ringma	Robinson
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Solomon	St-Laurent
Stinson	Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne	Wayne
White (Fraser Valley West)	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—59	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Barnes
Beaumier	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Campbell	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Cohen
Comuzzi	Culbert
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky
Duhamel	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harvard
Hickey	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Keys	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna

Government Orders

Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
Nunziata	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Rideout	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Skoke
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wood
Young	Zed—116

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphoné—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshais
Dingwall	Dupuy
Easter	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Plamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

(2005)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 20 lost.

We are now on Group No. 4. The next question is on Motion No. 19.

(The House divided on Motion No. 19, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 294)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Barnes
Bellehumeur	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélisle	Caccia
Campbell	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Cohen	Comuzzi
Crête	Culbert
DeVillers	Discepola
Dromisky	Duceppe
Duhamel	Eggleton
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Gagliano
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gray (Windsor West)

Government Orders

Guay	Harvard
Hubbard	Jackson
Keys	Langlois
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	
Lee	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Massé
McGuire	McLaughlin
Murphy	Nunez
O'Brien	Patry
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Rideout
Robillard	Rock
Rompkey	Solomon
Speller	Stewart (Northumberland)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne	Volpe
Wayne	Wood
Young —80	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Gilmour	Grubel
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jennings	Johnston
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith	Morrison
Ramsay	Ringma
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson	White (Fraser Valley West)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—36

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dingwall	Dupuy
Easter	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Plamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

(2010)

After the taking of the vote:

The Speaker: The Table would like some clarification. Either the member of Parliament for Beaver River voted twice or someone like her voted. Would she tell us if she did vote and if she did, which way she voted.

Miss Grey: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Fortunately there only is one member for Beaver River in this House. I am about as tired as the woman who is calling the vote. She is exhausted. I stood to try to expedite it. I am in fact a nay.

The Speaker: I do not know if this is in order but maybe the hon. member for Beaver River could pass this time.

Miss Grey: I am happy to pass, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 19 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 22. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 23 and 25.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. On December 13 the House passed at second reading private member's Bill C-226, which deals with section 745 of the Criminal Code.

The House in principle supported the repeal of section 745 of the Criminal Code. This amendment to this piece of legislation purports to amend a bill or a section of the Criminal Code Parliament has already pronounced on in terms of repealing it at second reading.

The private member's bill is presently before the justice committee. I seek some direction from the Chair as to whether this amendment and the section in this bill are in order.

(2020)

The Speaker: I have been asked for a ruling. I rule these amendments are in order because the other bill is not now before the House and therefore we will proceed with Motion No. 22.

(The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 295)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Benoit
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Gilmour	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Maloney
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McLaughlin
McTeague	Meredith
Morrison	Nunziata
Ramsay	Ringma
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Silye	Skoke
Solomon	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Terrana	Thompson
Wappel	Wayne
White (Fraser Valley West)	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—47	

Government Orders

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

NAYS

Members

Allmand	Anawak
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bergeron
Blondin-Andrew	Boudria
Brien	Bélangier
Caccia	Caron
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Comuzzi	Duhamel
Dumas	Eggleton
Fillion	Finestone
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey	Godin
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jacob	Kirkby
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leroux (Shefford)	Loney
MacAulay	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Marleau	Massé
McKinnon	Mercier
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	O'Brien
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peters	Peterson
Pomerleau	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Simmons
St-Laurent	St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)	Telegdi
Thalheimer	Ur
Young —75	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin-Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dingwall	Dupuy
Easter	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Piamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

(2025)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 22 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 23 and 25 lost also.

We are now at Group No. 7. The next question is on Motion No. 24.

(Division No. 296)

YEAS

Members

Alcock	Allmand
Althouse	Anawak
Arseneault	Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bellehumeur
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Boudria
Bélaire	Bélangier
Caccia	Chan
Comuzzi	Crête
Culbert	Discepola
Dromisky	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Eggleton	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Kirkby	Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McCormick	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	Mercier
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nunez	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri	Pomerleau
Rideout	Robillard
Rock	Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Shepherd
Sheridan	Simmons
Skoke	Solomon
Speller	St-Laurent
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur	Venne
Wells	Young
Zed—107	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Cummins	Duncan
Epp	Gilmour
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Hanrahan

Government Orders

Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hermanson	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jennings	Johnston
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Ramsay	Ringma
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson
Wayne	White (Fraser Valley West)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—44

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dingwall	Dupuy
Easter	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Plamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

(2035)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 24 carried.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Miss Grey: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was sure which way I voted. I should like to seek unanimous consent of the House to give a great round of applause to Audrey O'Brien who has been on her feet for hours and called every vote here tonight.

Mr. Fontana: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Now that members of the Reform Party have been gracious enough to pay tribute to someone who has done a lot of work for us tonight in counting the votes, perhaps they would stop playing games and get on with the votes.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Neither of those were points of order.

Mr. Hermanson: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member on the other side impugned that we do not take serious the democratic process. I would ask that he withdraw the comments.

The Speaker: We have been at it now for three hours. Everything is going quite well. I am reminded of the story of the elephant and what he said when his tail was cut off. He said: "It won't be long now".

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(Division No. 297)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Arseneault
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélangier
Bélisle	Caccia
Campbell	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Cohen	Comuzzi
Cowling	Crête
Culbert	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromisky	Dubé
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jacob
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Langlois	Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Leroux (Sheffield)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau

Government Orders

Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Serré
Simmons
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wood
Zed—167

McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Rideout
Robinson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Solomon
St-Laurent
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wells
Young

Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

(2045)

After the taking of the vote:

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not think the name of the member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley was called. I was listening quite carefully and I would like to ascertain whether it was correctly registered.

The Speaker: His name was called and recorded.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 37, because of the delay, Private Members' Business will be rescheduled for another sitting.

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Skoke
Speaker
Stinson
Thompson
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Duncan
Forseth
Gouk
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Manning
Mayfield
McTeague
Mills (Red Deer)
Ramsay
Schmidt
Silye
Solberg
Steckle
Strahl
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—50

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Coppes
Dalphond—Guiral
Debien
Dingwall

Asselin
Blondin—Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Davialt
Deshaies
Dupuy

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT, 1995

The House proceeded to the consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries.

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House agrees to amendment number 4(a) made by the Senate to Bill C-69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundary commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries, and this House disagrees with amendments numbers 1, 2, 3, 4(b), 4(c), 5 and 6 for the following reasons:

The bill was, in accordance with the new procedures of this House, prepared by a committee of the House. While amendment number 4(a) corrects an omission, the other amendments address points, each of which were supported by members representing at least two of the three parties officially recognized in the House. Taken together, the bill represents a balance aimed at improving the responsiveness of the system of readjusting electoral boundaries both to rapid shifts of population and to the operative realities of effective representation of the people, a balance that, in the opinion of this House, requires:

(a) in view of the varied Canadian geography and demography, the retention of a variation of up to 25 per cent from the electoral quota of each province (addressed by amendments number 1 and 6(a));

Government Orders

(b) the avoidance of unnecessary electoral boundary adjustments in provinces where shifts of population do not require them (addressed in amendments number 2, 3, 5, 6(b)(i) and 7);

(c) the clear acceptance of the non-partisan status of members of commissions through the provision of parliamentary oversight of appointments (addressed by amendments number 4(b) and 4(c));

(d) the retention of the definition of "community of interest" developed on a non-partisan basis by currently serving elected representatives, through a consensus of all parties, in the House of Commons Standing Committee rather than the substitution of another definition (addressed by amendment number 6(b)(ii)).

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to support the motion proposed by the government House leader in respect of the Senate amendments to Bill C-69.

The motion before the House accepts one of the amendments proposed by the Senate to this bill and rejects the other amendments proposed.

I am pleased to support the motion before the House.

Mr. Gilmour: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, under a little used section on Private Members' Business, could the Speaker indicate whether that private members' motion will be within the closing session of the next seven days.

(2050)

The Speaker: In response to the question of order it is the responsibility of the Speaker to reschedule this private member's day within the next 10 days.

It is my intention to try to reschedule it before the end of this session. This session is scheduled to finish in the next seven days and I will attempt to put it on there.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to assist you in rescheduling it at 3.30 this morning.

I want to go ahead with the speech I have before me. This is an attempt to obstruct my speech and I hope the Chair will put a short end to it.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, in light of the proceedings earlier this evening it might be wise to now move that the House do now adjourn.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands has the floor and the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster cannot move that motion as a point of order.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, the government fulfilled its obligation in respect of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act when it appointed a committee to draft and bring in a bill to the House. The procedure and House affairs committee, which I have the honour to chair, worked for a considerable period of time drafting and bringing in amendments to the Electoral

Boundaries Readjustment Act. In most cases the amendments were agreeable to all the members on the committee.

There were only a couple of items on which there was disagreement. I am sure that will be reflected in the speeches from the other parties in the course of the evening. Basically there was substantial agreement on the elements of the bill.

The end result of the work the committee did was to give Canadians a more open, transparent and effective system of readjusting electoral boundaries. The bill which was brought to the House by the government based on the committee report and in substantial compliance with the committee report was adopted by the House following on that committee's work.

In other words, there had been consensus at the beginning. There was consensus basically all the way through, although I respect the fact the opposition parties voted against the bill in the end for two different reasons. One was unconnected with the bill and condemned the bill for something it did not contain. The other was due to disagreement with one of the provisions in the bill which carried on a provision from the previous law that allowed for ridings that vary by more than 25 per cent from the provincial quotient.

As I have indicated, the motion proposed by the government House leader agrees with Senate amendment 4(a) which would add a requirement to the law that members of a boundaries commission be resident in the province for which the commission is established. That was omitted from the bill largely by oversight on the part of the committee and we are happy to agree with the Senate that the provision could be fixed. I acknowledge the oversight on the part of the standing committee and I am glad to see it corrected by this amendment.

(2055)

However, the other amendments proposed by the Senate in my submission are unacceptable because they would repeal the most important innovations set out in Bill C-69, each of which was supported by at least two of the parties in the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs when introduced and considered in that committee.

These amendments therefore upset the balance struck by the standing committee in improving the system for electoral boundaries and in my view should therefore be rejected.

I respectfully disagree with Amendments Nos. 1 and 6(a) to reduce the maximum deviation from the electoral quota for a province from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. This quota was agreed on after extensive discussion, after extensive hearings in the committee and I admit over the objections of the Reform Party which wanted to reduce the quota to 15 per cent. There is a genuine difference of opinion on that. Members of the Reform Party will likely maintain that difference of opinion tonight.

Government Orders

Members of the Bloc and members of the Liberal Party are both of the view that in a country as large and as geographically diverse as Canada limiting the boundaries to 15 per cent of the provincial quotient, a deviation of 15 per cent either way, would be too restrictive and might result in serious inequities, leaving members to represent enormous ridings scattered over a vast distance with very few people in them but obviously trying to make up for the lack of population by adding to those ridings in a very substantial way.

We do not feel the system in the past has worked that badly. The most recent set of commissions has done a poor job and we have come up with a new and better way of appointing of those commissions and in our view a better way of having the commissions work where there is public input early in the process. That was a provision agreed on by all parties in the committee.

I also disagree with proposed Amendments Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6(b)(i) and 7 which would repeal the provisions that would avoid unnecessary electoral boundaries readjustments in provinces where shifts in population did not require them. Again, this set of provisions was agreed to by all parties.

Why would we spend money on having an electoral redistribution in a province when there has been no significant change in the population, no new seats in the province and the boundaries are more than adequate? Yet the committee formed that view very strongly. We put this in the bill. The Senate has decided in its view this should come out. We disagreed with that and are requesting the Senate simply acknowledge the House is insisting on these amendments and accept that we disagree and allow the bill to proceed.

Amendments Nos. 4(b) and (c) which in my view are unacceptable eliminate the provision of parliamentary oversight of appointments to electoral boundaries commissions. The appointment process in our view had flaws. The committee agreed on this. After extensive discussion in committee we agreed on this new appointment procedure.

Mr. Speaker, under the procedure in the bill you have the right to make nominations of persons to act as commissioners. Those names are to be submitted to the House of Commons and will be considered here. If members object motions can be moved that if carried could result in your having to come up with a new appointment. We think that is a fair and reasonable way to proceed. We supported it. The House supported at the time the bill came here and we hope it will be supported in the Senate later.

Also we disagree with Amendment No. 6(b)(i) which would redefine community of interest by incorporating the definition recommended by the royal commission on electoral reform and party financing. I think all members of the committee consid-

ered whether to adopt that definition. The definition was agreed on after extensive discussion among all members of the committee, and there was substantial agreement on it.

[*Translation*]

Bill C-69 was a good agreement, approved by all committee members on almost all points. There are, however, some clauses in the bill that are not to everyone's liking.

The member for Bellechasse, who is here now, did not agree with the bill, because he felt certain provisions were not included. He will probably talk about them in his speech. That is fine, but unfortunately everybody cannot have everything they want in the bill.

(2100)

We have before us a fine bill, and I hope that all the members here will support the motion currently before the House proposed by the government House leader to send these amendments and the wishes of the House to the Senate for its consideration and quick adoption of the bill.

