



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 108 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, May 25, 1998

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, May 25, 1998

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1100)

[*English*]

NATIONAL HEAD START PROGRAM

The House resumed from April 20 consideration of the motion.

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, discussions have taken place among all parties and the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca concerning the taking of the division on M-261 scheduled for today at the conclusion of Private Members' Business and I believe that you will find consent for the following:

That at the conclusion of today's debate on M-261, all questions necessary to dispose of the said motion shall be deemed put, a recorded division deemed requested and deferred until the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

• (1105)

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the people of Surrey Central to speak in favour of Motion No. 261 as proposed by my hon. colleague from Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca.

The motion states:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should: (a) develop, along with their provincial counterparts, a comprehensive National Head Start Program for children in their first 8 years of life; (b) ensure that this integrated program involves both hospitals and schools, and is modelled on the experiences of the Moncton Head

Start Program, Hawaii Head Start Program, and PERRY Pre-School Program; and (c) ensure that the program is implemented by the year 2000.

We in the official opposition are pleased that the motion is receiving so much support in the House.

The motion clearly states that the federal government should develop a national head start program along with its provincial counterparts. This would be a comprehensive program for all Canadian children in their first eight years of their life.

As a member of parliament I have divided my mandate into four components of society which I would like to focus on. They are: youth, senior citizens, families and women. I find this helpful in my work because, for example, I find that I learn a great deal about youth when I meet with students at schools.

We should provide a good start in life for our children. Our federal government tries to help all children through our health and education programs. The motion simply asks the federal government to concentrate on our children in the first eight years of their life, which is a critical stage in a child's development.

We know that inadequate attention and nurturing for our youngsters can often lead to subsequent developmental difficulties. We know that with a poor start the life of a child is at risk of winding up on the wrong side of the law. Our federal government should be interested in any opportunities that result in successful crime prevention. We spend more money dealing with criminals than on early detection and prevention of crime. The dollars spent on providing a good head start for our children will result in the saving of many dollars in the future that would have been spent dealing with anti-social and criminal behaviour.

The government has already implemented head start programs for our aboriginal communities. They have been primarily limited to reserves, but most aboriginal people living off reserve and non-aboriginal people also need this kind of program. We should treat all Canadians equally.

We have head start programs for our aboriginal children. Why are head start programs not available to other children who are not living on reserve?

This motion proposes that the government explore models based on the Perry Preschool Program, among others.

Private Members' Business

This government's National Crime Prevention Council has been very supportive of a national head start program. On page 2 of the executive summary of its 1996 report it states:

● (1110)

There is ample evidence that well-designed social development programs can prevent crime and be cost-effective. Rigorous evaluations, mainly American, show that crime prevention through social development pays handsome dividends.

In almost 30 years of participant follow-up the Perry Preschool Program in Michigan has been shown to be responsible for very significantly reducing juvenile and adult crime.

The Secretary of State for Children and Youth has already spoken to this motion on behalf of the Liberals. She acknowledges the success of the aboriginal head start program and pointed out that funding had doubled due to its benefits.

We need to expand our efforts to include the protection of all children and to assist needy parents to properly nurture and care for our country's children.

The motion we are debating should be supported by all members of this House, but especially by Liberals. The motion is not in conflict with the comments made by the secretary of state.

It is known that healthy babies become healthy children. Hospitals could screen all new mothers to identify babies and families who may need extra support and services.

Supporting this motion would pave the way for providing high risk families with the parenting help needed to avoid child abuse and neglect.

The official opposition justice critic spoke on this motion during its second hour of debate. He recounted that during the justice committee's recent 10-year review of the Young Offenders Act the committee travelled across the country. It listened to witnesses. It heard experts, professionals and lay people who have an interest in the whole area of the development of youth and the prevention of youth crime. During the hearings experts told the committee that teachers could detect aberrant and over-aggressive behaviour in children as early as grades one, two and three.

The Bloc fears that the motion encroaches into the area of provincial jurisdiction. As such, it has tied this motion into the Canadian unity debate. That is unfortunate.

In Quebec the justice committee found programs that are far ahead of some of the other provinces. That province has done an excellent job. There are programs in Quebec that ought to be looked at and perhaps emulated by other provinces if they have a real concern about dealing with early detection and preventive programs.

This brings us to the heart of the role of our federal government. Far from being threatened, Quebec should be anxious to share its technology and some of its successful programs with the rest of the country. The Bloc members should also support this motion.

Our federal government should pursue this motion and pool our resources to reduce the cost of implementation. Ideas and successes could be shared. National standards would ensure that children from all parts of this country receive the necessary assistance and protection in a national head start program.

Back in August 1996 the former minister of justice commented about the justice system and how the harm has already been done by the time people come before the courts. He stated "We must do more than deal with the symptoms of the problem. We must go to the source". Programs, as proposed by this motion, go to the source.

In 1996 the Child Welfare League of Canada argued the need to create a comprehensive and permanent universal program across Canada to address funding for early intervention measures to assist our children.

I would like to give an example. Sandor Nyerges was a constituent of mine and a veteran of the two great wars. He was deaf, mute, 80 years old and lived alone. He became the victim of a ferocious attack by an assailant who has a long record as a young offender. My constituent died in the hospital from that attack. The alleged assailant was apparently intoxicated, a youth, possibly on drugs.

● (1115)

The constituents of Surrey Central and I are furious. In Surrey and elsewhere we hear about such crimes day after day. We have had another murder in Surrey, a caretaker at the Sikh temple, another victim of youth.

If our federal government had been acting in a timely fashion in the direction of the motion we are debating today, maybe Sandor and many other Canadians might not have been assaulted or murdered.

At the Princess Margaret Senior Secondary School in Surrey in March 1998 I met with students shortly after Sandor died. During my meeting with these students they raised the issue of crime as a major concern.

This is just another example of how the government continues to put the rights of the accused first and the safety of Canadians second. The government does not have a national head start program.

In closing I would like to say that Canadians are suffering. We want safer streets and safer communities. We want the Liberal government to respond to society's justice needs. That is why we should all support Motion No. 261.

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to speak on Motion No. 261 put

forward by the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca. The member continues to demonstrate his commitment to progressive social policy. I have spoken about this issue previously in the House and it is with great pride that I do so today.

Good government means providing the vehicle for a prosperous Canadian economy and also ensuring equality of opportunity in that prosperous economy.

The best economic system to provide prosperity is the free market, but the free market is only sustainable if all citizens have access to the economic levers. I believe that if we were to implement a national head start program and focus on early intervention, we would be going a long way in addressing the equality of opportunity and the access to those levers.

Recently several issues have been debated in the House and focused on by the Canadian people. One is the Liberal government's \$2.5 billion millennium scholarship fund introduced in Bill C-36 which will be debated later on and which has been debated quite extensively in the House lately. Another is the government's new posturing on the Young Offenders Act. Not surprisingly the Liberals have missed the point on both programs.

Motion No. 261 speaks to a process that is far more admirable, effective and economical than these government sponsored programs. Motion No. 261 is an early intervention program that promotes prevention instead of punishment.

Study after study suggests that one dollar invested in a child in the formative years, particularly between birth and three years of age, and some studies say birth and six years of age, can deliver a six dollar and some say a seven dollar return on a child during those formative years. Some studies indicate that a one dollar investment in a child between birth and the age of three will provide a return of seven dollars to society.

Programs like the head start program in Moncton, New Brunswick offer this alternative, an economic return already in Canada. Not all areas are so fortunate.

From personal experience, I grew up on the Hants shore in rural Nova Scotia. In grade 6 there were 23 students who left grade 6 at the same time I did to go to another school. Only 8 of those students ever graduated from high school, 8 out of 23. I have some degree of experience and indeed a very personal empathy for this issue.

More recently in that community there has been significant progress by that school. The Dr. Arthur Hines School has become a leader in Nova Scotia in terms of providing equality of opportunity in rural Nova Scotia. I commend the principal, Hazel Dill, for her hard work. I also commend grassroots organizations such as the

Private Members' Business

Hants Shore Health Clinic that work on these head start and early intervention programs.

There are other programs in my community, including an adult literacy program which is being promoted by Patricia Helliwell. It is achieving significant progress with people who have fallen through the cracks in the system early on. I commend that adult literacy program for its commendable work and its effectiveness in helping provide these people with an opportunity.

I cannot help but think what if we really started to deal with the roots of the problem. What if we got to these people earlier, when they were children and a significant impact could be made. Then someday perhaps we would not need adult literacy programs in Canada because all Canadians would have achieved a basic competence in communication and literacy.

• (1120)

The government has chosen a different more politically palatable route. It has decided to use the memorial fund for the Prime Minister. This Canadian millennium scholarship fund will only benefit 7% of Canadian students who attend university when it is implemented two years from now. If the government had put this \$2.5 billion toward a national head start program, it would have provided a better economic return on that money for Canadians.

However the Liberal Party's focus group and polling data have told it to spend the money on university students, that post-secondary education is a more politically palatable initiative than is early intervention. The facts are contrary to this. Experts on post-secondary education will agree that the best bang for the buck for the Canadian taxpayer is to invest in the youngest of Canadians, those Canadians who are most vulnerable to negative influences and who can benefit most from positive influences, those between birth and the age of three.

I assume based on focus groups and polling data that the government has recently decided to get tough with young offenders. Arguably it is extremely important that the Young Offenders Act be tightened and that young people be made more responsible for their actions. Again the Liberals have really missed the point.