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not rising to move that the House do now adjourn but to speak to the substantive motion addressed by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

First of all, I may say it is rather ironic that a House whose members are appointed by the governor in council, by cabinet, to all intents and purposes, to sit until the age of 75 tries to teach us a thing or two about democracy in connection with such basic issues as electoral boundaries readjustment.

I am very pleased to see that the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands is listening carefully to my speech, as is the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine. We have worked very hard without a hint of partisanship. I would also like to mention the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior who showed a great interest in this bill. The hon. member was instrumental in having the bill drafted in its present form, especially one specific point that I will discuss later on, and I am referring to the 25 per cent deviation from the electoral quota.

I said earlier that the non-elected House, the Canadian Senate, wants to teach us a lesson about democracy, and I think there is something fundamentally wrong with this Parliament. It should be up to us to say that the other House should either cease to exist and be abolished or its members should be elected, one or the other.

In any case, the process started a long time ago with Bill C-18 which suspended for a certain period of time the work of commissions which had already been appointed until June this year so we are getting close to the deadline, and the Committee of the House on Procedure and House Affairs was subsequently instructed to draft a bill.

Government Orders

Strictly speaking, it is not a government bill, although it was tabled on behalf of the Government House Leader. This is a bill that was drafted in committee, before the Standing Committee of the House on Procedure and House Affairs, as I said before.

There was a very broad consensus among committee members on most clauses. In fact, there were far more items on which we agreed than on which we disagreed.

Unfortunately, there was one item on which we could not agree and since it was a fundamental rule, the crux of the whole debate, this meant that the official opposition, the Bloc Québécois, could not vote for Bill C-69 on third reading. This item was the subject of a motion that I tabled in this House and that was defeated, a motion that guaranteed Quebec a minimum representation rate of 25 per cent, irrespective of its population at the time of the census.

We hope we will never have to apply this minimum guarantee, because in the next federal election, I assume or in any case I hope we will then be living within a new Quebec-Canada partnership so that this legislation would not apply to Quebec, which will have its own legislation that will apply to Quebec's 125 ridings.

(2105)

This basic characteristic of holding 25 per cent of the seats was, and still is, related to the fundamental notion that Canada has two founding peoples, not equal in numbers but equal in rights. A pact, an agreement, was made in 1867 between two nations: the anglophone nation and the francophone nation.

They decided to pool certain things to be managed by this Parliament and they decided to grant the legislatures of the founding provinces, and those which subsequently joined confederation, specific jurisdictions which made them autonomous and sovereign states, when it came to their spheres of jurisdiction. Did they ever fool us in 1867. And I use the polite term, because I cannot use any other in this House.

Today, the interpretation of events given by our Reform colleagues, in particular the hon. members for Calgary West and Kindersley-Lloydminster, has made us realize that the Canada of today is no longer a bicultural and biethnic country, but a multicultural and multiethnic one: this is not the Canada of 1867, the one in which our fathers, mothers, grandfathers, grandmothers and ancestors so strongly believed.

In 1965, the premier, Daniel Johnson Sr., said that Canada will be made up of two nations and two cultures or it will cease to exist. We have already seen this in practice, the proof. Just look at what is happening today. This is what Mr. Johnson said in 1965, Sir George-Étienne Cartier said in 1867, Louis Riel said after him, and Franco-Ontarians were saying at the time that they were making demands—remember Regulation 17 in Ontario—at the time that they were pursuing the issue of having to fund public schools and fund their own private schools, because

public funding for their schools was dropped altogether. These are the kinds of things that tend to be forgotten in this country.

There is a tendency to forget the heroic battles led not only by francophones in Quebec, but by francophones outside it and by Acadians to protect their rights. These were major battles. The fight against the Greenway laws in Manitoba. From 1889 on, the rights of francophones were suspended in Manitoba and they were only restored by the Supreme Court almost 100 years later.

Over the past 100 years in Manitoba, the percentage of francophones has gone from 50 per cent, one in every two Manitobans was francophone, to 4 per cent. That is the result of having no constitutional guarantees.

If only we had known. We had no way of knowing or those who should have seen it coming did not. And now we are faced with a situation where the survival of francophone communities, in particular outside Quebec, is a daily struggle. Even the survival of the francophone community in Quebec is a weighty issue, and we have to deal with it every day because each new day brings with it new menaces.

Do not forget that we only represent two per cent of the population on the North American continent. Therefore, we should be equipped with some legal protection in our battle as North American francophones. Where were those who, in the Senate, claimed to have promoted a guarantee of 25 per cent for Quebec?

Where was the senator for Stadacona, the one who claimed to have promoted protection of 25 per cent of seats for Quebec? Where was the senator for Lasalle, the one who claimed that Trudeau had made an offer that Quebec had rejected?

There is nothing in the Senate's report about a guarantee of 25 per cent. The Senate's greatest omission is to have failed to consider the issue of representation for Quebec and probably francophone communities as well, to ensure a guaranteed minimum in this House.

We must not forget that other provinces such as Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick have, because of the senatorial provision of 1915, a constitutional guarantee of never having fewer members in this House than they have senators in the Senate.

Quebec does not have this guarantee. The national home of the francophone people in Canada has no guaranteed representation in this House.

(2110)

Some passages in Canada's history have been forgotten. Oddly enough, the forgotten bits almost always have to do with one party. I think that we are at the point where, to solve this puzzle, we are going to have to cut our losses and define what should have been defined in 1867, go back to the real spirit of the founding fathers, which was to see the two nations work together, as equals, neighbours and partners.

Government Orders

The Senate's motions in amendment are totally unacceptable, except for one, which merely corrects a technical error we made. The first amendment proposes reducing the allowable variation from the provincial quota from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. For Quebec, which, like Ontario by the way, has no constitutional guarantee as I mentioned earlier—we think about franco-Ontarians who are scattered across a large area and have no more protection than Quebecers at that level—reducing the allowable variation from the quota from 25 per cent to 15 per cent directly imperils the ridings in the Gaspé Peninsula and the Lower St. Lawrence.

I can hear behind me my colleague, the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, who represents a riding that would be directly affected if the allowable variation from the quota were reduced to 15 per cent from 25 per cent. The only way it would be possible to guarantee adequate representation would be to eat into the metropolitan region of Montreal, to ask ridings in that area, Montérégie and the Laurentides to have 125 per cent representation everywhere. Given the territory, given the uniqueness of the people there, given the fact that the Magdalen Islands are stranded out in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, there is no way we will be able to maintain adequate representation in these regions if we have to accept that the allowable variation from the quota will be reduced from 25 per cent to 15 per cent.

It would also be impossible to keep the riding of Manicouagan, which stretches far to the north and we would be putting at risk ridings like Abitibi, at least in the future—not with the current figures but in coming censuses, if this law were to apply in Quebec.

The same reasoning would certainly apply regarding the boundaries which would be imposed in Ontario's north.

I believe that by maintaining the 25 per cent variation which has been the standard for the past 30 years, ever since the first legislation on electoral boundaries readjustment, we have kept a very sensible provision on the books that allows for making adjustments where necessary.

The 25 per cent variation reflects the situation in rural Canada. The fact is that in Quebec and Canada we have a number of cities with a high population density because of developments that have taken place during the past fifty years. However, rural Canada, which in the process lost some of its population, must maintain a strong and powerful voice in this House.

In the past few days, and I do not have to elaborate, we have seen the effects of reduced rural representation in this House. Some votes would probably have been different if rural areas had been represented as they were 30 years ago in the House of Commons, when the regions were far better represented.

Obviously, we cannot support the first amendment proposed by the Senate. Therefore I suggest retention of the variation of up to 25 per cent from the electoral quota of the province when establishing electoral boundaries.

The Senate also suggests deleting provisions that would allow 20 members of this House to challenge appointments made by the Speaker of the House to provincial commissions instructed to establish electoral boundaries.

I believe this provision is a guarantee that will simply encourage the Speaker to conduct consultations prior to these appointments with the various political parties recognized in this House.

(2115)

I would be very surprised if appointments made by the Speaker of the House following consultations with the recognized parties were subsequently criticized by members. I think it is quite simply a precaution to ensure that the process follows normal procedure.

So the Senate is asking us to remove this provision. The non-elected House is saying: "You who have been elected by the people do not even have the right to discuss who will sit on provincial commissions and who will be appointed by your Speaker". Let them get on with their own rules, but they better not meddle with ours.

If they want to discuss, we will discuss. We will not, however, be told how to behave by the non-elected House, by the honourable senators, who do not have to put their head on the chopping block every five years, like the members of this House, and who are not accountable for their actions to the public, who are accountable to no one. We will also not support the Senate's proposal with respect to allowing this House to overturn an appointment made by its Speaker.

The Senate is also proposing that the provisions providing exceptions to the establishment of a commission after a decennial census be removed. The best example in this regard is the Province of Newfoundland and the region of Labrador. The latest census reported a change of fewer than 1,000 persons over the previous one, if memory serves me, in Newfoundland and Labrador. However, a provincial commission was set up and it turned the whole electoral map upside down.

We had provided, in Bill C-69, that no commission would be set up in such a situation. We can see that the population did not change and that the population did not shift from one region to another, and so no commission is set up. Taxpayers' money is saved, and people continue to feel they belong to their region. The people of St. John's, Newfoundland, know that they are going to vote in St. John's East or St. John's West or some other riding—Bonavista, for example—it does not matter, the feeling of belonging remains. So, why set something in motion when

Government Orders

there is no need to? We will also oppose the motion the Senate is sending us to this amendment.

We are also asked to eliminate the discretionary power of the provincial commissions to reject changes to the electoral map if these changes are not significant enough. Excessive change must be avoided. Many, I would say, even, almost all, members appearing before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs in June and July of last year, made the same complaint, regardless of their political affiliation, with a few exceptions among Reform Party members, who wanted to muddle things even more.

But the Liberal and Bloc members who appeared before us all shared the same concern. They wanted to retain this sense of belonging, so that someone who lives in Lachine, for instance, will not be in one riding for one election, in another riding for the following election, and goodness only knows where for the provincial election in between. This was one of the concerns expressed by all the members who appeared before the committee.

Therefore, the provincial commissions should, of course, have discretion to correct certain small problems that may arise because there is a realization that, at a given time, a municipality has closer ties with a nearby town or, economically, leans in a particular direction. The commissions should be able to make these small changes, but not to turn everything upside down if there is no need to. Here, as well, moderation is preferable.

(2120)

The Senate is also proposing that the notion of community of interest be redefined. In clause 19(5) of the bill we set out the criterion of community of interest as follows:

—“community of interest” includes such factors as the economy, existing or traditional boundaries of electoral districts, the urban or rural characteristics of a territory, the boundaries of municipalities and Indian reserves, natural boundaries and access to means of communication and transport.

The amendment proposed by the Senate would make community of interest the basic criterion from which all subsequent changes would flow.

Let us remember that the amendment which the Senate is proposing and on the basis of which we would have to decide electoral boundaries must be read with the other amendment being proposed by the Senate, which is to reduce the variation from the quota from 25 per cent to 15 per cent, in other words a minimum variation, with community of interest as the basic criterion. The criterion of community of interest is extremely important, except that it comes up against the mathematical wall of the 15 per cent deviation. They cannot seriously be telling us that the boundaries will be defined on the basis of community of interest, having just said that the variation is only 15 per cent,

because the criterion of community of interest is subordinate to the 15 per cent variation which the Senate is also proposing.

Therefore, not only am I of the opinion that we must not change our definition of the criterion of the community of interest, but that we also have to retain a variation of 25 per cent from the electoral quota of each province in order for the two criteria to have a real impact in practice. The constituents of Bellechasse, my riding, should know what to expect from one election to the next, which parish could become part of the riding and which one could cease to be, what minor or major adjustments could be made to take demographics into consideration, but still take into consideration the community of interest.

This community of interest is not an abstract notion, it is a notion that can be seen in action. And the people in the best position to define communities of interest, all partisan politics aside, are probably the hon. members of this House who, each day, each week or each month, depending on the distance they have to go, travel the roads of their ridings. And when there are no roads, they take the plane, or use a helicopter, sometimes even a snowmobile or a dog sled—whatever means of transportation is available.

Therefore, who is in the best position to define a community of interest? I will not pass judgment on my own case, but, take the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior, whose riding is huge, for example. Is it he who is in the best position to talk about the community of interest in Cochrane—Superior and to tell us that the town of Kapuskasing is the community of interest for such and such a region or is it a senator from Ontario representing this region who is in the best position to talk to us about it? There can be only one answer: the representatives elected by the public, whose basic mandate is to defend the interests of all of their voters, of everyone who voted for them, of course, but also the interests of everyone, of everyone who voted against them, of everyone who did not vote or have the right to vote, because MPs basically are the representatives of everyone who lives in the territory they represent. What an important role! A role which must not be subordinate to the interests of a minority appointed to the other place, most of whom are there for purely political reasons and were either defeated or were never successful in getting elected in general elections.

It takes some nerve to come and propose amendments on behalf of people who were defeated, people who, with a few notable exceptions, just cannot get elected.

It is high time we slashed government spending, and one of our first decisions should be to suspend the other House for a time, perhaps five years, to find out whether we really miss it. This could be in the form of a constitutional amendment or we could agree to get rid of the Senate for five years. If we really need it, nature, like Parliament, abhors a vacuum. We will create a new Senate and make new appointments according to a system

Government Orders

to be determined by the Canadian people, by the members of the other House.

(2125)

But for the time being, we should get rid of the surplus. Let us have a garage sale but keep the main House, the House of Commons. We represent the people, and we are elected by universal suffrage. The rule should be that from the president of the largest mining company down to the worker doing the simplest tasks, everyone has the same right to vote so everyone should have the same access to his member of Parliament. The House is what counts.

In Canada there is a consensus on at least one thing: there is one House too many at the federal level, and it is certainly not the House of Commons where people's elected representatives speak on behalf of the people, but the Senate. The problem is to decide whether we should reform the Senate or get rid of it. I suggest getting rid of it for five years.

The Senate does have its uses, however. It pointed out that we had overlooked a clause that would provide that commissioners should reside in the province for which they were appointed. That is what the Senate pointed out to us. This from parliamentarians who in most cases do not even have an office in the senatorial district they happen to represent.

A legal adviser earning a modest salary could have done this. Our employees are not overpaid, and members of the House are not overpaid either for the work they do. If they are, it will be up to the voters to determine whether the member who represents them is getting too much money for the kind of work he does. That is up to the electorate in a general election.

One or two legal advisers could have pointed out that the clause was missing. We do not need a House with 104 individuals and their staff, their operating budgets and all the expense and waste of time that entails. How many bills are languishing before the other House right now?

The bill concerning Pearson Airport has been lying around for quite some time. It was passed in this House when the government first came to power, by a House of Commons that had just been elected, and then put on hold by the other House.

The same thing happened to Bill C-69. In this case, it is even worse because Bill C-69, which concerns electoral boundaries readjustment, is not a case of gerrymandering and is not intended to give special privileges to parliamentarians. Bill C-69 met with a very broad consensus on its wording, with the notable exception of the request for a minimum of 25 per cent of the seats for Quebec. We will have a chance to get back to this issue in the debate that will take place this fall in Quebec. In our

proposal for partnership to be extended to Canada, we will suggest a number of institutions where we will have a representation rate of 25 per cent.

That being said, as the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands indicated when he spoke for the government, we will only support the Senate motion that would make it mandatory for a commissioner appointed for the purpose of electoral boundaries adjustment to reside in the province for which he or she is appointed.

I hope that when it comes to a vote, the Senate will sit up and take notice and stop these delaying tactics that are useless, futile and cost money. They prevent us from allowing electoral boundaries readjustment to take its course and, I also hope that these commissions can be set up again so that hon. members and the public will be able to resume the process under the rules established by Bill C-69, and we will have a balanced electoral map for the next general election, in which I do not hope to participate.

[English]

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-69 rings a familiar bell. It was Yogi Berra who said it was déjà vu all over again.

This issue of electoral boundaries readjustment will not go away. Before we get into the amendments that have been proposed by the Senate to deal with Bill C-69, we should quickly review the chronology of events which have led us to today when we are dealing with this bill yet again.

(2130)

I first became aware of some perceived problems with the electoral boundaries readjustment process when the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands cornered me one evening and said: "We have a real problem with the new electoral maps that are being presented by the electoral boundaries commissions. They are just incompetent. They are doing a terrible job. The boundaries are all drawn in the wrong places. They have made some grave errors and our caucus feels we have to do something about it. We can't put up with this type of incompetence." He suggested that a major review of the whole process needed to be undertaken.

This was shortly after we had launched out on this first session of the 35th Parliament. In fact you could say that those of us who are newly elected were launched from the electoral womb out into the cold, cruel world. It seemed like a number of Liberal MPs were rather unhappy with the uncomfortable climate they found themselves in. They were not prepared for the political realities.

Government Orders

I think there was a little revolt in the Liberal caucus, which I suspect was mainly composed of Ontario members of Parliament, and probably some Atlantic Canada members as well, who found that their boundaries were redrawn and that those people who had elected them and the organizations that had won the election for them had suddenly become irrelevant. They were concerned. They were inexperienced parliamentarians, many were inexperienced politicians, and they were not able to cope with the prospect of change.

With this revolt in the Liberal caucus the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands came with all of this concern. We asked what the problems were. When it came down to brass tacks it was not so much the system that was the problem but the outcome of that system with which they were unhappy. They felt the way to solve the problem was to pretend it never happened, strike new commissions all across Canada and let them redraw the boundaries in a way the Liberal government might find more acceptable. They were quite certain they would be able to draft some master plan, some revolutionary new boundary readjustment plan that would solve their problems.

In March 1994 the Liberals introduced Bill C-18. Not surprisingly, they time allocated the bill. We thought that was extremely unusual. What was the emergency? After all, we had just been elected and they were time allocating this Bill C-18 to suspend the electoral boundaries process so they could cook up some new and wonderful scheme to readjust our electoral boundaries.

We have seen time allocation and closure imposed on this House many times. We should have known then what was coming, that this government is not prepared to deal with reality. It finds unacceptable any opposition whatsoever and uses its clout and the might of its majority to ram things through the House with very little regard to other members.

After the government had suspended the process it had to launch a new process, so it introduced a motion to this House, Motion No. 10. I have an Order Paper from Tuesday, April 19, which has Motion No. 10 in it. For the record I will read the motion:

That the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs be instructed to prepare and bring in a bill, in accordance with Standing Order 68(5), respecting the system of readjusting the boundaries of electoral districts for the House of Commons by Electoral Boundaries Commissions, and, in preparing the said bill, the committee be instructed to consider, among other related matters, the general operation over the past thirty years of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, including:

(a) an assessment of whether there should be a continual increase in the number of Members of the House of Commons after each census, as now provided in section 51 of the Constitution Act;

I will break there for one minute and review what happened with regard to that instruction put forward in Motion No. 10.

We considered the expansion of the House that is called for under the existing provisions of the electoral act and the Constitution of the country. Our seats currently are 295. Mr. Speaker, as you can tell, we are pretty well stretched to the maximum, but we are going to have to find room for six more seats in this House. It seems very odd that we would want to be adding seats to this House when the trend in Canada is to go the other way.

Currently in my province of Saskatchewan a provincial election is being fought, and it is being fought for fewer seats than in the last election. In 1991, 66 seats were available for the taking in the election. In this current campaign only 58 seats are available to be contested.

(2135)

I understand there was an election in Ontario the other day. We do not hear too much about that election from members on the other side, but I happen to know that the successful campaigners were also campaigning for a reduction in the size of the Ontario legislature. They wanted to see fewer seats in Queen's Park, not more. And they won. I think they wanted to reduce the seats by something like 30 per cent, if I am not mistaken.

However, do the Liberals in Ottawa, listen to the Canadian public? Do they think Canadians want smaller government or less government? Did they take it seriously when this motion was drafted that stated we should look at reducing the size of the House or freezing the number of seats so it could not expand? Not on your life, Mr. Speaker. They thought they had it made. They thought they were in lotus land and that no one was going to take away any of their seats. They refused to consider reducing the number of seats in this House of Commons. They wanted it the way it was. In fact they wanted more seats. They refused to do anything that would keep this House from expanding. It would have to go on to 301 seats, and in future years, after censuses, they would see even more seats added to this House.

That was the first point in Motion No. 10, to deal with freezing the size of the House and reducing the number of seats in the House, but to no avail.

The second point in Motion No. 10, point (b), states: "A review of the adequacy of the present method of selection of members of the Electoral Boundaries Commissions". Now these commissions were supposed to be terrible. They had done a terrible job, so we really had to revolutionize the way we structure these committees and the way they choose these commissions.

The Liberals scratched their heads and tried to think of ways in which they could recraft the appointment of these commissions. They tried to think of ways in which they could re-

Government Orders

structure them. It was almost to no avail. There was a little tinkering around the edges and a few little new wrinkles were put into the process. But if we look at Bill C-69, the bill we are debating here tonight, we will see that the composition of the commissions and almost every aspect of the commissions is very similar to what was in place before.

We have to wonder about the concerns the government expressed in the first place about the way in which the commissions were chosen or appointed and the way they were to function.

We go on to point (c). Point (c) of Motion No. 10 states: "A review of the rules governing the powers and methods of proceedings of Electoral Boundaries Commissions, including whether these commissions ought to commence their work on the basis of making necessary alterations to the boundaries of existing electoral districts wherever possible".

I will admit that there have been some improvements in this area. The fact that there have been some improvements does not justify suspending the process, wasting \$5 million of taxpayers' money and getting ourselves into the bind we now find ourselves in, still dealing with Bill C-69.

Those improvements could have been introduced without suspending the process and they would have come into play when the next boundary readjustment took place. While this is one small reward for the fruit of our labour, it certainly was not justification for all the pain this House has had to go through, the procedure and House affairs committee has had to go through, and those Liberal MPs who were so concerned about the process have had to go through.

Point (d) in Motion No. 10 states: "A review of the time and nature of involvement of the public and the House of Commons in the work of the Electoral Boundaries Commissions". Here again some minor changes were made. Hopefully they will be improvements. They were certainly ideas or proposals the members of the Reform Party in the procedure and House affairs committee saw as small improvements. Again, this certainly was not justification for the suspension of the process and for the dilemma we now find ourselves in, having to deal with Bill C-69 once again.

When I began my speech tonight I talked about this all beginning before March 1994 when a panicked member for Kingston and the Islands said: "Disaster has struck. The sky is falling. Our electoral process has broken down and it is irreparable. We have to fix it."

The Liberals introduced Motion No. 10 on April 19, 1994, and with very little improvement over what we had prior to that.

(2140)

What did we do? Like all good parliamentary committees, we brought in witnesses. Sometimes the government agrees to bring in witnesses and sometimes it does not. If it is dealing with electoral boundaries, which affects MPs, it is very important that members of Parliament be allowed to appear as witnesses before the committee. It is imperative. No MP should be denied the right to appear before the procedure and House affairs committee. However, if it happens to be MPs' pensions, members of Parliament have no business appearing before the procedure and House affairs committee. They were refused the right to appear before the committee. The Liberals found this issue very embarrassing. We have to question the motives of the Liberal government.

However, we had members of Parliament appear before the committee. We also had expert witnesses who appeared before the procedure and House affairs committee. They told us that we have one of the best processes in the world. We talked about what they did in Australia, what they did in Europe, and how the process works in the United States.

When we started to draft Bill C-69 on the basis of the information from the witnesses, we made very few changes. Commissions are still composed of three members. One is still appointed, the chief justice of the province, and two are selected by the Speaker. There are a few new wrinkles and a little more consultation in the process. That is fine, those are small improvements. But again, there is absolutely no reason to suspend the process, as was the case in Bill C-18.

We heard the witnesses and we met with the government House leader, who appeared as a witness before the committee, and then we began going through the clause by clause study of the bill. We made some changes and achieved some improvements. We found that during our initial discussions with Liberal members on key issues of the legislation there was co-operation and often agreement.

I remember the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands telling me: "I think 15 per cent variable quotient is superior to 25 per cent. I agree with you absolutely." However, as we got near the end of the crafting stage of the bill suddenly 15 per cent was just impossible. "It is unacceptable to my members", he said. He said that it had to be 25 per cent, that it just would not fly if it was 15 per cent. Suddenly the members in the committee who had been saying yes, it is reasonable to have a 15 per cent variable quotient, withdrew that support and went back to the comfortable old familiar 25 per cent variable quotient. Here we are in Canada, in 1995, a modern, highly educated, highly developed country, and we have to stay in the dark ages; we have to stay in the days of yore and allow for a wide variant of at least 25 per cent.

Government Orders

We met with Elections Canada officials and they were extremely helpful. They helped us with the technical components of the bill and they provided resources that helped us in the crafting of the bill.

While the Liberals were inflexible on key principles such as the schedule and the variable quotient, and to a degree on the communities of interest, although we were able to make some small improvements there, this bill was passed here in the House of Commons earlier this year and sent off to the Senate.

I should backtrack for a minute and talk about the Liberal backbenchers who came to appear before the procedure and House affairs committee. They were mainly rural members and members from large, growing, urban areas. It was quite interesting to watch the rural members saying "We want to make sure the bill is drafted in such a way that our already very large rural ridings will not be made any larger, so that in areas like northern Ontario, where we have few rural ridings, we will not lose some of those and have even fewer rural ridings and more urban ridings". They were very concerned about that. The Liberal brass, the chairman of the procedure and House affairs committee and other Liberals said "Don't worry. Everything will be fine. We will leave the 25 per cent variable in there and you will be all right."

The members from the large urban ridings came before the committee and said "We are very concerned. Our areas are growing so quickly and we are concerned that we will be representing 200,000 or 300,000 people, like we are now, if we do not have a readjustment process that takes into consideration the growth in our areas."

Now the Liberal brass had to worry about another problem. They said "Don't worry, we have the 25 per cent variable quotient". They said: "We will make sure your ridings are smaller when we start out so there is room to grow and they will not become too large". They are trying to pull the wool over their own members' eyes.