Harsher penalties will not prevent young people from committing crimes. We must address the flaws in the Young Offenders Act but what can we do to prevent these young people from turning toward crime? Why are we not dealing with these issues in a more holistic manner instead of by knee-jerk reaction and crisis management? The real answer is early intervention. A national head start program would go a long way toward addressing that.

A stable and caring environment during a child's formative years offers the best opportunity to provide a productive and stable adolescence and ultimately a productive and prosperous adulthood.

Private Members' Business

Studies have demonstrated that this early intervention is one of the best social policy approaches.

In the finance committee hearings earlier this month I questioned Professor David Stager from the University of Toronto. I asked him how he felt about early intervention. Professor Stager is an expert on post-secondary education. When I asked him how he felt about the investment we could potentially make in early intervention he said that the best bang for the buck would be before school. There was a splendid synthesis done this past fall of the research in the area of human capital. It concluded that early intervention has the greatest pay-off for a number of reasons.

This man is an expert on post-secondary education and an advocate for post-secondary education who has spent his life advocating investment in areas of post-secondary education. He told the finance committee that the best investment for society to make is in early intervention before children even get to elementary school where much damage could have already occurred if positive environments were not provided earlier.

I commend the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca for his forward thinking and his commitment to progressive social policy. His motion would be very effective in addressing the real needs of Canadians at a very critical time. We are entering the 21st century. We have a global knowledge based economy that will generate the economic growth of the 21st century.

We in this House can make a difference so it is absolutely imperative that we focus on ensuring that young Canadians have every opportunity. If we as public policy makers and parliamentarians can ensure that young Canadians do not just have as good a chance but that they have a better opportunity than people in other countries, we will be doing a great deal to ensure that Canada is on a firm footing and that young Canadians are poised to participate actively and prosper in the new economy.

This type of commitment will prevent the necessity of a TAGS program in the 21st century. It will prevent the necessity of a lot of the social investment that has been more reactive than proactive.

• (1125)

As an Atlantic Canadian, I have watched over the years as successive governments have tried to effectively deal with the situation in Atlantic Canada frankly by using money on social spending as opposed to social investment. Unfortunately these governments in trying to protect Atlantic Canadians from the risks of the future have prevented them from participating in the rewards of the future.

That is where aggressive and forward thinking social policy, such as an early intervention program, would make a difference. Then we would not have to be engaged in regional economic development debates in 20 years in this House because we would

have provided the equality of opportunity which is necessary to allow all Canadians to participate in growth. As an Atlantic Canadian it is very important to me that we continue to work to this end.

I would urge every member of this House to consider very carefully and to support this motion. I think it is very important for us, when provided with the opportunity, to make the right decisions, to make decisions that will last much longer than many of us will be in this House and to provide those types of benefits. It would be an affront to the people who put us here not to do so.

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to address the House today on this motion advocating a national head start program for Canadian children.

I want to applaud the hon. member for his strong support of early childhood development. The Government of Canada shares his enthusiasm for early childhood development as a way of positively influencing the health of children. In fact the government has made increased knowledge of and action on early childhood development a top priority.

In the next few minutes I would like to share with the House some of the things we have learned about early childhood development and how this knowledge is shaping our approach to prevention and early intervention initiatives on behalf of Canada's children.

The most important thing we have learned from a vast body of research over the last 30 years is that the experiences of Canadian children especially in their early years profoundly influence their health and well-being throughout their lives.

We have long known that early negative factors such as low birth weight, low income, abuse, neglect and poor physical and mental health are barriers to healthy child development. Government initiatives such as the community action program for children, the Canada prenatal nutrition program and aboriginal head start have achieved considerable success in responding to these factors.

Nevertheless, research and experience tell us we must do more to recognize and support positive factors that contribute to healthy development. These factors range from healthy pregnancies and birth weights to loving parents, to supportive mentors or role models, to caring families and communities.

Another key thing we have learned is that developing these positive factors requires the involvement of many partners across society. These include parents, who are children's earliest and most influential teachers, volunteer organizations, health service providers, schools, neighbourhoods and communities. We need strong involvement from across society because we all have a stake in

ensuring that Canada's children get off to the best possible start in life.

As the Minister of Health recently noted in this House, Canadians and their governments have a moral responsibility to help improve conditions of childhood for the seven million children in this country. He went on to say that taking collective responsibility for children is not just the right thing to do, it makes good economic and social sense.

How early do we need to focus on childhood development? Research tells us that we have the best opportunity to make a positive impact in the very early years of life. This is because 85% of a child's core brain development occurs by age three.

While negative experiences in these early years can result in disorganized and underdeveloped brains, positive experiences often stimulate overall brain development. What are the social implications of negative versus positive early experiences for children?

• (1130)

Research shows that negative experiences tend to produce impulsive, aggressive adults. On the other hand, positive early life experiences tend to produce more intelligent, caring and responsible citizens.

Another area where we have made advances is our increased knowledge of the developmental pathways children pass through on their way to adulthood. These pathways can be influenced by a wide variety of negative or positive factors.

Researchers have found that all children pass through critical periods along their own developmental pathways. During these periods, there are windows of opportunity where support and intervention can make a difference in their development. The period from conception to the age of five or six is seen as the most critical of these periods.

While families are first and foremost responsible for the development of their children in this early period, they are not the only ones that must assume the responsibility. Families need support. Governments, communities, corporations, employers, unions, teachers and individual Canadians all have a role to play. We must work together to help children move along healthy pathways to adulthood.

With this in mind, I call on fellow members to join me in encouraging Canadians to make healthy child development a priority in their own neighbourhoods and communities. By acting together we can make a world of difference for Canada's children.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the motion by the Reform Party member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca.

Private Members' Business

To begin with, although we support the motion in principle and the underlying reasoning concerning youth crime, we cannot support it for the following reasons.

First, family policy is a matter of provincial jurisdiction, and this has always been the case. Second, as far as Quebec is concerned, it has well established policies in place to reduce juvenile delinquency, to help young people reintegrate society and to divert them from a life of crime. One thing the Reform Party member should understand is that youth crime will decrease when other Canadian provinces do as Ontario has done and follow Quebec's example with respect to youth protection, creating youth centres to help young people and tracking those at risk throughout their formative years.

I would like to provide some very important, and very revealing, statistics, which were brought to light by my colleague, the member for Berthier—Montcalm, a little while ago.

The figures on juvenile delinquency recidivism rates are eloquent and speak for themselves. Quebec has been active in this area for 30 years, through its youth centres and through its youth protection legislation. The result is that it has the lowest rate of recidivism in Canada. It has the lowest rate of recidivism for youth crime anywhere in North America. The number is 195 per 100,000 in Quebec while, for a province such as Saskatchewan, where the accent has been much more on punitive measures than on reintegration into society, the number is 800 per 10,000. That is high.

Four or five years ago, Ontario decided to follow Quebec's example and model part of its youth protection program on what is being done in Quebec. The results are very impressive. For the past five years, the rate of juvenile delinquency in Ontario has steadily decreased. Right now, it is around 400 or 500 per 10,000, as opposed to 800 per 10,000 for provinces such as Saskatchewan. These are the two points I wish to make regarding the motion per se.

As for the fact that this motion is being introduced by the Reform Party, that I find somewhat confusing, because we no longer know where Reformers are coming from.

• (1135)

Do they have a common party policy regarding youth protection and the Criminal Code in general? We have heard all sorts of things in the past five years. We even heard of a delegation of Reform members planning to visit a country, whose name I forget, to look into the benefits of flogging criminals.

Private members' bills were tabled and remarks were made by members of the Reform Party, which were extremely harsh and made no mention of reintegration or social rehabilitation, only of punishment per se.

Private Members' Business

Now, there is this Reform bill, which is kind of mild compared to the ones tabled previously. This is somewhat confusing. What do members of the Reform Party think? Are they in favour of reintegration?

Recently, Reformers criticized the Minister of Justice for lowering the age at which children may be tried in adult court for a serious crime. They argued that lowering the age was not enough. They wanted provisions included in the legislation whereby children under the age of 10 who are charged with a serious crime may be tried in adult court.

During this debate, when the Minister of Justice lowered the age for transferring young offenders charged with serious crimes, not once did a Reformer raise the importance of reintegration and the need to help young offenders re-enter society for its greater benefit. This is a bit confusing.

Another concern we have is with the fact that, in their remarks on this motion, Reformers failed to mention that there is a major reason why youth crime is on the rise, as crime in general may be, and that is the social and economic conditions people live in.

Over the last four or five years, the Liberal government has imposed drastic cuts to social transfers for welfare, health and provincial funding for higher education.

Such cuts, which total billions of dollars and which will continue to be made until the year 2003, have an obvious impact on the economic situation of households, particularly those with children. Social problems surface whenever the economic well-being and development opportunities of families are targeted.

A child whose basic needs are not met because of financial problems experienced by the parents, or because of psychological distress also related to reduced federal transfers is more likely to become a juvenile delinquent.

Let us look at what this government has done regarding employment insurance since January 1996. The changes it made had a significant impact on the economic conditions of Canadian families, thus creating a tendency among children to become juvenile delinquents.