(2145)

It cannot be both ways. We cannot have the large growing urban ridings with a small population and maintain a smaller rural riding to keep from eliminating rural ridings. It is impossible. The Liberals try to say one thing to urban members and another thing to rural members to try and sneak this through all on the basis of a 25 per cent variable quotient. It reminds me of Liberal economics: It just does not work and it gets us into trouble. The government is going to pay a price for miscommunicating to its members.

The bill was sent to the Senate without Reform approval. There were flaws. Principles were violated that should not be violated, principles of democracy and proper representation.

But the government had its way and the bill was sent off to the Senate. Lo and behold, as our leader has aptly said, the place which is known more for its consideration of protocol, alcohol and geritol actually must have read some of the speeches the Reform Party made with regard to the bill because it actually came up with a couple of conclusions that were the same as ours.

We will be speaking to the amendments proposed by the Senate. The hon. member for Calgary West will deal with them in more detail.

In my concluding remarks I will talk about what is going to happen if we expand the size of the House. What does bigger government mean for Canadians? I just got my statement of expenses, what it costs to keep me as an MP here in the House. We have the average as well, so we know these figures are similar for all members.

Currently there are 295 members. The average travel cost of members of Parliament using the 64 point system is \$32,885. If we add six more members as Bill C-69 recommends, the costs would add up to over \$400,000 because there are telephone costs and other office costs that are not included in the MOBs. If we take the \$66,000 it costs to keep each MP and multiply it by six, it comes to about \$400,000. Then there is the MOB which is about \$185,000 each. If we multiply that by six it adds up to approximately \$11 million in additional costs. Then of course there are our salaries of approximately \$64,000 which if multiplied by six comes up to \$385,000. The expense allowance of \$27,000 multiplied by six comes out to \$160,000.

Then there is the big one so many people have been talking about, the pension. Of course, Reform MPs will opt out of the pension plan. However if the impossible happened and the six new MPs were Liberals or Conservatives, and I hope that does not happen, or NDPers or members of the Bloc, we could look at about \$1 million per MP for pension costs. That would be another \$1.1 million.

We are looking at about \$20 million or \$25 million just in the basic costs of more MPs in the House, not including the costs of handing out contracts if members of the House are trying to wheel and deal and get special deals for—

Mr. Keyes: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I find it curious that we are talking about costs and this is the same member of the same party who just took us through three hours of voting at \$48,000 an hour when we could have done it in half an hour.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I see by the clock that it is 9.50 p.m. The House was scheduled to sit until 11.30 p.m. because of a special government order. Therefore this party has not cost the Canadian taxpayer one cent. We are taking democracy seriously.

This means that the added costs of having extra members here—

Government Orders

Mr. Keyes: Mr. Speaker, there would not have been a waste because there would have been more legislation put through the House.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' rationale is sometimes very hard to understand. They do not seem to think that debate and taking the votes seriously is important. They have become so arrogant on that side that they think just because they introduce a bill it should get speedy passage through this place without the cut and thrust of debate and serious consideration in voting.

(2150)

There were a lot of members tonight who put great effort into some of the amendments on that bill. Members on that side would have quickly rushed through the process without allowing those members to stand and vote for the principles in which they believe. We know the Liberals do not believe in free votes because they sent talking points around saying that it was not a free vote. The Liberals want to bring six more MPs in here and tell them that they do not want free votes. The Liberals want them to be their little voting machine slaves. It is a shame and this House deserves much better than what the Liberal government is giving us.

The government is supporting one of the amendments that came back from the Senate. I assure the House that it makes sense. We will be supporting it as well. That is the commissioners must be residents of the province which they are serving.

There are some other changes. The Senate suggested that the variable quota be reduced from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. Of course, the Senate heard us arguing a very good case here in the House and agreed with it. I believe there is one other amendment Reform can support. The other amendments we do not find acceptable.

Part of the reason for the problem tonight was because the Liberal government mismanaged this evening's activities. We talked to the Liberals. We wanted to arrange the situation much better than we did, but they were not interested. It is very typical of what they have done with Bill C-69. They have mismanaged the process. They have set targets which they cannot reach. They have tried to pass legislation that is unacceptable to Canadians. It is receiving obstruction or meeting a roadblock in the Senate and with real justification.

In wrapping up, I want to thank the Senate for sending this bill back. I certainly wish the Senate had been elected so that it would have more legitimacy. It could do this on a more regular basis. It could offer sober second thought, as it is supposed to, to legislation this House passes that is ill conceived and not of the quality Canadians deserve.

The government has introduced a motion to send this bill back to the Senate with some amendments. These amendments do not

concur with the wishes of the Reform Party because of the arguments that not only myself, but my colleague from Calgary West and perhaps some others will bring forward.

I would like to move an amendment to the motion. I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following:

a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House agrees to Amendments Nos. 1, 4(a), 6(a) and 6(b)(i) made by the Senate to Bill C-69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundary commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries, and this House disagrees with Amendments Nos. 2, 3, 4(b), 4(c), 5, 6(b)(ii), 6(c) and 7.

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair will reserve on the amendment to see if it is valid.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster, who commented rather negatively on the reception given members by the standing committee, that it must have taught him a lot about Quebec. When I made my proposal on the ridings in eastern Quebec, he asked me whether it was to protect the ridings of real French Canadians, to use his expression. He felt that what was happening was self-serving. So, we had an opportunity to give him a good history and geography lesson and show him that there is also a strong anglophone minority in eastern Quebec and in the Gaspé.

(2155)

We argued that the ridings should be left as they were. One of the reasons was in order to support this section of the population, which is both substantial and historically important. These people are the descendants of the loyalists, who came and settled of their own volition, particularly because they were fleeing a system they could not live with. I was quite surprised by the hon. member's ignorance of these facts. I hope he has learned an important lesson he will long remember, that there is an anglophone minority in Quebec and that it is scattered pretty well throughout the province, in the Gaspé—

An hon. member: They are well served.

Mr. Crête: They are indeed well served, as the member says. In the Gaspé, for example, the anglophone minority has college-level courses in English in Gaspé. For all of the Gaspé, there is a regular service and regular train service is maintained because, for one reason, many of these people have family in Ontario and elsewhere. They are very well served in many places.

I particularly wanted the member to realize that not only improper things had happened in committee, that one person at least learned something.

My question concerns another matter. Does the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster not think that the Senate could have considered many other aspects of the legislation? Including the fact that a little more than half the Reform members were

Government Orders

elected by fewer than 40 per cent of the electorate and that their democratic claims are not really very high.

Could the Senate not have looked at that? While it was doing a superficial job, it could have gone a little further and looked to see if the members in the House representing the fewest voters were not members of the Reform Party?

[*English*]

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question from my colleague, the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup.

I remember the procedure and House affairs committee meeting the hon. member is reflecting upon. That committee meeting was held just a few days after one of his colleagues made the suggestion that in the referendum we expect to be called this fall, if the separatists have the courage to call it this fall, only old stock Quebecers should have the franchise. Those are not my words. I am quoting his colleague. In other words, only old stock Quebecers should be allowed to vote. Those are not my thoughts and I would certainly not suggest that but one of his colleagues did.

I saw some of the flip-flopping on the whole electoral boundaries issue. For a while the critic for the Bloc was in favour of the bill then later opposed it. He supported some parts of it and then was not sure.

I began to wonder what was the rationale for the Bloc's arguments regarding Bill C-69. I asked the hon. member the reason. I asked whether the member was trying to design an electoral system in Quebec that would give the advantage to old stock Quebecers. That is a very honest question in light of the comments his colleagues made, not mine. I assure the hon. member that I am not as ignorant of the situation in Quebec as he might have this House believe.

This goes to the more important issue of democratic principles. If his colleagues can suggest that democracy can be abused to the point where only certain people would have a franchise based on their ethnicity, that causes some concern as to whether or not they are legitimate spokespersons for the democratic process and the whole process of determining how the electoral boundaries readjustment act is crafted.

The other very interesting question is, why would they even care? If they lose the referendum, they have lost the argument. That means Quebecers have decided they want to stay in Canada. I suspect that is what Quebecers will say when the referendum is held, if it is ever held. Why would they care? They have lost and would not represent Quebecers.

On the other hand, if the separatists win the referendum in Quebec, they say they are going to leave, that they are going to

separate. It is going to be unilateral and they are gone. Therefore what do they care about how Canada crafts the electoral boundaries readjustment act?

It just shows how irrelevant the Bloc Quebecois is to legislation we are considering in this House. It shows how irrelevant the Bloc is as Canada's supposedly loyal official opposition.

(2200)

Mr. Morris Bodnar (Saskatoon—Dundurn, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has been speaking about keeping the number of seats as they are at present. Under such a proposition the province of Saskatchewan would lose about two seats, which would mean that almost 20 per cent of the seats in Saskatchewan would be lost.

Does he agree that the province of Saskatchewan should lose almost 20 per cent of its representation in the House?

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I touched on that in my speech. Saskatchewan is seeing a reduction in the total number of MLAs. They have gone from 66 to 58. The people in the province with whom I have talked applaud that. They want less government.

If we start reducing the number of seats in the House of Commons the way we proposed in the procedure and House affairs committee, Ontario would lose a few seats as well. The province of Quebec would lose a few seats. Instead of B.C. increasing its number of seats it would lose a few and, yes, Saskatchewan would lose a few.

We are fair minded in Saskatchewan. We know what we could lose. We believe in smaller government and we are prepared to accept it.

The Deputy Speaker: The amendment of the hon. House leader of the Reform Party is acceptable as to form.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, in replying to questions from my colleague, the member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster suggested that I had acted inconsistently and without due consideration on the committee. I wish to point out that, throughout study of Bill C-69, I supported the proposals made, offering my critical analysis.

It was not until report stage, in the House, that an amendment was proposed to guarantee Quebec 25 per cent of the seats. It was from that point on that I decided I could no longer support Bill C-69, not because it had been badly drafted, but because the issue of the 25 per cent guarantee for Quebec was not accepted by the majority of members in this House. I therefore voted against it at third reading.

Government Orders

I wish to point out the facts, so as not to give rise to a debate as indicated in Beauchesne.

[*English*]

Mr. Harper (Calgary West): I rise on the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. If you were to review that point you would find there is no point of privilege. If you were to review the blues on the speech of the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster you would see that he merely stated a fact, that there were several changes of position by the Bloc Québécois in the course of the electoral redistribution debate.

The Bloc member is certainly capable of describing what was his motivation. I think you will see that the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster was simply establishing the fact he behaved that way, and in any case it is not a violation of his privileges to do that.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I want the House to know that I do not doubt the abilities of my colleague, the hon. member who served with me on the procedure and House affairs committee, but I brought into question why he and his party would change position on the electoral boundaries process from supporting the government to opposing the government. In fact I believe they changed critics. I think that is fair comment. I do not think I made any personal allegations against the member.

If the House deems that I did, I would certainly withdraw them. It was certainly not my intent. I was trying to deal specifically with the positions taken by the Liberals and the Bloc Québécois with regard to all the legislation including Bill C-69 which we are debating this evening.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: My colleagues know very well that the Chair always takes questions of privilege seriously. I will therefore reread the blues and, if need be, communicate my decision to the House as soon as possible.

(2205)

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would find it interesting, as I begin my speech, to go over the reasons that led the Bloc Québécois to intervene on several occasions during study of the bill on the readjustment of electoral boundaries.

The Bloc Québécois was elected to defend the interests of Quebec, and in that sense, faced with this bill, it has shown its complete respect for democracy by making no assumptions about the choice Quebecers will make in the referendum. We wanted to ensure that, in the event that Quebecers voted no, they could continue to have the advantage of the best electoral map possible in their continued representation within the govern-

ment of Canada. But I am sure they will decide to vote yes, for a number of other reasons.

To answer the member's question, I have no doubt that Quebecers will decide to vote yes, for all sorts of historical reasons. For more than 125 years, and particularly over the last 30 years, they have tried everything they could to change the system and they were never successful. The most recent example was here in this House, when the Liberal majority refused to give Quebec the 25 per cent minimum it was asking for. This 25 per cent minimum, already agreed to in the Charlottetown accord, would have been a demonstration of respect for Quebec, but the present Liberal government, under the direction of the Prime Minister we all know, refused to make this minimum gesture. This is one more reason, symbolic but practical, why Quebecers will opt for full control over their future development.

I have spoken to this bill several times. I participated in debate at each reading and in committee, always to argue that rural regions must have adequate representation.

Unfortunately, I have never at any stage seen amendments that are as out of touch with Canadian reality as those put forward by the Senate. Before talking about the substance of the amendments, I wondered why the Senate was so out of touch with Canadian reality. Why do senators seem to be from Mars rather than from the country in which we live?

My first thought was that it was certainly not for lack of travel since, as we know, our senators travel a great deal within Canada. They travel at taxpayers' expense on a regular basis. There must be a real reason why senators decided, among other things, to demand that the maximum variation from the quota, which makes it possible to determine the number of ridings, be reduced from 25 to 15 per cent.

I found a reason which I think is significant: an amendment like this one will, somewhat insidiously, impose even greater restrictions on Quebec representation. In fact, if we look at the current electoral map as a whole, we see that there are constitutional, historic protective measures for very small ridings, like those in Prince Edward Island. Although I have no intention of depriving the people of that province of their members of Parliament, the Tories' amendment would give Quebec ridings even less weight because lowering the maximum allowable gap to 15 per cent would reduce the total number of members and expand the areas represented by members to an absolutely unrealistic extent.