The statistics on employment insurance are shocking and revolting. They amount to political and administrative barbarism. This government has made so many cuts and has tightened the eligibility criteria for employment insurance so much that, for the fiscal year 1997-98, only 42% of the unemployed are eligible for EI benefits, compared to 83% just nine years ago. In 1989, 83% of the unemployed were entitled to benefits, compared to only 42% today.

When you tighten eligibility criteria to that extent and when you triple the number of hours that must be worked, you create conditions that are conducive to a rise in juvenile delinquency. You

also create conditions which, in the families that suffer psychological shock and stress as a result of these cuts, promote delinquency.

• (1140)

In 1989, there were a million unemployed. Now, there are 1.4 million unemployed, but we are paying out \$3 billion less in employment insurance than in 1989. So, there are 400,000 more unemployed and \$3 billion less. This can only cause increased distress and lead to juvenile delinquency.

For instance, eligibility requirements for parental leave, leave that is often necessary, have doubled. It now takes 700 hours, or 20 weeks of 35 hours each. This is one of the major areas that was tightened up, along with the way seasonal workers and those on the labour market for the first time are treated when they are hit by unemployment. The requirement now to receive employment insurance benefits is 910 hours, whereas before it took 20 weeks at 15 hours per week.

Clearly these cuts, which are pushing families toward welfare, are increasing the distress of these families and the likelihood of the children of these families turning to delinquency.

Had the Reform Party taken a coherent and intelligent approach, it would have supported the Bloc Québécois in the matter of provincial transfers for welfare, post-secondary education and health and it would have supported the Bloc's demands for reform of employment insurance, which is needed immediately to avoid psychological and economic distress to the people of Quebec and Canada.

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am rising to indicate my support of Motion M-261, presented by the hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca. I would like to draw particular attention to his proactive action in proposing a preventive solution to crime.

Motion M-261 is composed of three elements. First, that the government should develop, along with their provincial counterparts, a comprehensive National Head Start Program for children in their first eight years of life. Then, that they should ensure that this integrated program involves both hospitals and schools, and is modelled on the experiences of the Moncton Head Start Program, Hawaii Head Start Program, and PERRY Pre-School Program. Finally, the government should ensure that the program is implemented by the year 2000.

Motion M-261 is a good idea, because it addresses the fundamental causes of crime and prevents criminal behaviour in later life. This government's strategy toward crime involves reacting once a crime has been committed. We spend millions of dollars on the criminal justice system processing offenders through the court and prison systems. This approach to the problem is very costly in both financial and personal terms. Anyone who has been the victim

of a crime can say that the effects linger long after the actual incident.

If we are really concerned about victims' rights, we should work at decreasing the number of crimes and this will decrease the number of victims.

The purpose of this motion is to address the fundamental needs of Canadian children at a very early age. The NDP has long recognized the importance of meeting our children's basic needs so that they may develop to their full potential with the right nutrition and the right environment. In 1989, the then NDP leader Ed Broadbent introduced a motion aimed at eliminating child poverty by the year 2000. This motion was adopted by all parties, but now in 1998 the situation has not improved, in fact it is even more critical. We must invest in our children in order to ensure a better future, with less crime.

• (1145)

The program this motion is suggesting is not a new one. Head start programs were introduced in Michigan, Hawaii and Moncton, New Brunswick. Hawaii's healthy start program was one of the first early intervention programs for children. It focussed on high risk families and on interventions during pregnancy. By tackling problems such as basic parenting skills, nutrition, conflict resolution and substance abuse, it was able to reduce child abuse by 99%.

The PERRY Pre-School Program in Michigan has focused on improving parenting skills, improving infant health, bettering family circumstances and promoting cognitive and social development. Assessments of this program have shown that it has reduced the adult and juvenile crime rate by almost 50%, decreased the number of teen pregnancies by 40%, and increased rates of employment and income. Long-term savings to taxpayers were substantial and, in all, amounted to six times the initial investment.

The Head Start Program in Moncton, New Brunswick, provides children of parents who are socially, emotionally or educationally disadvantaged with an environment that focuses on children's and parents' basic needs. For each dollar spent under the Head Start program, it is estimated that six are saved in social assistance services. In addition to saving money, we are preventing the considerable emotional difficulties suffered by crime victims.

We should set aside political discourse that talks about crime as though it is inevitable. A proactive approach that invests in our children not only ensures a future with less crime but it also ensures a promising future for our young people. I can think of no better investment.

Motion M-261 should go further. Federal and provincial governments should urge first nations chiefs to take part in the program,

Private Members' Business

because we know that the problem of crime among aboriginals is incredible. By inviting them to join us in our efforts, I think we will be able to accomplish something.

For these reasons, I urge all my colleagues to support Motion M-261. All our children deserve a head start.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We have three minutes left in the debate.

Mr. Keith Martin: Mr. Speaker, since the debate is to be terminated in three minutes and since Government Orders do not start until noon, I ask for unanimous consent of the House that we continue until noon to debate this motion.

I also ask that the member for Elgin—Middlesex—London be allowed five minutes, that the member for Lethbridge be allowed five minutes, and that I would have a minute to thank everyone.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The House has heard the suggestion of the hon. member. Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Gar Knutson (Elgin—Middlesex—London, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I commend the hon. member for putting forward the motion we are debating today. I remind members of the House that the motion states:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should (a) develop, along with their provincial counterparts, a comprehensive National Head Start Program for children in their first 8 years of life; (b) ensure that this integrated program involves both hospitals and schools, and is modelled on the experiences of the Moncton Head Start Program, Hawaii Head Start Program and PERRY Pre-School Program; and (c) ensure that the program is implemented by the year 2000.

I could speak for some time on the substantive merits of the proposal. I support the intent of the motion quite strongly. It has been stated eloquently by members who spoke before me that by investing in children in the early years of life we get a tremendous compounding effect of benefits throughout a person's life. If we invest early we get better literacy rates. If we invest early we get lower criminal rates. If we invest early we get better health rates. All social factors are improved by investing early between the ages of zero and eight. I certainly hope the member knows that I know that and that I know the intent.

• (1150)

However, if we had questions and answers I would raise some concerns over the bill. For the federal government to partner with the provinces these days is a difficult task. Anyone who reads the newspapers knows that it is difficult.

Unfortunately in many parts of the country the provinces want the federal government to write a cheque. Then we would let provinces go off on their merry way and devise programs. They

Private Members' Business

would thank Ottawa and take the money, but they do not want the federal government involved in their jurisdiction.

Quebec would have some opinions on federal government spending on what traditionally would be seen as a provincial jurisdiction. That causes me some concern. Other provinces whether out west or whatever would also have some concerns about the federal government embarking on a new spending program. I am not sure we can put a time line of the year 2000. These things would involve some very difficult negotiations. They would have to be processed and I do not know whether that can be done by the year 2000.

I do not think the member is suggesting that the federal government, if it does not have an agreement to bring in a program by the year 2000, would unilaterally embark on its own program. I do not read that in the bill so I am not sure what would happen if the motion passed and the federal government could not get agreement by the year 2000.

That is not to suggest I do not support the bill. I have some difficulty with the wording. I ask members when they vote on the motion not just to vote on the intent of the bill. All members can see the intent is worth while. It is worth supporting.

However it is not simple and straightforward to embark on new federal-provincial programs. The federal government is trying to get a new federal-provincial program on home care. It has on its agenda that at some point it would like a new federal-provincial program around a national pharmacare program. This would become another program that would be added to the agenda.

We saw it on the hepatitis C issue. The government is trying to work out another agreement with the provinces on how to treat the people excluded from the original agreement. Those negotiations are proving to be difficult. I could throw some stones at those on the other side who are in some respect playing politics.

My main point is that federal-provincial agreements are not as simple as a simple private member's motion might suggest on first read. I ask members to think about what they are voting on when the motion comes before us for a vote. I advise members opposite that I support the intent of the bill, but I will have to reflect on whether I will be voting for it.

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I thank members present for allowing us to carry on. It is a pleasure to rise to speak to Motion No. 261 advising the government to develop a national head start program.

My colleague for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca is someone for whom I have a great deal of respect. I know many members in the

House have respect for him as well. He has dedicated his life to helping the injured and the sick. He has had a firsthand opportunity to witness breakdowns in our health care and education systems as the two are so closely linked.

I am confident all members of the House will support the motion because almost all of us are parents and many of us are grandparents or soon to be. We know that in an ever increasing competitive global market technological advances make leaps and bounds but should never come at the expense of our children. The generations to come will require every head start they can get, every advantage their health and happiness will allow, giving them the support and positive reinforcement required to excel in a competitive world.

As my colleague recently wrote in a note:

—research has clearly demonstrated that events in early childhood can have a dramatic effect on an individual. Ensuring that children's basic needs are met (i.e. proper nutrition, strengthening parent child relationships, good parenting skills, preventing child abuse, etc.) has proven to have a profound effect in producing stable, happy children and thereafter, well functioning adults. Programs that address these needs are not only effective in their outcome, but also, extremely cost effective.

I doubt any member of the House would refute that youth crime is becoming increasingly common and increasingly violent. While legislative changes can bring about statistical changes in youth crime, my colleague urges us to consider the motion, to support it, and to get to the root of youth problems before they start.

• (1155)

The operative word here is prevention. The time has come for the House to start taking a proactive stance on youth problems and to stop relying solely on reactionary solutions.

The problem of youth crime may not be the only problem in society but it is one issue we can try to resolve before it materializes. If we can implement a national head start program, children who may have began an early life in crime can be helped in the right direction through such a program.

The cost of implementing a national head start program will be returned many times over, as has been previously mentioned, with every child that is helped. Youth criminals can easily become serious adult offenders and we all know how expensive our judicial and penal systems have become.

If we invest the money now we could save the costs associated with youth criminals and their subsequent adult crime life. Children do not begin lives in crime out of choice. My colleague has done a great deal of research on the issue and I urge all members here today to seriously listen to the facts and act in the best interest of Canadian children.

The motion before us today will help children, plain and simple. Regardless of our political affiliation let us put our partisan politics aside and act in the best interest of our youth.

It is imperative we remember to whom we owe these seats in parliament: our constituents, the men, women and children who rely on us to represent their best interest. Today we can prove to all our constituents that we recognize a good thing when we see it. Today's motion will only improve the conditions of our children by addressing basic parenting skills, proper nutrition, conflict resolution and abuse issues.

The statistics are in and early intervention programs can be very successful. Members of the House cannot ignore the 50% decrease in juvenile and adult crime as a result of early intervention programs. Nor can my colleagues ignore the 40% reduction in teen pregnancies and the resulting higher rates of employment and income. The long term savings to Canadians are enormous.

I do not need to do the math to remind my colleagues about the huge price tag associated with crime. Costs go up and insurance premiums rise. Policing expenses, court costs, in addition to incarceration and counselling are all extremely expensive.

To simplify the decision of whether or not to support the motion—and my common sense tells me that all in the House will support a decent and worthwhile initiative such as this one—I liken the situation to a favourite poem of mine “The Road Not Taken” by Robert Frost.

In our great country we have and will often come to a crossroads, two diverging roads that branch off in two different directions. I see today's motion on the implementation of a national head start program as exactly that. It is a fork in the road. Either we take the road that has been travelled many times, the reactionary road of detention and incarceration, or we take a new path, a proactive path of crime prevention through social development.

Every child in Canada deserves the opportunity to develop as a normal human being. I urge all members here today to support my colleague's motion.

Mr. Peter Stoffer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I would like to stand in debate to move a friendly amendment to the motion before us. Could I have unanimous consent of the House to rise in debate to move an amendment to the motion?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Sackville—Eastern Shore has requested unanimous consent to be recognized on debate to move an amendment to the motion.

Private Members' Business

The reason there is concern is that the House has previously given unanimous consent for three persons to speak. That is why it has to be done in this way.

Is there unanimous consent of the House for the member to rise on debate to present an amendment to the motion?

Mr. Peter Stoffer: Mr. Speaker, if I may just briefly explain my amendment, it may become clearer. The amendment would be to insert after “their provincial counterparts” “and the leaders of the aboriginal communities”. In consultation with the federal and provincial governments it would include aboriginal communities.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Does the hon. member for Sackville—Eastern Shore have unanimous consent of the House to be recognized on debate by the Chair?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Peter Stoffer: Mr. Speaker, as the member for Sackville—Eastern Shore and along with my colleague, the member for Acadie—Bathurst, I would like to move that the motion be amended by adding after the words “develop, along with their provincial counterparts,” and before the words “a comprehensive National Head Start Program for children in their first 8 years of life”:

—and leaders of aboriginal communities—

• (1200)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): If the hon. member for Sackville—Eastern Shore would get the amendment to the table officers we will check it to make sure that it is appropriate. If it is, then we will bring it to the House.

Although Private Members' Business has now expired, the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca has been given the assurance of the House that he will have one minute to wrap up the debate.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all members of the House today who spoke in favour of Motion No. 261.

This motion will very clearly demonstrate the leadership of this House in preventing some of the child abuse, violence and youth crime which we see in our society today. It will strengthen co-operation between the provinces and the federal government. It will strengthen parental involvement. It will provide a brighter future for children.

So far, five provinces and territories have come on side to say they want to work with the federal government to make a national head start program a reality.

Again I want to thank all the members who spoke in favour of this motion today. They are speaking in favour not only of this motion, but also of the future of the children of our nation.

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The Chair has been advised that the amendment is in order. Therefore, the amendment is before the House, but debate has concluded, so the vote is deferred.

It being 12.03 p.m. the time provided for Private Members' Business has expired.

Pursuant to order made earlier today, all questions on the motion are deemed to have been put and a recorded division is deemed demanded and deferred at the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders today.

• (1250)

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

(Division No. 158)

YEAS

Members

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 1998

BILL C-36—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

That in relation to Bill C-36, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 24, 1998, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage of the bill and one sitting day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill and, and fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the day allotted to the consideration of report stage and on the day allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

• (1205)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Call in the members.

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Clouthier
Cohen	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Godfrey
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Patry	Peric
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert—131	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Borotsik
Brien	Brisson
Cadman	Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Earle
Epp	Forseth
Fourmier	Gagnon
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Hardy
Hart	Harvey
Herron	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Konrad
Laliberté	Lalonde
Laurin	Lefebvre
Loubier	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Mayfield
McDonough	Ménard
Mercier	Morrison
Muise	Nunziata
Nystrom	Obhrai
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Ramsay	Riis
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solberg
St-Hilaire	Stinson
Stoffer	Strahl
Thompson (Charlotte)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Venne	White (Langley—Abbotsford) —89

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collenette
Dalphond-Guiral	Finestone
Galloway	Guimond
Lebel	McKay (Scarborough East)
Perron	Proud

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I seek the unanimous consent of the House to debate and vote on the following motion:

That this House congratulate the board of the new Ottawa Hospital on its decision to confirm David Levine in his position as chief executive officer and reiterate—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have permission to put the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Translation*]

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from May 13, 1998 consideration of Bill C-36, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 24, 1998, as reported (without amendment) from the committee; and of Group No. 1.

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-36 before us contains various provisions, including one regarding the millennium scholarships program, which the Prime Minister would like to impose on and force down the throats of the provinces, particularly Quebec, whose loans and grants system is working remarkably well.

Incidentally, last Wednesday, in the City of Lac-Mégantic, I attended the opening of a new foundation, which does not make any waves or cause any jurisdictional problems. The founding president of the Montignac Foundation, Serge Poulin, who is the vice-principal of the Montignac school, together with the board, will carry out his duties on a voluntary basis and will be required to raise up to \$1 million within five years in support of Montignac's high school graduates.

Unlike the federal government, this foundation does not plan to spend 5% of its budget on administration costs. Everyone involved unanimously agreed to work for free, not only in managing and administering the fund but also in raising funds, while it is a well known fact that the federal government has already earmarked \$2.5 billion in the 1997-98 budget for scholarships that will not be granted to students for another two or three years.

• (1255)

It is a real scandal, and, in addition, it is causing barefaced duplication. The last time I spoke on this bill, I compared the duplication to the situation of a farmer with a mixed quota of processing milk and fluid milk. That means two ministers of agriculture will be managing the same cow, which belongs to the same producer.

There will be two levels of government, two heads of government, two forms for every student to complete to obtain money to continue studying.

Of course students do not care whether the cheque bears a maple leaf or a fleur de lys. We all know that the Government of Quebec will deduct from bursaries to students any amount it discovers the federal government has given them.

I would like to congratulate Serge Poulin, the founding president, and the members of his board of directors along with the

Government Orders

members of the 15 municipalities surrounding the city of Lac-Mégantic, who will manage the Fondation Montignac. The region of Lac-Mégantic is very prosperous, with a level of unemployment no doubt under 6%. However, the average income is lower than that in the eastern townships. With this sort of foundation, we will enable dozens and dozens of students to continue their studies.

In closing, I invite the federal government and the Minister of Human Resources Development, in particular, to sit down with Pauline Marois and come to an agreement. It is disastrous when the government is continually sowing the seeds of discord and always looking for an argument or a run in with the provinces, given that education is a provincial matter.

[English]

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to speak on Bill C-36, the budget implementation bill, and to represent my constituents.

I suppose what is most frustrating, though, would be for them to witness this last vote. The government should be ashamed of itself. It has just forced closure again, again and again. There are 107 amendments to this bill. There has been less than one day to debate these at report stage and what does this government do? It does like it has in the past from the very first bill, right back to Bill C-2. It forces closure.

The government pulls every single trick and all the people on that side of the House get their little marching orders, they stand up like trained sheep and do what they are told to do. It is absolutely disgusting and appalling.

I want to talk about Group No. 1. I have not quite figured out whether this is the Prime Minister's slush fund or if it is the finance minister's. The Prime Minister has announced a \$2.5 billion slush fund which nobody will see until at least the year 2000. We have no idea what direction it is going. He is sort of burying it in a dark hole. We are not sure if it is being put away for the finance minister's announcement when he wants to seek the nomination of this party to sit on this side of the House. We do not know where it is going.

Imagine if it does go to some of the students. Only 6% of the entire student population would receive any benefit of this \$2.5 billion slush fund belonging to we are not sure who.

I find that very disturbing but even more disturbing is that this government stands up on that side of the House, gets on its moral high horse and all of a sudden it is so proud of doing something for young Canadians, putting something back into education. This government has a very short memory. Over the last four years during the last parliament this government cut \$7 billion in transfer payments to the provinces. What do those go to? Education.

• (1300)

Students are struggling. Now the government is on its moral high horse again to announce a slush fund. It does not want to do it too early in its term. It is going to wait and the fund will benefit at best 6% of students if it ever gets to them. That is a disgrace.