Consequently, to replace the 25 per cent variation by a 15 per cent variation would be somewhat disrespectful of Canadians and Quebecers, while also showing a total ignorance of geographical considerations, as well as a systematic attempt to promote centralization. Indeed, to define boundaries strictly in

Government Orders

terms of arithmetic would result in an overrepresentation of urban areas, while also promoting a migration to those urban centres, something which, in the long term, would be very harmful to Canada's future. Should there be a snowball effect, it could lead to the situation which exists in some southern countries, where there are very large cities with shanty towns, while the rest of the territory is very sparsely populated and people have access to very few adequate services to ensure their future.

Let us not forget that Canada was not developed by concentrating its population in certain areas. Indeed, it was always felt that the territory as a whole should be populated. However, the amendments proposed by the Senate would go against that historical pattern. I find it quite disturbing that a House of non-elected representatives would come to such conclusions.

(2210)

Another rather surprising amendment by the Senate provides that a group of 20 MPs would no longer be allowed to challenge appointments to electoral commissions. We, as elected representatives, and this is particularly true when we form a sufficiently large group, should be considered a watchdog, for the public, regarding this issue. I think that the Conservative amendment would have an effect opposite to the intended one and could create many more unacceptable situations.

There is another aspect to the Senate amendments which I would like to bring to the attention of the House and I am referring to the different definition it gives of "community of interest". The people in the Senate use the same words as before but provide a definition that restricts the concept of community of interest to demographic and geographic considerations as well as the existing boundaries of municipalities. However, the definition now no longer considers the human factor.

For instance, in a riding like Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup which I represent, there are 55 municipalities and four regional county municipalities I have to cover. Perhaps the senators overlooked this or perhaps some of them are not aware of this because they were never members of the House of Commons, but a member has to sit in the House four days a week in Ottawa, spend day five in his riding and on the weekend participate in social activities and meet his constituents. In a riding like this one where there are 55 municipalities, we get to the point where people are no longer able to meet their member of Parliament.

Narrowing the definition of community of interest and decreasing the quota will lead to situations that make no sense at all. If we look at the draft electoral map the commission used to conduct consultations in my riding, if, for instance, the riding of Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup were to go on in the same way until the next election, it would include 72 municipalities. From 55 to 72, I do not know whether you have any idea what this

means in the way of additional work, but it has the effect of creating an even greater gap between the voter and the individual who is supposed to represent him.

Shutting off communications between constituents and their elected representative has the somewhat perverse effect of strengthening the power of the other House which cannot claim to represent the electorate. Our strength has always been that we can say we are there to represent the people. Even more so when we represent more than 50 per cent of the population, as in the case of most members of the Bloc Québécois, many Liberal members, but only a few Reform Party members. But in any case, the way the legislation works, we are elected by the people, and as far as I am concerned, that is the principle that gives us the right to have the final say on bills, as opposed to the Senate.

Distancing us from our electorate would help weaken the link between the electorate and government decisions and would give very bad results.

In particular, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the effect that such a decision as reducing the variation from the provincial quota from 25 to 15 per cent would have on eastern Quebec. Currently, there are five ridings in eastern Quebec: Gaspé, Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, Matapédia—Matane, Rimouski—Témiscouata and Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, which is my riding. Keeping these five ridings, even with the current map, would require a decision from the electoral commission. But, if the variation were reduced from 25 to 15 per cent, which is now being called for, it is certain that one riding would disappear, possibly two. This would have the following effects on all of the inhabitants of those areas: it would encourage depopulation and the neglect of their regions and it would take the weight of representation away from these people who are in one of Quebec's resource regions. The same thing would happen in several other regions in Canada.

(2215)

We have discussed issues like unemployment insurance reform, where the first proposal was quite bureaucratic, which was to create a two-tiered system: one for people who do not use it often and one for people who do. If the representation of the people from these regions is reduced, decisions which are out of sync with their reality will be more readily accepted.

If the human resources development committee had not been able to meet with Quebecers and Canadians across the country, it would not have achieved the result that it did, which was to convince the government that this proposal was not in sync with reality.

It is true for other legislation as well. When it comes to a vote, in the end, if there are fewer members representing these areas, the country's future will suffer. It is not true that Canada comprises only large centres and nothing else. The people who represent these various parts of the country must be given a real

Government Orders

right. If they are not, we will be facing very negative situations in the medium term.

By way of example for the members of the House, I would point out that, when the rural fact is denied in one way or another, the voters always have the last word.

The Conservative government had set up a devastating post office strategy. They believed, in good faith, that a significant number of municipal post offices had to be closed. We saw the results in the election. I do not say this is the only reason for the change in government, I think there were a number of good reasons for it. However, the fact that the people in rural settings felt they would not be properly represented by those they had elected led them to terminate the relationship, because they felt not enough attention had been paid to this detail.

If we do not permit the rural communities sufficient representation, we will find ourselves in the same situation.

It is perhaps understandable that an institution, such as the other House, should be so far removed from the concerns of the public that it does not give the importance of representation its due, but I think it is our responsibility here in the House, because we are elected by the people, to bring things back to reality. The quota is perhaps the most important criterion. In talking of a variation in the quota in defining boundaries, 25 per cent was rightly given as the most reasonable variation. In this regard, the member for the Reform Party preceding me argued in support of the 25 per cent.

If members appearing before the committee representing urban centres felt that 25 per cent was the maximum permissible and those representing rural communities felt it was the minimum, it seems a pretty reasonable choice over the figure of 15 per cent. This figure would mean completely absurd situations and the combining of communities that had nothing in common simply in order to satisfy arithmetical criteria, which should not be the case in my opinion.

To conclude, I want to say that we should take this opportunity to ponder the usefulness of sending bills to an institution such as the other place. In fact, nowadays, in the society we live in we can no longer distinguish, as was done 100 years ago, between members of the Commons and the Lords. We should keep in mind that our system is based on the British one and that a non-elected house was created to advise members coming from the working class and whose real wisdom was in doubt due to their lack of education. I do not believe that this was ever a problem, but more than ever today, one cannot assume that elected members are less educated. In this respect, we can hold our own to the same degree as any senator. This situation no longer reflects today's reality in this country.

(2220)

Keeping this in mind, this bill shows that we could perhaps find a better use for the \$40 million the Senate costs every year.

To conclude, I do hope that this is the last time we will revisit the changes to the electoral boundaries. For my part, I am convinced that the electoral map will never again be used in Quebec, since in the fall, we will decide to take full control of our destiny. After the referendum, we will suggest to the rest of Canada an association which will put an end to the constitutional industry, ensure that neighbours of equal status deal with each other on an equal footing, and eliminate the negative effects, the useless spending and the overlap due to the present system, so that we can debate the real issues, and each of us build our own house as we really want it.

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of having the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup as my neighbour, in the next riding. The riding that he has the honour of representing shares its eastern border with my riding of Bellechasse, so that we have a common border. The communities of Saint-Roch-des-Aulnaies, Sainte-Louise-des-Aulnaies, Mont-Carmel, that is from the St. Lawrence River to the Maine border, are the eastern limit of the riding of Bellechasse.

My colleague from Chicoutimi was saying that it is a beautiful riding. Indeed, all the ridings that we represent are the most beautiful in Canada or in Quebec, because that is where we live, those are the people that we represent. So, it is quite normal for us to think that our ridings are the most beautiful. The South Shore, most of which I have the honour to represent with my colleague from Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, is definitely a beautiful region.

These ridings may look alike in many respects, with more or less the same number of municipalities, about 60 of them, and with the new map, about 70. I now realize that it took me about 18 months before I managed to cover my whole riding. I do not know about the member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup; perhaps he will have the opportunity of enlightening me by answering my question.

I am bringing up the point raised by the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster in committee and here, during debate. Let us expand rural ridings; that is no problem, we can simply have more staff. Let us add two or three assistants in the ridings. However, as far as I know, on the ballot, we do not vote for parliamentary assistants, for riding assistants, we vote for the member of Parliament.

Any constituent in my riding, whether living in Saint-Pamphile-de-l'Islet, in Saint-Jean-Port-Joli, in Lac-Étchemin, in Bromont or in Sainte-Claire-de-Dorchester, has the right to meet me. As a rural member, I find myself in a situation where these constituents, because of distances, because of all the

Government Orders

restraints, because of the multiplication of municipal councils and other municipal and regional organizations, are less able to meet me than the constituents of an urban member.

I want to ask my hon. colleague whether he has the same problems and whether he believes, like the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster, that the increase in constituency staff will compensate for the extension of rural ridings in such a way that the voice of rural constituents will be adequately heard in the House?

Mr. Crête: Mr. Speaker, place names like Saint-Roch-des-Aulnaies and Sainte-Louise-des-Aulnaies help me answer the hon. member's question. A few weeks ago, we had the opportunity to meet with mayors of that regional county municipality.

Our discussions dealt with the decentralization requested by various regions in Quebec. To go to that meeting, I had to travel 75 kilometres through the regional county municipality which includes those two communities, at one end of my riding.

That shows that having a larger territory would not be a suitable solution, because we already have to cover a very large territory.

(2225)

However, I would like to suggest another solution. I think the hon. member for Bellechasse will agree. We realize that double representation should be eliminated because it serves no purpose. Today, we have federal MPs and provincial MNAs whose ridings overlap and whose jurisdictions overlap also. One never knows who is responsible for what. When people come to us in our ridings, the last thing they want to know about is whether their question concerns a federal or a provincial jurisdiction. The only thing they know is they want to see their member.

This is what Quebecers came to realize. A great many of them, over 70 per cent of Quebecers according to the polls, would like to deal with only one member of Parliament, someone who would represent them at a National Parliament in Quebec City and who could probably be sent to the joint Parliamentary assembly in Canada to make suggestions on how to manage the partnership between Quebec and Canada once Quebec has opted for sovereignty.

We would then be able to reduce a lot of the unnecessary costs and settle many of the problems we currently have. As federal MPs, if we have to call a provincial MLA who is not a member of our own party, we find it a bit awkward. Oftentimes, when our constituents come to us, they do not know if they will be able to find a solution to their problem at one level or the other. It is up to us to try to find out if there are provincial or federal programs

that can be helpful to them. I think this is where we have a problem.

Finally, I want to say that in a region like mine, the riding of Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, as well as in the riding of Bellechasse and all along the shores of the St. Lawrence, home to the only French-speaking community in North America, where a lot of Lévesques, Pelletiers, Ouellets are living—

Mr. Langlois: Crêtes, Langlois.

Mr. Crête: Langlois and Crêtes, as well, yes, although there are not so many Crêtes in that area, I think.

I want people to realize that Quebecers have gone beyond the plumbing all the way to the architect's plan. We, in the Bloc Québécois, are here to protect the interests of Quebec, which is why, during this debate on the redistribution of seats, we have tried to ensure that Quebecers are as well represented as possible. We are a few months away from a much more crucial decision which would not only ensure us an adequate representation, but also give us full control over our own development. I think this is what the future holds for the province of Quebec and this is what Quebecers will decide.

[English]

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, first let me explain exactly what it is we are debating tonight.

At the moment we are debating Senate amendments to Bill C-69 which amends the previously amended bill from the Senate, Bill C-18, which sought to amend and suspend the Electoral Boundaries Commission. If that explains what we are doing, let me add a little more. If we accept all or some of these amendments the process will continue amended. It will amend Bill C-18 which will then be suspended. The amended process will begin again and we will have amended boundaries for the next election.

However, should we decide not to proceed with any of this, the process continues just as it was before with no amendments whatsoever. This is the incredible journey we have been on in the government's quest to, for reasons that are becoming less and less clear by the day, redo the electoral boundaries all over again. I think I will stop there before I confuse myself.

The member for Bellechasse addressed a very interesting point in his speech. He really addressed the role of the Senate in making these amendments. It is an interesting question because I think all members of the House feel some concern about the role of the Senate. We are here at the end of the 20th century, nearly the 21st century, and we will be one of the very few countries even if we include the non-democratic world that actually has a quarter of the seats in its Parliament unelected.

Government Orders

(2230)

There are two proposals to deal with that, as the hon. member for Bellechasse suggested, either of which would be preferable to the status quo. One is to abolish the Senate, the proposal of the Bloc Québécois. I find it interesting that it comes from the Bloc because Quebec was the last province to eliminate its own upper house, in 1968, in the living memory of virtually every member of this institution.

At the same time, Mr. Parizeau has created a council of ministers, a council of unelected regional advisors, to really parallel the very role the Senate is supposed to play in the Chamber, which it does not. It was admirable innovation by Mr. Parizeau. I do not know if it is working quite as he hoped but it is interesting that he would appoint an unelected second cabinet.

We prefer to have the Senate elected but the question we have to ask ourselves, given the government supports status quo federalism and does not believe in changing anything and believes in appointed senators, is what the senators are supposed to do. Senators have constitutional responsibilities to execute. Bills go to the Senate, the Senate is paid to consider those bills and the Senate has considered those bills.