I will talk about the budget. The minister was quite upset at being criticized by the auditor general for his accounting practices so he sent his cronies to talk to the auditor general. The message was basically that if you do not like the way we are keeping our books, we will just change the rules. Who do you think you are to criticize the government, you are only the auditor general.

I have to commend the auditor general on his reply. On March 18 the auditor general stated this to the government: "I believe the change will open the door for governments to influence reported results by simply announcing intentions in their budgets and then deciding what to include in the deficit or surplus after the end of the year once preliminary numbers are known". The auditor general is trying to very politely tell the government to quit cooking the books. That is exactly what the government is doing. I cannot believe the Liberals sit on that side of the House with their faces buried in their papers. They are not paying attention.

Look at the facts. Look what those guys did less than a half hour ago. They stood up like trained sheep and followed their marching orders. How can they do that? We watched it on hepatitis C and we watch it on vote after vote. Why do they even come to Ottawa? They are ordered here. They think they have some dignity coming to this House and voting like that. I have been here for one year. Time after time I see closure.

They can crack jokes but this is serious business. The people of Canada are incredibly frustrated that the Liberals sit on that side of the House and force closure on bills like this, that they make a slush fund for the finance minister to dispose of when he feels it is right for his political advantage while students are out there struggling. They are struggling all over British Columbia where I come from.

Canadian students are facing rising tuition costs and expenses and the government's response to them is we will create a slush fund but come back and see us in the year 2000 and we will decide if you qualify. If you buy a young Liberals membership we will see where you fit in the mix and if you will get some of this fund. We have not quite decided who will benefit from it.

That is absolutely shameful. Students are looking for help. They are facing rising tuition costs on account of this government's massive cutbacks to post-secondary institutions, \$7 billion since the Liberals formed government.

That is straight fact. Look at the numbers. Any financial expert can tell them that. They sit over there and think it is a big joke. The day of reckoning will come, next election day. How they can

actually stand up and vote to force closure on 107 amendments is incredible. We have had one day of debate.

There was a time when those members sat on this side of the House. They thought it was appalling to force closure. But how quickly it changes when they are on that side of the House. Time and time again we have seen what these members have done. They get their marching orders from the whip. I think they call it a triple whip vote. That is what we are getting again.

• (1305)

How can those guys sit on that side of the House with straight faces and joke and laugh about something this serious? We are talking about the budget implementation act and I am specifically talking about the \$2.5 billion millennium scholarship fund which is a nice fancy title for the Prime Minister and his cronies.

If this government had anything to do it would put that \$2.5 billion into tax cuts immediately where there would be a tangible benefit, where jobs could be created for students who will be getting out of university in the next week or two looking for jobs. Students are facing dismal prospects right now across the country due to the government's high taxation on small business. This government could have done something positive for the students of this country. Instead it chose to play its political games, cooking the books, hiding the money and deciding what fits its political agenda and how it can benefit from this. That is exactly what the government has done.

I honestly believe that students and all Canadians in the next election will come back to this. We will make sure they remember that time after time this government forced closure when it was convenient, when it suited its own political agenda. There is no substance in this. It is just hiding \$2.5 billion. The government calls it a scholarship fund but it is not accessible until the year 2000. Even then it may benefit 6% of the students of this country.

How can government members sit on that side of the House and be proud of themselves?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Maud Debieu (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, about 10 days ago, the Quebec National Assembly unanimously passed a resolution asking the federal government to amend its bill on the millennium scholarship fund, so as to respect Quebec's unique student loans and grants program.

Over the next few minutes, I will explain why the representatives of the people of Quebec asked Ottawa to unconditionally withdraw from this area and to provide full financial compensation to the Quebec government.

Government Orders

Let me first discuss the federal government's unconditional withdrawal from education. Many reasons justify such a measure, but it is always worth repeating them.

First, under the Constitution, education is an exclusive provincial jurisdiction. We can never say it too often. The federal government argued that its initiative is not related to education, but to the funding of education. Yet, it is clear that the federal program interferes in the education sector by evaluating scholarship recipients and asking them for an activity report.

Second, the issue is even more sensitive in the case of Quebec which, as you know, is not a province like the others, even though some refuse to recognize that fact. Again, anything relating to language, culture and education is vital to Quebec's national identity.

Finally, the federal government's project is a waste of time, money and resources. Indeed, the Quebec government has been administering its own loans and scholarships program for 34 years. It has the expertise and the necessary infrastructures to ensure the smooth operation of a new scholarships program. Why create a new structure, the millennium scholarship foundation, and provide it with the required staff and mechanisms, when everything is already in place in Quebec?

Such shameful duplication is condemned so strongly that a consensus quickly developed in Quebec to have all student scholarships administered by the Quebec government.

This leads me to discuss the second Quebec claim, that is the transfer to the Quebec government of the financial resources reserved for Quebec, so that it can implement an additional scholarship program if needed.

The main reason for this is the current imbalance between the federal government's financial resources and those of the provinces.

• (1310)

In February 1957, ten years before he became Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Elliott Trudeau wrote the following: "The total wealth at the disposal of the Canadian tax system needs to be divided between the federal government and the provincial governments so that each may do as it sees fit with its share".

In other words, each level of government must have its share of taxes so that it may meet its constitutional responsibilities. The present Prime Minister would do well to read what his mentor had to say on this.

The federal government does, however, have greater powers of taxation than the provinces. This problem dates back to the beginnings of Confederation, worsening as the provinces began to develop programs to meet the growing needs of their populations in

Government Orders

the areas of health, education and welfare. Instead of splitting tax resources differently with the provinces, however, the government of Canada offered to co-finance programs under certain conditions.

Worse yet, the federal government did not settle for controlling the provinces' exercise of power. Often, solely in order to raise its profile, it wants to be the one to control a program in an area of provincial jurisdiction. As we know, very often it does this by taking advantage of its spending power.

What is the millennium scholarship foundation but just one more abuse of the federal spending power, despite this government's promise to limit spending in the aftermath of the 1995 referendum?

The present Prime Minister of Canada is launching unprecedented assaults on the provinces. Even Pierre Elliott Trudeau supported the Quebec premier in his opposition to the federal grants to universities in the 1950s. On this he wrote the following: "If a government has such a superabundance of revenue that it undertakes to provide part of the common wealth which does not fall under its jurisdiction—that government is conspicuously guilty of going against the principle of proportional taxation".

Judging by these words from a Quebecker who cannot be labelled a separatist, the Government of Canada collects too much taxes compared to the provincial governments. This is no doubt the reason the Minister of Finance is trying to camouflage his budget surplus. Every year he has undervalued his taxation revenues, overestimated his reserve for contingencies, and as a result exaggerated the size of the federal deficit. Today, he is trying to include in the 1998-99 budget expenditures that would be made over a period of ten years. What will he invent tomorrow to interfere, once again, in areas under provincial jurisdiction?

The federal government now has more money than it needs to fulfil its responsibilities. That money is not the federal government's money. First of all, it is the money the provinces should have received through transfers, which were cut by several billion dollars. It is also the money of the workers, whose EI contributions were diverted. Finally, it is the money of taxpayers from Quebec, Alberta, New Brunswick and all the other Canadian provinces where the federal government collects taxes.

If there is a need for scholarships, the provinces must meet that need themselves. The federal government just has to give them part of the fiscal base so they can collect the necessary taxes directly or, as a former premier of Quebec used to say, "to give them back their loot". But, as we can see, the more things change, the more they stay the same.

In other words, the federal government should withdraw from the area of scholarships with full compensation to the provinces, as demanded unanimously by the members of the National Assembly of Quebec. As a matter of fact, that is the intent of the amendments to the bill that were brought forward by my colleague, the member

for Quebec. It is so convenient to attack the separatists when things are not going well in the Canadian system.

• (1315)

But if there is a sovereignist movement in Quebec, is it not primarily because the Canadian federation is not working? If it is not working, is it not mainly because the federal government is infringing upon provincial areas of jurisdiction, which is leading to costly overlap?

To answer these questions, let me remind the House of what the late political analyst Léon Dion wrote in 1980: "The political stability of our country relies on Quebec being granted control over all linguistic and cultural matters as well as the financial means to develop and implement the programs it would see fit to promote in these areas as suitable for its own people."

Canada is a dysfunctional entity. For the last 50 years, Canadian federalism has moved away from the model developed by its founders, since respect for the autonomy of the provinces is at the heart of the 1867 pact.

The Millennium Scholarship Foundation is but another example of this distorted federalism. Since negotiations are underway to allow the Government of Quebec to regain exclusive control over scholarships, it would be appropriate to suspend the implementation of the millennium scholarship program.

However, the federal government seems to be too concerned about its political visibility and not enough about the welfare of the students to support the amendments put forward by the Bloc Québécois.

[English]

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have some quick facts on the so-called Liberal millennium fund.

According to human resources development, in Canada 45% of all new jobs by the year 2000 will require post-secondary education. This means that for many young people attending university or college is not an option if they want to find work. Despite this fact and despite the fact that the Liberals say they are committed to youth, the Liberals continue to throw barriers in the way of young people struggling to develop the skills and talents necessary to get ahead in a cutthroat global economy.

Since 1995 the federal Liberals have cut \$1.5 billion from federal funding for post-secondary education. Since 1980 Liberal and Conservative governments have cut federal funding from \$6.44 for each dollar of student fees to less than \$3.

Over the last 10 years tuition fees have climbed by 240%. Last year alone they rose by almost 12% nationally, increasing at a rate seven times the rate of inflation. Tuition fees in Canada have

Government Orders

reached a national average of \$3,100 which surpasses the average tuition rate of publicly funded universities in the United States.

In a 1997 survey of high school students in the maritimes, 40% of students not going to university said they could not go because they could not afford it. The average student debt load is \$25,000. That is up \$13,000 in 1993 when the Liberals took power. Bankruptcies for students trying to pay off loans are at record levels, having increased by 700% since 1989. Currently 130,000 students are in default. The number of bankrupt graduates is estimated at 37,000. Missing one payment determines default.

Now some questions for them. By the time the first cheque from the millennium fund is mailed out the Liberal cuts to the Canada health and social transfer will have cost colleges and universities \$3 billion. It does nothing to redress rapid increases in tuition fees for post-secondary education which have almost tripled since 1990. It would not substantially alter the huge debt load the university students face upon graduation. Nor does the scholarship better the situation for students graduating into unemployment. Less than 1% of unemployed youth will benefit from the government's program to fight youth unemployment.

To add hypocrisy to the mix, very deep within the budget's small print is a provision that stops students from filing for bankruptcy for at least 10 years after they have graduated. The current policy is two years.

We have heard a lot of discussion about the millennium fund and whether it will improve the situation for post-secondary education. Having looked at the document in committee where some of the discussion has taken place, it is quite clear that post-secondary education is in a very deep crisis. One of the reasons that we are facing a crisis with post-secondary education is the retreat of public funding for our post-secondary educational facilities.

Although we have heard a lot of talk about the millennium fund, this grand fund of \$2.5 billion, the reality is that this fund will not even begin until the year 2000 and will only help 7% of the students.

• (1320)

The auditor general has some questions about the accounting practices of the millennium fund. Those questions should be raised with the Minister of Finance as well.

By the time the fund begins in the year 2000 we will have experienced cuts of around \$3 billion. It becomes very clear that the millennium fund does not even come close to replacing or compensating for the massive draining cuts we have experienced in post-secondary education. This is causing enormous concerns not only in terms of where public policy is going, but also for the impact it is having on the lives of individual students.

It is because of the retreat of public funding that tuition fees have skyrocketed. We have seen huge increases over the last 10 years. There is a direct relationship between the pain and debt load students are facing in the retreat of public funding as a result of a loss of transfers from the federal government to the provincial governments. There is absolutely no escaping the fact that the millennium fund cannot make up and does not make up for the loss we have experienced.

In addition the other really serious situation that the millennium fund creates is that it begins to take us down the slippery slope of privatization. New Democrats are very concerned that with this foundation, a private foundation being set up which will have representation from corporations in the private sector, there will be less and less control of public administration and public direction of our post-secondary educational facilities. For that reason alone this fund should be rejected.

We should go back to the drawing board and say that the real issue here is to support publicly administered, publicly accessible post-secondary educational facilities. We have already seen examples in Canada where the corporate influence on a board of governors of universities and colleges and now on this millennium fund is beginning to have an impact on the curriculum, deregulation of tuition fees and deregulation of programs. All these things are creating an environment where there is increasing privatization and corporatization of our post-secondary educational system.

The NDP believes that we have to have leadership from the federal government. It needs to be the kind of leadership done in co-operation and collaboration with provincial jurisdictions to design a national program of national grants that deals with different jurisdictions and different provincial contexts where there is a clear understanding and a principle that accessibility for all students in Canada is a national standard.

The NDP believes that this is a starting point of ensuring that our post-secondary educational system is protected and strengthened and not destroyed as we have seen over the last few years.

Canada is only one of two OECD countries that do not have a national grants system. We need to ensure federal funding is provided in co-operation with provincial governments to establish a national system of grants.

In the province of British Columbia as well as in the province of Quebec leadership has been shown in terms of trying to keep education accessible for students even in the face of massive cutbacks. British Columbia is now in the third year of a tuition freeze. This has been very difficult to accomplish, given the massive cutbacks it has experienced in transfers from the federal government.

The NDP is calling on the federal government to show the necessary leadership. We have heard a lot of rhetoric and concern expressed by government members about the levels of student

Government Orders

debt. There is nothing in this bill that will alleviate the pressure and the huge debt load now facing students.

We need to go back to the drawing board and state clearly that this millennium fund is taking us down the wrong road. We need a national grants system. We need accessibility. Most important of all, we need restoration of the federal funding for post-secondary education in Canada.

Mr. Paul Bonwick (Simcoe—Grey, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I contribute to the debate on the merits of Bill C-36. The question in my mind is, on such a basic issue as education, a mom and apple pie type issue, what does Reform have against students? It boggles me.

I consider it a privilege to serve as a member of this government and as we for the first time in a generation deliver a balanced budget speak about an education initiative this government has brought forward. What makes me most proud about this accomplishment is the fact that it has enabled us to introduce perhaps the most progressive program ever witnessed in this country, the Canada millennium scholarship program, the cornerstone of the Canadian opportunities strategy.

This government knows there is no better investment in the future than future investments in access to post-secondary education, knowledge and innovation. That is why we are creating the single largest endowment ever offered by a federal government to ensure that a post-secondary education is within reach of anyone who wants it. We are especially targeting those of modest means for whom post-secondary education would be beyond their grasp.

• (1325)

This \$2.5 billion initiative will change the lives and the future of Canadians. It will give Canadians access to the knowledge and skills necessary for jobs of the 21st century. It will give up to one million Canadians a chance to thrive in a new economy and in a new millennium.

There can be no debate. As we stand here on the threshold of the 21st century we must prepare our citizens to think innovatively and creatively in a world that is transformed into information and technology. For this very reason increasing access to post-secondary education must be a national priority.

Yet there are some in this country who suggest it is not the Government of Canada's business to ensure higher learning and make sure it is accessible and affordable; this despite the fact it is now universally recognized that post-secondary education is a precondition for full participation in a future economy. These critics overlook the federal government's well established history in helping Canadians to pursue advanced studies.

In addition to funding post-secondary education through Canada's health and social transfer we have provided some \$4.2 billion in financial assistance since 1964 to students in provinces that participate in the Canada student loans program. Since that same year we have provided \$1.4 billion to the two jurisdictions that do not participate in the program, namely Quebec and the Northwest Territories.

We have a long tradition of awarding scholarships to students through various granting councils and programs such as the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, the Medical Research Council of Canada, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. If this legislation is adopted we will add an additional \$400 million for the next three years to the combined budgets of these three councils. This is pretty impressive.

While similar in spirit, the Canada millennium scholarship fund is quite unique. This contribution is Canada's way of celebrating the passage into the new millennium. We are observing this extraordinary event not by building monuments but by investing in Canadians and preparing them to be the knowledge workers in a knowledge economy.

An equally important reason why the millennium scholarship cannot be considered the same as other federal funding for post-secondary education is that the endowment fund will be managed by an independent organization.

The Canada millennium scholarship foundation in consultation with key stakeholders will decide how to design and deliver millennium scholarship funds. The fund will be administered by a board of directors made up of private citizens, at least one of whom will be a student.

The minister of education as well as the education community will play a key role in identifying prospective directors and nominating people who have a pulse on the education community. Once operational, the foundation will be able to enter into agreements with provincial governments and post-secondary institutions on some aspects of scholarship eligibility. In addition the Canadian millennium scholarship foundation will be expected to minimize administrative costs and overhead.

Our overriding goal is to significantly increase access to post-secondary studies everywhere in Canada for low and middle income students and to do so in a way that avoids duplication with any province.

The Government of Canada is committed to ensuring that the millennium scholarship complements other types of student assistance programs. Given this flexibility the Government of Quebec's decision to break off discussions regarding the millennium fund is both puzzling and very frustrating.

Government Orders

This government is deeply dismayed that Quebec has not put the interests of young Quebecers first. Dismayed but not totally surprised. From the outset the PQ government took a hard line putting forward a lopsided proposal that left no room for reconciliation. Despite our repeated efforts to find common ground, our provincial counterparts remained intransigent.

The position of Mr. Bouchard's government has not changed. Mr. Bouchard wants to opt out with full compensation. His government has shown no flexibility whatsoever. It is clear that Mr. Bouchard had no intention of negotiating so there is no point in returning to the negotiation table.

Even though Premier Bouchard told the Prime Minister last March that he recognized the Government of Canada's intention to "make a significant concrete and modern contribution to the knowledge through scholarships and" acknowledge that this was "a legitimate concern", the Quebec government wants to opt out of this program with full compensation. This would seriously weaken and undermine the Canadian millennium scholarship foundation and the intent for which it is put in place.

• (1330)

As disappointing as these developments are, we must move forward without interfering with Quebec's priorities in the areas of education and without penalizing, most importantly, Quebec students.

Members on this side of the House are confident that a solution to outstanding issues relating to implementing a foundation can be found in the context of the current legislation. As the Prime Minister has already said in the House "We are satisfied that the bill gives us the needed flexibility to resolve the situation in a reasonable manner". Reasonable words from a reasonable man.

The fact that the finance committee decided to extend its consideration for Bill C-36 to hear further witnesses is a further reflection of that flexibility, but there are practical limitations which must be factored into the equation. If we want this program in place by the year 2000 we must adopt the legislation as quickly as possible.