The Senate has suggested six sets of amendments. It has taken some time to study these. In all honesty, although some of the people in the Senate are not my favourite people and that is probably an opinion they share, they have conducted themselves very responsibly on this issue. They have examined a case in which Parliament has grossly abused its authority in a way that is irresponsible financially because it is costing us \$6 million. It is irresponsible democratically because it is suspending a process set up by Parliament to be independent. It is irresponsible in a basic governmental sense. The reasons for doing this are obviously for self-interest in interrupting this whole process, so evident it is quite embarrassing to this body.

The Senate has examined these things and proposed a number of amendments. I do not support all its amendments. If I have time I will go into describing why I support some and why I do not support others. The Senate has looked at a number of issues that need examination and has given us an honest opinion. Certainly no one here doubts the chairman of the committee in the Senate that examined this bill is an outstanding constitutional expert, Senator Beaudoin. Everybody recognizes that and certainly he has tried to play a useful role in this debate.

[Translation]

It is also interesting to note that the Bloc Québécois's opposition is based on the absence of a guarantee of 25 per cent of the seats in the House of Commons. The hon. member for Bellechasse has repeated this fact tonight. It is also interesting because that would obviously be an unconstitutional amendment to this bill. Senator Beaudoin knows that, as do all the constitutional experts, but this is also interesting because it

must be remembered that the solution to these problems, as far as the Bloc Québécois is concerned, is in fact a Parliament where Quebec would have 0 per cent of the members.

(2235)

The important course taken by Quebec at the present time, the course taken by its premiers over the last thirty years, would have disappeared, and this is the solution. Quebecers should not forget that. The Bloc Québécois's solution does not guarantee 25 per cent of the seats in the House of Commons. Its solution lies in a Quebec with 0 per cent of the seats in the Parliament of Canada.

[English]

Let me go over these amendments in some detail to give my party's considered position on them. To repeat what the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster said, one amendment is certainly acceptable to the Reform Party, just as it is acceptable to the government. In Amendment No. 4(a) the Senate is proposing to add a requirement for the two non-judicial commissioners to be resident in the province for which the commission is established. The Senate recognized that is a tradition and something that really should be in the bill.

It is fair to say in the committee that studied this bill, of which I was a member, this requirement was inadvertently omitted by the technical drafters. This is an amendment the Liberal government will accept and which we are certainly prepared to accept. Our amendment also accepts this change and clarifies something that should be in the bill. It would be an abuse to have a commission that contained members who were not resident in the province.

Consistent with what we have advocated in the past, the Senate has proposed that the allowable deviation from the provincial quotient be reduced in its general application from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. This is was one of a series of amendments the Senate is proposing because it felt, not without some justification, we have drifted so far from voting equality in a number of clauses of the bill that there needs to be some correction. Independent of that we in the Reform Party had already supported this consideration when the bill was before committee last summer and also when Bill C-69 was in the House.

Our view is there should be more equalized voting power, that the 15 per cent discrepancy should be acceptable between various rural and urban constituencies in all but the most exceptional cases. That would achieve this. We argued for this at all previous stages of the bill.

The contrary argument is there need to be special discrepancies for rural areas but 15 per cent is a wide discrepancy. It means a variation from 85 per cent to 115 per cent. We would actually have quite a wide variation in the number of consti-

Government Orders

tuencies plus the fact the bill actually allows for exceptional circumstances that go beyond that, not just those laid out in the senatorial clause or the grandfather clause of the Constitution but discrepancies that go over and above that for exceptional ridings in the far north of the various provinces. We propose in our amendment that this amendment from the Senate be accepted and we have argued for it at all previous stages of the bill.

The Senate has proposed along the same lines in its Amendment No. 6(b)(i) to eliminate the provision that a commission will only recommend changes to existing electoral district boundaries where the factors set out are significant enough to warrant such a recommendation. This was basically designed to encourage the commission to give greater consideration to electoral boundaries.

We had a lot of debate on this and related topics in committee.

(2240)

The government should remember I was troubled by the comments of the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader in the House and before the Senate committee on legal and constitutional affairs. He really tried to convey the impression there had been massive agreement on this legislation.

In our case we disagreed fundamentally with the entire purpose of this legislation, with the idea of suspending electoral boundaries right from day one. We had questioned also the purpose of re-establishing the commissions prior to the next census when it would be necessary. There were disagreements beyond that in terms of the amending formula, for the number of seats in terms of the quotient. Beyond that there were many items in which we had multiple differences before arriving at an agreement.

When the member for Kingston and the Islands suggests we had agreed on all these areas, we had agreed on all these areas only after our first, second, third, fourth and fifth preferences in many cases had been rejected.

To say there had been enthusiastic agreement about all these things from the Reform Party is certainly an exaggeration. As he knows and knows full well, both opposition parties and particularly the Reform Party have opposed this bill at every important stage of its development.

With regard to Amendment No. 6(b)(i) the Senate has in its consideration come upon something that deserves re-examination. There are probably a lot of things like that, given the timetable forced on this bill. The re-examination here is that there should be this special factor, clause 19(2)(c), that if factors are not significant enough to warrant such a recommendation the commission should not recommend changes.

That is covered in several other clauses of the bill, as the Senate pointed out. There is the definition of community of interest which describes existing constituencies as one of the most important basis of any new electoral map. Wide deviations are already allowed, the 25 per cent plus additional consideration for constituencies that go beyond 25 per cent in some cases. There are already many factors in the bill that give a very high priority on keeping existing ridings intact.

As well, the bill as it is now probably provides to members a bit of a false assurance. One of the things we were told in our committee hearings last summer by people who had been involved in the drafting process is to stop thinking of our ridings as individual ridings. This is a trap that we fall into as members of Parliament. We represent a riding and if that riding changes we see that as a change to our riding. Commissions do not draw ridings, they draw boundaries to ridings. It is impossible to change one riding without changing another riding.

Once the criteria set out in the act require a change to any riding, almost always that has a domino effect that impacts on the vast majority of ridings in a province. Therefore in practical terms once one hits the basic triggers laid out in the bill it is impossible to preserve existing ridings exactly as they are in any case.

For that reason the Senate has pointed out a consideration which is probably not terribly useful and which the House should withdraw. That is why in our amendment we propose accepting Amendment No. 6(b)(i) from the Senate.

Let me now talk about those Senate amendments the House should continue to oppose. In doing so I will lay out the considerations the Senate did give in suggesting these amendments. In every case they have some merit and we should understand the reasoning.

The Senate proposed to eliminate this new clause we have in the bill that would give 20 members of the Commons the ability to challenge the Speaker's appointments to boundary commissions. The Senate did that for a couple of reasons. It was concerned about the role of the Speaker. The Speaker is required to give rulings every day and his impartiality is an important criterion of his effectiveness. The concern was that setting up a mechanism in a bill that allowed people to challenge the Speaker in and of itself provided a situation where the Speaker's authority could be easily undermined not just on this issue but on a number of issues.

(2245)

The Senate was concerned about the introduction of fairly blatant partisan politics into the process. I would not deny that is the case. In supporting this amendment we in the Reform Party recognize that it would force the Speaker to consult with all three parties and maybe in some cases with representatives of other parties.

We did that not because we prefer partisanship but because we have come to the conclusion that a certain amount of partisanship may enhance the independence of the process. Let me explain what I mean by that.

There is no doubt that the process we have today is independent. If we look at it on paper it is independent. It was established in 1964 and nobody has suggested that it leads to undue political interference. However, what has the reality been since 1964? The reality has been that every time boundary commissions have made proposals for change, the House of Commons has intervened not to interfere directly in the process but to use its power to quash the process completely.

In a sense the House of Commons can always interfere, and it interfered on a grand scale. In the past the outcome of that interference has been a new formula for distribution of seats among the provinces under the Constitution. This time that particular route was rejected and we made no major changes along those lines. That was fairly blatant political interference.

We in the Reform Party are hoping that the process of consultation, which will ensure that the Speaker not only hears from the government but hears from all parties, will bind all parties and all members into the process so they do not invent the kind of wild stories and conspiracy theories that were necessary to justify the kind of interference we had in 1994. That is what we are hoping and I think the Senate should take that into account. There is a dynamic here. The dynamic is partisan. We have been unable to secure true independence and we feel this is the next best alternative.

These appointments are not a ruling by the Speaker and thus challenges to his appointments. While they would be embarrassing and would certainly undermine the credibility of the Speaker were he to propose any kind of commissioner that was not accepted on a partisan basis, it is certainly not likely to be seen as a non-confidence motion.

I would like to continue to analyse some of the amendments. The Senate proposed to eliminate the use of the special trigger based on population shifts for the very establishment of a boundaries commission in the first place. The Senate was concerned that we were in effect violating the Constitution by not automatically having boundary commissions, and that because the boundaries would not be considered in a certain province it would easily put the legislation before the courts in some kind of a court challenge.

Once again the Senate has something which it has a right to consider. I believe in this case that the senators are fundamentally wrong. Senator Carstairs argued, and I think she is correct, that the Constitution requires only interprovincial decennial redistribution and not intraprovincial decennial redistribution. In other words, the failure to have intraprovincial decennial

Government Orders

redistribution would not in our view contravene section 51 of the Constitution Act.

As well, by not changing the boundaries if they are at least within 25 per cent we are in effect reasserting boundaries that already exist and that presumably have survived any previous court challenge.

The reason we supported the measure originally was that it was a considerable cost saving. In the redistribution that will likely recommence after the bill is passed, it will not be necessary to re-establish commissions for Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Prince Edward Island, as well as the Northwest Territories. That will save over \$1 million in the next process.

While the Senate has raised some concerns of a legal nature, I believe they are incorrect. I also believe they are dealing largely with theory. I believe very few people would challenge a redistribution simply because it failed to change a riding that already existed.

(2250)

Finally I will comment on the redefinition of community of interest the Senate is proposing. Its definition came from the Lortie commission which had a number of worthwhile recommendations on the electoral redistribution process. We in the Reform Party worked hard to provide another definition because we fundamentally reject the Lortie commission's approach that there basically be affirmative action-racial kinds of criteria involved in the drawing of boundary commissions.

The Senate and the Lortie commission have some legal support in suggesting that there are court decisions. There are legal precedents that not only recommend this but, in the case of some courts, are actually pushing this kind of approach. Whether or not that is the case, it is in our view clearly contrary to the best interest of our country and to the idea of a non-racial Canada that we support. We feel the Lortie commission and the Senate are mistaken in that regard. We were satisfied that all three parties in the committee agreed that approach was not appropriate.

That is the Reform Party's review of the various amendments the Senate has proposed. I hope it sheds some light on why it proposed them as well as why we accept or reject them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish to thank and commend the hon. member for Calgary West for wanting to know more about the institutions which will be proposed to Canada by a sovereign Quebec. I think he should be reminded, and I want to reassure him on this, that the parliamentary assembly, one of the institutions provided for in the economic association proposal, will be an elected assembly.

Government Orders

The members of this assembly will be elected by the Parliament of Quebec and the Parliament of Canada or all parliaments in Canada together, depending on the type of representation they choose. They will not be appointed randomly. This joint assembly will bring together elected members from Quebec and Canada.

A decision on this economic association proposal will be made after the people of Quebec have voted in a referendum to take full control of their own development, which means passing all legislation, collecting all taxes and making agreements, including perhaps an economic partnership agreement with Canada. It is very interesting to share views on this proposal. I suggest that the hon. member for Calgary West do so at some point in time.

Quebecers will have to choose between a federal system in which they have very few powers and another one in which they will have 100 per cent of the powers in the Quebec Parliament, which has always been the heart and cradle of the Quebec nation, formerly referred to as the French Canadian nation. This nation will have the credibility and strength required to negotiate with Canada a mutually satisfactory agreement to get us out of the constitutional mess we are in.

I would like the hon. member to tell us if he would be prepared to talk his colleagues into accepting the referendum results if, as I suspect, it meant that Quebec achieved sovereignty and took full responsibility for its development in the future.

Mr. Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I find the member's remarks very interesting. I am a bit confused. I think Quebecers will be just as confused as I am during the referendum campaign.

In responding to the member for Bellechasse, the member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup talked about the need to have only one member in Quebec City and only one level of government and the need to eliminate duplication and overlap, as members of the Bloc always say.

(2255)

Now, in the agreement signed by the three sovereignist leaders, we see a proposal for a new Parliament for an independent Quebec and the rest of Canada, and not only a Parliament, but also a new cabinet, and we know what will happen. There will be public servants, offices, etc. They are also proposing a tribunal to solve some problems between the two nations.

In fact, they are proposing a new level of government with independence. I think that it is contrary to the commitment of the Parti Québécois, which is to eliminate a level of government, and we must take into consideration the fact that this PQ government has already promised to hire all federal public

servants here, in Hull. I cannot understand this position. It will be interesting to see how they will explain to Quebecers the creation of a new level of government after independence.

Regarding the member's question, he asked me if I would accept the result of a referendum. Obviously, we cannot recognize Quebec's power to determine the future of all the provinces, but the result of a referendum is clear. It is the expression of the will of the people. If the result is affirmative, it means that the majority really wants to separate, and if the result is negative, it means that they want to remain part of Canada. What I want to know now is if members of the Bloc will accept a negative result this time.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have thirty seconds left so I will simply say that on the issue of civil servants, we now have 18 percent of all civil servants and 24 per cent of the population. When federal civil servants join the Quebec public service, there will be a significant economy of scale for us and we will be better off.

As for accepting the results, I will return the question to the member. Does he believe that people who form a nation, and who have fought for the last 250 or 300 years to obtain the complete control of that nation, will stop now? The struggle will stop only when Quebec is absolutely sovereign and that is the answer of Quebec sovereignists.

Mr. Harper: Mr. Speaker, as I said many times before, I am not a Quebecer, but here is how I understand Quebec's history: Quebecers want to form a society within a bigger Canadian society. They want to keep both their Canadian identity and their Quebec identity and that will only be possible in a federal state.

The Deputy Speaker: Before giving the floor to the member for Chicoutimi, I should perhaps bring to the attention of all members Standing Order 18 which states, in part:

No member shall use offensive words against either House or against any member thereof.

[English]

I draw that to the attention of all members and obviously not just the member who is about to speak. I remind members that the rules bar us from using offensive words against either house or any member thereof.

(2300)

[Translation]

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the member for Calgary West, who has been in this House for a year and a half now, and has finally realized that Bloc Québécois members are first and foremost sovereignists. And of course, this means that what we are seeking is that one day there will no longer be any Quebec members in this House.

Government Orders

This is the reason why, as long as Quebecers are part of the federal experiment, Bloc Québécois members will oppose any change to the present formula for riding distribution. Its effect would be to weaken Quebec representation in the House of Commons, as long as Quebecers have not made up their minds on a new social covenant.

The present formula for the distribution of seats is not perfect because, historically speaking, during the 126 years of existence of this federation, Quebec has never had its rightful share of seats in the House of Commons. The six amendments proposed by the Senate, far from improving the content of the bill, actually make the situation even worse for Quebec. This is like the Robin Hood principle in reverse. We take from the poor, Quebec, to give to the rich, the rest of Canada.

The first amendment would reduce the maximum variation from the provincial quota from 25 to 15 per cent. What a nice equity exercise on the part of the non-elected members of the other place. According to the thinkers of the other House, one of the fundamental conditions of democracy is the fair mathematical share of regional representation.

I must admit that this is a very nice principle, but it does not explain the senate clause and the grandfather rights.

While the Senate is concerned about a perfect equality within the provinces, it seems to forget that there are several ridings in English Canada that do not even have 35,000 people. I am talking here, among others, about four ridings in Prince Edward Island, the riding of Labrador, the riding of Yukon and a few others. So, where is the senators' concern for equality for the voters in these ridings?

This amendment does nothing to improve this bill, and they know it very well. Besides, they even ignored what one of their peers was telling them. Senator Jean-Claude Rivest, a former advisor to Robert Bourassa, was demanding, like us, in the Bloc Québécois, that Quebec be given 25 per cent of the seats in Parliament.

I would remind you very briefly that, concerning Quebec's share of seats, the 1985 Act on Representation is quite clear.

(2305)

In fact, it stipulates that the returning officer must take into account, before distributing any other seats, the fact that 25 per cent of all seats in the House of Commons must be assigned to Quebec.

I am taking the liberty of reminding the House, with all of the respect it merits and which holds traditions so dear, that since the very first parliamentary session, Quebec has always enjoyed at least, and I stress at least, 25 per cent of all seats. This is neither an acquired right nor a favour that Canada has bestowed on Quebec: it is a simple mathematical calculation governed by

the Constitution Act, 1867, and by clauses 14 and 15 of the act to provide for the readjustment of electoral boundaries.

It would therefore be a shame, and actually inadmissible, to put an end to this tradition which has been handed down from the very first Parliament. Why put an end to the tradition? Simply to compensate, yes, I said compensate, English Canada for having kept its allegiances straight when voting. Do not forget that Quebec was the cradle of Canada. Quebec brought it into this world, and not the other way around. The first amendment will not only reduce the maximum variation from the province's quota, but could also wipe certain electoral ridings right off the map.

Yes, the population of several of Quebec's rural regions has been steadily declining over the past several years. The government knows it. So, what is it doing about it? With this bill, it is ensuring that English Canada will get additional ridings, and that Quebec will lose a few. What a great exercise in democracy! This is what I would call the Robin Hood principle.

The other amendment I find particularly disturbing is amendment No. 6 which seeks to redefine the concept of community of interest.

The senators suggest establishing boundaries based on demographic and geographic considerations. I realize that to say this amendment totally ignores the human aspect is to say the obvious. It is unfortunate, and it makes no sense at all. On paper this might work, but theoretically, realistically, practically, on a day to day basis, we cannot ignore the human factor because in the end it determines how things work.

For a riding like mine that borders on several municipalities and has a very large territory, this amendment could be a disaster. Take the riding of Chicoutimi. Last year, when the federal electoral boundaries commission came to the riding, it suggested taking the municipalities of Ferland-et-Boileau, Saint-Félix-d'Otis, Rivière-Éternité, L'Anse-Saint-Jean and Petit-Saguenay away from the riding of Chicoutimi and annexing them to the riding of my colleague, the hon. member for Jonquière.

This problem illustrates the importance of community of interest. In fact, these small rural municipalities on the Lower Saguenay, those the commission wanted to take away from my riding, have always considered La Baie, one of the larger cities in the riding of Chicoutimi, as their economic and social centre.

(2310)

Most of the services used by the people in the Lower Saguenay are located in La Baie. The closest employment centre is there, as is the small business development centre. Ferland-et-Boilleau, the municipality closest to the riding of Jonquière is 45 km away. This is the community of interest proposed by these amendments. It seems rather unreasonable to me.

Government Orders

A bill cannot be permitted to push aside—and I mean push aside—the human factor without a thought in order to establish electoral boundaries. This is a serious mistake, and I find it most regrettable. My comment is, simply: “Stop wasting taxpayers’ money with useless and pointless bills. Let us get down to the real problems of our society, which are growing with every passing day”.

It is time to deal with the economic slowdown, when statistics indicate that for the sixth straight month there has been no net job creation in Canada. The government is setting an example by its inertia in this area.

The Prime Minister is too busy to study a new plan for reducing unemployment insurance benefits. Perhaps he thinks it will help the growth of employment, which is in a state of exhaustion. Let us stop wasting our time and taxpayers’ money and get down to this country’s real problems.

[*English*]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to make this presentation.

I have come to this place with high ideals and really wanting to understand the whole Canadian scene. I have been very privileged to have my place in Parliament here right next to the members of the Bloc and to hear the presentation we just had.

I have some questions for the member. One is that he indicates that it is somehow fair that the Quebec people should have 25 per cent of the members of Parliament, irrespective of their population. On the other hand, he speaks of the lack of fairness when there is not a proportional representation in other parts of the country. I would like to ask him how he can defend from a fairness point of view that particular model.

I certainly have respect for the people of the province of Quebec. I have said this before. During our campaign we had people there who sported bumper stickers that said “My Canada includes Quebec”. Certainly I have that personal conviction. Regardless of what happens politically in that province, we will not take a chainsaw and cut them out and float them off into the ocean. They will remain physically here, with whatever kind of political arrangement we have.

I would like to have him explain how he proposes to justify that in perpetuity they should have an advantage over other Canadians in this particular regard and how he thinks that might generate more love and understanding toward them from the rest of Canadians.

(2315)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fillion: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. With regard to my preamble, I believe I answered his question when I said that the present seat distribution formula in this place was not perfect. One must remember that historically Quebec never had its fair share of seats in the House of Commons over the last 125 years.

In order to stop the gradual erosion of Quebec’s influence in our federal institutions and, especially—and I think this is the key word—to reaffirm the Canadian duality, members from the Bloc demand that Quebec retain 25 per cent of the seats in the House of Commons as long as we are part of the federal experience.

As you know, in the fall, Quebecers will decide their political future. The member emphasized this in the preamble to his question. It is then that Quebec, depending upon the choice made by Quebecers, will be either a province or a country. This is the choice Quebecers will have to make. In the meantime, they know that if Quebec remains a province in this federal system that cannot be renewed, this province will be limited. It will remain a colony of English Canada and we will remain a minority forever and ever.

An hon. member: Amen.

Mr. Fillion: Amen. And we will naturally be ruled by the present unitary federal government, whereas we would have a new lease on life if we became a country. I hope Quebecers will make that choice. I am convinced they will. Then, with new and more efficient methods, we will proudly develop this country.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, it will be a pleasure for me to let the member for Elk Island have the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, the member did not answer my question. He simply restated what he said before about the history and the present formula which I already know. What I want to know is how he defends the premise that the number of members of Parliament from the province of Quebec and only from the province of Quebec should not be related to the population.

In the past it has been a fixed number of 75. We know that relative to the rest of Canada, Quebec’s population has gone down. The mathematical fact stands. If it were not for that we would not be asking for more members in the House. That results when either the population of Quebec goes down or the population of the rest of the country goes up. That necessitates more members in this House by the present formula.

How is it that the Quebec members believe that they and they alone do not have to submit to the same rules of representation by population that the rest of Canada does? How does he justify that?

*Government Orders**[Translation]*

Mr. Fillion: Mr. Speaker, of course, here we must refer to the notion of the two founding nations. If Quebec had been respected when this country was formed, it would not have been allowed 25 per cent of seats in this House, but 50 per cent.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fillion: Yes, fifty per cent of seats. Two equal founding nations means a 50:50 sharing. Whereas now we are claiming our fair share of seats, that is 25 per cent.

(2320)

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a short comment. Like my colleague from Chicoutimi, I had the opportunity to hear the hon. member for Calgary West, who seems to already understand a large part of the proposed agreement to be submitted to Quebecers for ratification in the fall. We all understand, of course, that the Canadian fibre was first woven in Quebec, in Lower Canada, in Ontario, and that we in Quebec naturally propose to repatriate our own powers, while opening the door to a European-type model and proposing economic integration and a certain kind of political association with Canada.

Since Quebec is about to propose to Canada the free movement of goods, people and capital, as well as the establishment of some common institutions, does the hon. member for Chicoutimi agree that, contrary to what our colleague from Calgary West said, a major economic integration would prevent any region of Canada from being isolated from the others, and that this free movement, this major economic integration, would involve some political integration and a common political institution to manage the agreement, the partnership that would result not from a law imposed by a foreign Parliament but from a treaty freely negotiated between Canada and Quebec?

Mr. Fillion: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that, when Quebec becomes sovereign in the fall, you will see no boundaries or barricades being built between Quebec and Ontario or the other provinces. It is therefore in the best interests of Ontario and the other provinces to do business with Quebec. Rules can certainly be drawn up at the political institutions level, through discussions between members from Quebec and Ontario, to govern trade. In that case, I feel every Canadian province would stand to profit from the birth of this new country.

[English]

Mr. White (North Vancouver): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member who has just been speaking continues to mislead the House by talking about sovereignty association. He is a separatist and he should tell it as it is. He is a separatist and he should stop misleading the House.

The Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order, however, the hon. member for North Vancouver now has the floor on debate.

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I feel tempted to repeat what I just said and maybe I will as part of my speech.

Before beginning my remarks on Bill C-69 I would like to remind the House that almost two years after the 1993 election the debt and deficit has risen by almost \$100 billion. That is just in the two years since the Liberal government took office.

In the past 24 hours the government has spent almost \$100 million more than it took in. That is about \$4 million per hour or \$67,000 per minute in money we simply do not have, money we have to borrow. This borrowed money continues to collect interest that adds to the more than \$550 billion debt burden our children and grandchildren will have to carry.

Some weeks ago at a public meeting in Vancouver the Liberal member for Halifax said that as a traditional tax and spend Liberal she had crashed and burned when the Minister of Finance announced his budget in March of this year. If serious action is not taken very soon to seriously start addressing the problem of the debt and deficit, the hon. member is sure going to crash and burn again and again and again. It will be to the point where the international lenders will stop supporting our foolishness.

(2325)

Today we find ourselves debating again Bill C-69, which exists simply because of Bill C-18, which we debated earlier in 1994. I said then that the Liberal government should be ashamed of itself because of what it was doing. It was imposing the will of unhappy Liberal MPs on the voters of Canada. It was probably because they were worried they would not be re-elected to collect their gold-plated pensions at the pension trough. They were worried that if the boundaries changed they would not be able to collect their pensions.

They have protected the content of those pork barrel pensions with Bill C-85, which they are also ramming through the House this next week or so. Now they have brought back the electoral boundaries issue in a last ditch attempt to control the shape of their ridings. Without regard to the huge investment of time by the Electoral Boundaries Commission and without regard to the millions of dollars that have already been spent on a non-partisan process, the government is still trying to jam through ill-conceived and selfish political agendas.

Politicians have no business setting their own electoral boundaries. Human nature being what it is, some members might be tempted to act in their own interests, to trim areas of opposition from their ridings or to add little areas of support to their ridings. Even if that did not happen, there would be the suspicion of course that it was happening.

Adjournment Debate

The important thing is that the whole process should not only be non-partisan but it should be seen to be non-partisan. Politicians should have absolutely nothing to do with the process.

One of the disturbing parts about this whole process is that the increase in population in the province of B.C. entitles us to two more seats in the House under the present rules. Even if we were to hold static the number of seats we presently have, at the very least they should be redistributed so that B.C. has a greater proportion of the seats.