I hear my colleagues across the floor commenting "Not until the year 2000". They speak as if we are in the 1950s or the 1930s. The year 2000 is merely 18 months away.

It is equally important that we not lose sight of the principal reason for introducing the millennium scholarships. Canada's success and competitiveness in the next century will depend on Canadians being well equipped and well motivated to meet Canada's challenges in a knowledge based economy.

The Canada millennium scholarships are critical new tools to help us prepare Canadians for the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century. As much as they will help equip 100,000 students each year with the knowledge necessary to function in an information society, they will also inspire other youth who may be thinking about dropping out or hesitating about going to college or university.

Perhaps most significant, these scholarships will heighten public awareness and appreciation that a post-secondary education is essential in a knowledge based economy. They will help mobilize the entire population behind a clear and strong inspiring vision, a collective future in which we all have the knowledge and skills we need.

The Government of Canada is determined to lead our society toward a future in which all Canadians are empowered to succeed in the new economy. That is why it is so critical that we quickly pass Bill C-36. If Canada is to grow and prosper in the 21st century we must begin by implementing the federal budget today.

I ask members opposite to read the bill, not the prepared texts which their staff have put together for them.

Mr. Scott Brison: Mr. Speaker, sound economic policy involves dealing with the challenges facing Canadians in a holistic way, with consistent economic policies, not stopgap measures that further complicate, for instance, the Canadian tax code.

The millennium scholarship fund will only benefit—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It is with regret that the Chair advises the hon. member for Kings—Hants that he has already spoken in this debate. He cannot speak again, although that is going to leave a lot of people in the House terribly disappointed.

We will double-check the blues and if it is determined that the hon. member has not spoken on this group of motions, then he will be the first recognized if we make that determination.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Prince George—Peace River.

• (1335)

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I had fully expected to have my speech interrupted by question period. That seems to be my lot in life, to rise just before the start of QP. However, with this sudden unexpected turn of events that is not going to happen today and I will speak earlier than I had originally intended.

There are a couple of fundamental issues which I wish to address in speaking to Bill C-36, and specifically the amendments put forward in Group No. 1 by the Bloc Québécois.

First of all, the very fundamental issue that we are dealing with in this very shortened debate that we are going to have today is the

Government Orders

issue of time allocation. The Liberals, once again, have cut off debate for the 41st time since 1994. It is despicable. I think there is rising resentment across the country due to the fact that there is no democracy in this Chamber, the very place that is supposed to be the heart of democracy.

Perhaps the government has done this because it has decided that it wants a longer summer break. Perhaps the backbenchers put pressure on cabinet and on the Prime Minister to ensure they get a long enough time to flip burgers and go to barbecues in their ridings. While that is important work for an MP, no doubt, the fact is that the main thrust should be to debate legislation in this Chamber.

We have seen this so many times in the past. When the opposition parties start to really get to this government and start to hold it accountable on important national issues like its complete failure to address the reform of the Young Offenders Act or the issue of compensation for all victims of hepatitis C, what does this government do? It runs for cover by invoking time allocation, by bringing down closure to cut off debate. In this case what we see is the cutting off of debate on a whole long list of amendments to this very important bill. The Group No. 1 amendments alone constitute over a dozen motions. How can these types of motions be adequately addressed when debate has been limited?

Not only do they want to cut off debate, they are heckling and directing inappropriate comments at opposition speakers who stand here today wanting to hold this government accountable to the people of Canada. They direct those comments at us to distract us from the little time that we are allowed to speak on this bill.

This group of amendments specifically deals with the millennium fund. I listened in somewhat stony silence as the hon. member opposite—

Mr. Paul Bonwick: That is exactly what is between your ears.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, he had his opportunity to speak. Now he is heckling me, trying to throw me off track when I am trying to drive home the message to the viewing public that there are fallacies contained in his prepared speech that probably came out of the minister's office or the Prime Minister's office and was handed to him a few minutes before he walked into the Chamber.

He stood and read it. If he really wants to debate the millennium fund and how much support it has, then why do we not have a debate about that instead of him standing and reading a prepared speech?

The fact is that the millennium fund is going to be a disgrace. It is going to be a failure. Why? The reason is simple. We pointed it out during the budget debate. I am sure the pages watching this debate today will be interested in this because, once again, what we see is that the Liberal government wants to differentiate between

Canadians. It wants to set up two classes, just as it has on the hepatitis C issue. It wants to have two classes of victims. It will compensate some of the people. The government says it is a caring government, that it will compensate the post-1986 victims. The ones between 1986 and 1990 will be compensated, but the ones before will not be compensated.

• (1340)

The hon. member across the way who just spoke was bragging about how the millennium fund will help 100,000 students. Is that not great? But the fact of the matter is that there 1.6 million post-secondary students: 400,000 are full time students and the rest are part time students. Do the math. The students are doing the math: 100,000 out of 400,000.

Once again this Liberal government wants to differentiate. Which will be the lucky quarter of the full time students who will get the scholarships? The government will decide which of those young students will get the scholarships. If they belong to the Young Liberals of Canada they might get a scholarship. Somehow the government is going to differentiate and decide who gets the scholarships.

That is not totally true. The hon. member who spoke before me said that there is going to be one student on the board. I am sure the government can find one Liberal student, but after this maybe not.

The fact is, there is no budget surplus to help Canadians in a unified way because of the false accounting practices of this government. That is the fact. This millennium fund is the latest example of that. The finance minister has put \$2.5 billion into the 1998 budget. He has built it in, but he has not spent the money yet. The money will be spent down the road.

The auditor general on March 18 responded to a threatening letter from finance officials by saying "I believe the change will open the door for governments to influence reporting results by simply announcing intentions in their budgets and then deciding what to include in the deficit or surplus after the end of the year once preliminary numbers are known".

The facts are very clear. The government is trying to separate students. It is trying to pit student against student. Very clearly during the last election campaign, and we are nearing the first anniversary of this new government since the June 2 election a year ago, we laid out our plan on how we would help all students. We did not hear anything back then about a millennium fund. This is something that the government has come up with to pit student against student. It will help a quarter of them. What about the other three-quarters who are seeing tuition costs rising?

The fact is, these students cannot afford huge increases in the cost of obtaining their education. The Liberal government with its

Government Orders

millennium fund is effectively bringing down a subsidy for people like Bill Gates because of the huge brain drain of our brightest young students. They get their education here and end up going to work for companies like Microsoft. The richest man in the world is getting a subsidy courtesy of the Liberal government because it has refused to address fundamental issues like high taxes that drive our young people away from our country to seek employment in the United States where taxes are more reasonable.

That is a fundamental issue that this government is not addressing and the government refuses to address it.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I was looking forward to address this issue, but not under these circumstances. Shame on the government for moving time allocation. Why? Because this bill makes no sense and it knows it. This is obvious in Quebec, where there is a consensus against the bill.

• (1345)

The federal government has taken a very drastic approach to reducing the deficit by cutting transfer payments for health, education and welfare. At the same time, by tightening eligibility requirements for employment insurance benefits, it ensured that the employment insurance fund would grow; it will soon contain \$19 billion. This is an extremely harsh and severe bite.

What is the federal government doing with the bite taken out of transfer payments to the provinces, now that it has reached zero deficit? It has given a \$2.5 billion budget to a private sector foundation responsible for distributing scholarship cheques, with a little maple leaf in the corner and the Prime Minister's signature at the bottom I guess.

The truth of the matter is that, in Quebec, these drastic cuts in education have turned universities into institutions where it is increasingly difficult to receive quality education, not because teachers and students are not doing their best, but rather because the conditions they are facing are increasingly difficult.

There have been countless wage cuts, job cuts, student-teacher ratio increases, budget cuts for research, labs, while all of these are essential to quality education.

What is the point of having \$3,000 scholarships after the year 2000, when the system itself has been hurt and impaired? It is so shameful that there is a consensus in Quebec—which is even echoed across the country—that the federal government has no business in this area. This is an ill-conceived project. The government must give back to Quebec the money earmarked for education, so that the province can help students pursue their education through its own loans and scholarships program.

The federal initiative makes no sense. It is despicable and shameful, as well as wasteful. In this day and age, it is unacceptable to waste money in education just to satisfy the Prime Minister's vanity.

Why am I so convinced that it is a waste? For a reason that I will try to make clear. Under the legislation, scholarships will be awarded based on merit to help the best students, not those who most need the money so they can become successful, but those who are the best students and are also in need.

This is not the policy that was developed in Quebec over the years. It is not even the policy that was developed in the other provinces and applied by the federal government, but this is another issue.

In Quebec, we chose a system that help students in need who, of course, also make the grade. What does a needs-based system mean? It means that a completely different structure will have to be built. Criteria will have to be set for each subject, to determine who are the best students, how many there are and how to go about it.

A burdensome bureaucracy will have to be put in place. Even though it is a private foundation, it will be burdensome and bureaucratic, because there is no other way to determine who are the best students. Even the system currently in place in Quebec would become a lot more burdensome and would have to undergo major changes if it were to use criteria based on merit, in addition to those based on needs.

• (1350)

The system is not designed for that, nor are the universities or the student loan system. This is wasteful. It means that every dollar of the \$2.5 billion, and of the portion to which Quebec is entitled but has no certainty of getting anyway, will not go to student aid. This is totally scandalous.