I vigorously oppose Bill C-69.

An hon. member: Fifty per cent.

Mr. White (North Vancouver): My hon. colleagues say we should have at least 50 per cent. Sometimes I would agree with them. The west obviously has a much more sensible attitude to politics than we have seen over on the opposite side of the House. We could certainly do with a greater percentage of the seats.

I am proud that Reform Party members stood against the government's attempts to ram through Bill C-18. They tried to do it in a clandestine fashion on a Friday afternoon when they thought no one would notice. I am proud that my colleagues stood and prevented that from happening.

Canadians are starting to see time and time again that Reformers stand up for democracy while the government continues to practice the old line Victorian style of politics. It punishes any Liberal MP who dares to represent their constituents by voting against a government bill. That method of operation is completely outdated. It is not appropriate to the information age. It may have been perfect in the olden days when the present Prime Minister first came to the House, but it is totally inappropriate for the information age. Shame on this government.

In previous Parliaments the issue of constituency representation in the form of free votes was never an issue because the three worn out, old style, dictatorial, arrogant, old line parties all played the same game of agenda politics. They never did want to and still do not want to govern the country according to the wishes of the majority of Canadians. They simply saw government as an opportunity to enact their own political agenda without regard to the concerns of Canadians.

The pressure for change is here in this House today and it is not going away. At the moment, with the exception of Reform MPs and a few independent minded Liberal MPs, most MPs are nothing more than voting machines; no matter what their constituents say, they follow the orders of the Prime Minister when they come into this House to vote. All of the debates, all of the questions, all of the committee meetings and hearings, all of the witness testimony, all of the travel junkets are nothing more than make work projects to keep MPs busy between votes. Those votes we already know the outcome of because the Prime

Minister had already decided before the first word of debate was spoken.

(2330)

Last year the government introduced approximately 60 bills. We debated them. We questioned them. We commented on them. At the end of the term we had passed 60 bills. We may as well have piled them up on a table 60 high and come here for one hour on one day and voted once. The outcome would have been exactly the same.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver North will have 14 minutes left the next time the bill is debated.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on June 1, I asked the Minister of the Environment whether the government planned to regulate emissions of dioxins, furans and hexachlorobenzenes from incinerators. I also asked whether the federal guideline for human exposure to dioxins and dioxin related compounds was adequate to protect human health. In response the minister stated that the exposure levels for dioxins and furans were under review by Health Canada.

Dioxins and dioxin-like compounds such as furans are highly toxic chemicals produced when various types of waste, particularly chlorinated plastics, are burned. Every day Canadians are exposed to dioxins and carry this persistent toxic compound in their bodies.

At present Canada's dioxin guideline is set at 10 picograms per kilogram of body weight per day. It has been maintained that this level of exposure is safe. However a recently published review, which took three years to conduct, in the United States by the Environmental Protection Agency pointed to dioxin being even more dangerous than was originally thought. The Environmental Protection Agency's reassessment found that even at extremely low levels dioxin affects human development, reproduction capacity and the immune system. The Environmental Protection Agency's reassessment of dioxin strongly suggests that safe levels of exposure set so far in the Canadian guidelines may no longer be safe or acceptable.

The time has come to shift the burden of proof so as to protect the environment and public health in this respect. The existence of safe doses needs to be re-examined because evidence from human epidemiological studies, from animal cancer studies and

Adjournment Debate

from biochemical research tells us that dioxin represents a cancer hazard to people.

The findings of the Environmental Protection Agency suggest that the environment and our own bodies are already overburdened with dioxin-like compounds. Given the persistence and toxicity of dioxin and dioxin-like compounds, one must conclude that the prudent course of action would be to prevent pollution, coupled most importantly with a reduction in our dependence on dioxin producing activities such as incineration.

In this context I ask the hon. parliamentary secretary to inform the House whether the federal government intends to take steps to phase out airborne dioxin emissions from incinerators across Canada and to reassess the Canadian guidelines for exposure to dioxins presently set at 10 picograms per kilogram of body weight per day.

I am looking forward to hearing the parliamentary secretary's reply.

Mr. George S. Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the major source of dioxins and furans identified in Canada today include municipal and hazardous waste incinerators, effluents from pulp and paper mills, long range atmospheric transport from other countries and contaminants in such chemical products as pentachlorophenol and PCBs.

As a result of Canadian regulatory and guidelines initiatives dioxin and furan emissions from municipal solid waste and hazardous waste incinerators have decreased by 80 per cent in the last four years.

Between 1989 and 1994 dioxin and furan emissions from bleached kraft pulp mill effluents have decreased by 82 per cent. Some dioxin contaminated pesticides are either strictly regulated or banned.

In addition, the levels of dioxin and furans in the Canadian environment have declined significantly. Annual releases from pulp and paper mills have dropped from more than 350 grams of dioxins and furans to less than 9 grams. Less than 50 grams of dioxins and furans are released from municipal solid waste incinerators in Canada per year. I am sure the member would agree these are good news stories.

A federal-provincial task force has been established by Environment Canada to identify and characterize additional sources of releases of dioxins and furans in Canada. This group will prepare and analysis of sectors and areas requiring further action to eliminate measurable releases of dioxins and furans and will recommend time lines for their virtual elimination from the environment. This task force may recommend further regulations under CEPA or modifications to existing guidelines.

Furthermore, federal guidelines relating to contaminants are constantly under review as new scientific findings are reported. Health Canada is currently looking at federal guidelines for human exposure to dioxins set in 1990 to determine whether it is necessary to revise them.

The Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 11.37 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 14, 1995

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

MusicFest Canada

Mrs. Kraft Sloan 13799

Telefilm Canada

Mr. Brien 13799

House of Commons Security Services

Mr. Solberg 13799

Interest Rates

Mr. Bhaduria 13800

Spina Bifida

Ms. Fry 13800

Stratford Chefs School

Mr. Richardson 13800

Tainted Blood

Mrs. Picard 13800

Gun Control

Mr. Gouk 13800

Ontario Election

Mrs. Wayne 13801

Brian Ducharme

Ms. Cohen 13801

Public Service of Canada

Mrs. Brushett 13801

Claire Culhane

Mrs. Terrana 13801

Bosnia

Mrs. Debien 13802

Sentencing Legislation

Mr. Ramsay 13802

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

Ms. McLaughlin 13802

Deputy Premier of Quebec

Mr. Discepola 13802

Carol Colangelo

Mr. Lastewka 13802

Member for Nepean

Mrs. Gaffney 13803

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Canada Social Transfer

Mr. Bouchard 13803

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) 13803

Mr. Bouchard 13803

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) 13803

Mr. Bouchard 13803

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) 13804

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) 13804

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) 13804

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) 13804

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) 13804

Minister of Canadian Heritage

Mr. Manning	13804
Mr. Gray	13805
Mr. Manning	13805
Mr. Gray	13805
Mr. Manning	13805
Mr. Gray	13805

Education and Social Assistance

Mr. Dubé	13805
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13805
Mr. Dubé	13805
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13805

Somalia inquiry

Mr. Frazer	13806
Mr. Collenette	13806
Mr. Frazer	13806
Mr. Collenette	13806

Canada Social Transfer

Mr. Crête	13806
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	13806
Mr. Crête	13806
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	13807

Transport

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West)	13807
Mr. Young	13807
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West)	13807
Mr. Young	13807

Job Creation

Mr. Loubier	13807
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	13808
Mr. Loubier	13808
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	13808

National Parks

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	13808
Ms. Guarnieri	13808
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	13808
Ms. Guarnieri	13808

Overfishing

Mr. Patry	13808
Mr. Tobin	13808

AMF Techno Transport

Mr. Pomerleau	13809
Mr. Young	13809
Mr. Pomerleau	13809
Mr. Young	13809

Hughes Aircraft

Mr. Gouk	13809
Mr. Young	13809
Mr. Gouk	13809
Mr. Young	13810

Gun Control

Mr. Jordan	13810
Mr. Rock	13810

Bovine Somatotropin

Mr. Landry	13810
Mr. Goodale	13810

Employment Equity

Mr. Strahl	13810
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13811

Fisheries

Mr. Robinson	13811
Mr. Tobin	13811

Presence in the Gallery

The Speaker	13811
-------------------	-------

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation

Mr. Tobin 13811

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Milliken 13811

Committees of the House

Procedure and House Affairs

Mr. Milliken 13811

Agriculture and Agri-Food

Mr. Speller 13812

Oceans Act

Bill C-98. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted 13812

Mr. Tobin 13812

Termination of Assistance to Indonesia Act

Bill C-333. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted 13812

Mr. Robinson 13812

Canada-United States Tax Convention Act, 1984

Bill S-9. Motion for first reading agreed to 13812

Mr. Chan 13812

Committees of the House

Procedure and House Affairs

Motion for Concurrence in 82nd Report 13812

Mr. Milliken 13812

(Motion agreed to.) 13812

Petitions

Human Rights

Mr. Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury) 13812

Income Tax Act	
Mr. Szabo	13812
Human Rights	
Mr. Verran	13813
Human Rights	
Mr. Bélanger	13813
Rights of Grandparents	
Mr. Bélanger	13813
Political Parties	
Mr. Benoit	13813
Arson	
Mr. Benoit	13813
Assisted Suicide	
Mr. Robinson	13813
Human Rights	
Mr. Adams	13813
Ms. Fry	13813
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West)	13814
Mr. Hart	13814
Firearms	
Mr. Hart	13814
Dangerous Offenders	
Mr. Hart	13814
Income Tax	
Mr. Hart	13814
Human Rights	
Mr. Godfrey	13814
Alcohol	
Mr. Duhamel	13814

Communications

Mr. Duhamel 13814

Human Rights

Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) 13814

Dangerous Offenders

Ms. Meredith 13815

Mr. Ringma 13815

Questions on the Order Paper

Ms. Milliken 13815

Motions for Papers

Ms. Milliken 13816

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Criminal Code

Bill C-41. Consideration resumed of report stage and Motions Nos. 5 to 17 inclusive. 13816

Mr. Abbott 13816

Mr. Keyes 13817

Amendment 13819

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) 13819

Mr. Chan 13820

Mrs. Wayne 13821

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) 13822

Mr. Forseth 13823

Mr. Boudria 13825

Mr. Gilmour 13826

Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) 13828

Mr. Williams 13829

Mrs. Barnes 13830

Division on Motion No. 5 deferred 13832

Motion Nos. 18 and 20 13832

Mrs. Venne 13832

(Motion negatived.) 13832

Division on motion deferred	13832
Mr. Chan	13832
Motion No. 19	13832
Division on Motion No. 19 deferred	13833
Mrs. Venne	13833
Motion No. 21	13833
(Motion negatived.)	13833
Mr. Ramsay	13833
Motions Nos. 22, 23 and 25	13833
Division on Motions Nos. 22, 23, and 25 deferred	13833
Mr. Chan	13833
Motion No. 24	13833
Division on Motion No. 24 deferred	13834
Motion No. 3 negatived on division: Yeas, 47; Nays, 179	13834
Motion No. 4 negatived on division: Yeas, 87; Nays, 140	13835
Motion No. 5 negatived on division: Yeas, 48; Nays, 180	13836
Motion No. 6 negatived on division: Yeas, 53; Nays, 174	13837
Motion No. 7 negatived on division: Yeas, 59; Nays, 166	13838
Motion No. 8 negatived on division: Yeas, 65; Nays, 157	13839
Motion No. 9 negatived on division: Yeas, 33; Nays, 114	13840
Motion No. 10 negatived on division: Yeas, 37; Nays, 178	13841
Motion No. 11 negatived on division: Yeas, 24; Nays, 105	13842
Motion No. 12 negatived on division: Yeas, 22; Nays, 74	13843
Motion No. 13 negatived on division: Yeas, 6; Nays, 67	13844
Motion No. 14 agreed to on division: Yeas, 91; Nays, 62	13845
Motion No. 15 negatived on division: Yeas, 33; Nays, 79	13846
(Motion No. 16 withdrawn.)	13847
Amendment agreed to on division: Yeas, 150; Nays, 12	13847
Motion No. 17, as amended, agreed to on division: Yeas, 158; Nays, 14	13848
Motion No. 20 negatived on division: Yeas, 59; Nays, 116	13849
Motion No. 19 agreed to on division: Yeas, 80; Nays, 36	13849
The Speaker	13850
Motion No. 22 negatived on division: Yeas, 47; Nays, 75	13850
Motion No. 24 agreed to on division: Yeas, 107; Nays, 44	13851
Motion for concurrence	13852
Mr. Rock	13852
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 167; Nays, 50.	13852

Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, 1995

Bill C-69. Consideration of senate amendments	13853
Mr. Gray	13853
Mr. Milliken	13854
Mr. Langlois	13855
Mr. Hermanson	13859
Amendment	13863
Mr. Crête	13863
Mr. Bodnar	13864
Mr. Crête	13865
Mr. Langlois	13867
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	13868
Mr. Crête	13871
Mr. Fillion	13872
Mr. Epp	13874
Mr. Langlois	13875
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	13875

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

The Environment

Mr. Caccia	13876
Mr. Rideout	13877

Appendix