The Liberals, who made such slashes to welfare, health and education, and have padded the employment insurance fund, are patting themselves on the back that this hard earned money will go, not to education, but to stroke the ego of the Prime Minister of Canada.

This Canadian Millennium Scholarship Foundation is unacceptable in every way. What an image it gives of federalism. A few days before the referendum, our Prime Minister said he would take Quebec's needs into account. What an image. What discouragement about today's federalism, if the division of power under the Constitution makes it so hard for the central government to perform its functions that it must also assume the functions of the provinces.

It is not content with the way things are, not satisfied, so it decides to see that the provinces' educational systems follow the line it sets. Come now, this makes no sense because when it comes to getting the best use of funds, each level of government has its

S. O. 31

responsibilities and must exercise them. In other words, I repeat, it would require one more bureaucracy—and this is already happening, as people have been hired.

What recourse will students or universities have? None at all. How will Quebec be sure of having its share? It will not. Public money and officials will be administered by a private foundation under criteria that it will set for itself according to the very broad principles in the law.

We are concerned, I note in passing, about the following in the bill: “The appointment of directors shall be made so as to ensure that (a) the Board is knowledgeable about post-secondary education”, that should go without saying, “and learning in Canada and the needs of the Canadian economy; and (b) the directors are drawn from the various regions of Canada.” University scholarships awarded on the basis of merit must not be given out according to the state of the Canadian economy, but according to the needs of the individual societies.

Why did we in Quebec choose to have an assistance plan based on need and to ensure access to university to just about everyone with the ability? Because we think merit is encouraged by the conditions of use and not because scholarships are given out on the basis of merit. I think that the results indicate that we in Quebec made the right choice.

Now the federal government is dismantling and derailing a system that worked well. It is doing so in two ways. First it dangerously underfunded it and now it has just introduced new factors for which it will be spending money that would be infinitely better spent where it should rightly go. That is, to the educational system, to assistance and as loans and scholarships to needy students.

• (1355)

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when it brought down its budget last February, the government once again demonstrated its lack of respect for the institutions and mechanisms developed by the people of Quebec during the quiet revolution.

By creating millennium scholarships, the Liberal government is once again poking its nose into a jurisdiction that belongs exclusively to Quebec, in this case education.

It is rather ironic to see the Prime Minister of Canada trying to sell the Canadian Constitution to Quebecers and to Canadians, when his own government is not even able to respect it. Section 93 of the Constitution Act, 1867, recognizes Quebec’s exclusive jurisdiction over education, and the millennium fund is an unprecedented intrusion into this area of provincial jurisdiction.

In 1964, the government of Lester B. Pearson suggested making interest-free loans available to Canadian students. When this federal education subsidy was opposed by Jean Lesage, a Liberal, the Pearson government then wisely declared that, if a province preferred to stick with its own loans program, it would be entitled to equivalent compensation. So said a Liberal. The government of the day had tried unsuccessfully to interfere in the area of education. The right to opt out of student financial assistance programs with compensation has existed since 1964.

Will the Liberal government be as fair a player in 1998? Knowing that paragraphs 29(1) and 25(2) of Bill C-36 are designed to block the transfer to the Government of Quebec of its fair share for opting out of the millennium fund, one could have one’s doubts. In order to have access to the program, Quebec will have to embark on a series of long and pointless negotiations in a field where it has already proven itself.

Worse yet, in order to deny Quebec its right to opt out with compensation, the federal government has decided to create a foundation outside regular federal programs. The federal government’s imperialist attitude is beyond all understanding.

Why interfere in Quebec’s loans and bursaries program when it is the most advanced in Canada? Quebec has built up an effective and vigorous loans and bursaries program that is the envy of students in other provinces.

Why, just when the federal government has reduced its deficit to zero, is the Minister of Finance rushing to create additional federal-provincial duplication and again wasting taxpayers’ money? Now that it again has money to spend, the federal government is spending it in provincial jurisdictions.

The Speaker: My colleague, you will have more than six minutes to conclude your speech, but it being almost 2 p.m., the House will now proceed to statements by members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

ALGONGUIN SECONDARY SCHOOL IN NORTH BAY

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 30th anniversary of Algonquin secondary school in North Bay, my alma mater.

During the Victoria Day weekend, or the Fête de Dollard weekend depending on one’s point of view, an organizing committee masterfully directed by Carole Laperrière, née Martineau, managed to bring together hundreds of Algonquin graduates from across the country.

This secondary school, which was originally called the bilingual school, was one of the first schools of its kind to be established in Ontario following the adoption of Bill 168, introduced by the then Minister of Education, the hon. Bill Davis.

This school has an important role to play in preserving and promoting the French language and culture in that part of Ontario.

Long live Algonquin secondary school, its students, its staff and its alumni.

* * *

• (1400)

[*English*]

OLIVER, B.C.

Mr. Jim Gouk (West Kootenay—Okanagan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the riding of West Kootenay—Okanagan is one of the most scenic and beautiful in Canada. One of the jewels of the riding is the town of Oliver in the Okanagan Valley. Oliver recently made the news under the caption “the hate capital of Canada”. This was the result of one inappropriate remark by an individual concerned about the racist content of an Internet service in Oliver which has since shut down.

In actual fact the remark is about as far from the truth as possible. Oliver is a warm and friendly blend of just about every racial origin imaginable. Population groups include aboriginal people, Portuguese and East Indian with lesser numbers of other European, Asian and Latin American people.

From June 19 to 21 Oliver will be holding its sunshine festival. This year will feature a multicultural celebration. I invite all Canadians to visit Oliver this summer, especially during the festival. Visitors will find orchards, vineyards, warm beaches and some of the finest wineries in Canada or abroad. Even more important, they will find a warm and friendly local population that will go out of its way to make sure visitors have a wonderful and memorable stay.

* * *

DR. RUSSELL MCDONALD

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my good friend Dr. Russell McDonald of Oxford county on his being named an honorary director for life of the royal agricultural winter fair. Dr. McDonald, or Rusty as he is better known, has served as a member of the board of directors for the winter fair for the past 20 years. A veterinarian by profession, Rusty served on the board as a representative of the artificial insemination industry. He is one of the founders and a former general manager of the Western Ontario Breeders Association. His appointment as an honorary

S. O. 31

lifetime director recognizes his achievements and contribution to agricultural and to the royal over many years.

I am happy to say that I know Rusty and his wife Helen well. This honour is well deserved. I am sure the royal agricultural winter fair will benefit from his knowledge and experience for years to come. Well done, Rusty.

* * *

APEC

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister of Canada hosted a conference for 21 APEC finance ministers from May 22 to May 24 in Kananaskis, Alberta. They discussed a global financial strategy for coping with the Asian crisis. With vision and leadership, the Minister of Finance made a proposal for a global mechanism to monitor the financial and banking system of the world. The G-8 leaders have recently endorsed such a plan. Again, our government is taking leadership in providing a solution for a global crisis.

* * *

NOTEMAKERS

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, notemakers, a pilot initiative of Industry Canada’s SchoolNet program, employs youth to help colleges and universities meet the challenge of the information highway. Funded by the Canada youth employment strategy, this initiative combines the Internet skills of young Canadians with the knowledge and experience of university and college educators to produce high quality post-secondary learn-ware.

Notemakers helps our youth gain marketable work experience that they can transfer to jobs in Canada’s emerging knowledge economy. I saw this firsthand when the University of Prince Edward Island participated in the last competition. Three full time positions were created as a result of the notemakers program. Universities and colleges benefit and Canada benefits as a whole.

Success from the first competition has led this government to open a second competition. Interested universities and colleges have until June 2, 1998 to submit their proposals. I encourage them to take advantage of notemakers and build for tomorrow.

* * *

IRELAND

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on Friday the people of Ireland took a brave step toward a future of peace and away from their violent past. By voting to endorse the Good Friday agreement in overwhelming numbers, both Unionists and Nationalists of the north together with the citizens of the Irish Republic have said no more to the men of violence. They have chosen instead to develop democratic institutions where people

S. O. 31

from both sides of the sectarian divide can work together in civility and where their still profound differences can be resolved by ballots and not bombs.

Let us not be misled that this is the beginning and not the end of the peace process. Millions of Canadians like me are either descendants or immigrants from Ireland. On behalf of all Canadians we join them in praying that last Friday's agreement may be the beginning of a lasting peace in Ireland.

* * *

● (1405)

ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH

Mr. John Cannis (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to welcome to our capital city His All Holiness, the Ecumenical Patriarch, Bartholomew the First, spiritual leader of all Orthodox Christians worldwide. This is indeed an historic visit for it is the first time in the history of Christianity that an Ecumenical Patriarch visits Canada.

His All Holiness is the 270th successor to the Apostle Andrew. Since his ascending to the ecumenical throne on November 2, 1991, he has tirelessly pursued the vision of his enthronement message which is spiritual renewal, orthodox unity, Christian reconciliation, interfaith tolerance and co-existence, protection of the environment and a world united in peace, justice, solidarity and love.

Known to Europe as the Green Patriarch, His All Holiness has taken the lead among all religious leaders in his concerns for the environment. We here in Canada not only applaud but support this endeavour wholeheartedly.

Time does not permit me to go on in great detail about his achievements but let me just say in closing we welcome him to Canada and I am sure his stay will be a memorable one.

* * *

[Translation]

MISSING CHILDREN DAY

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is Missing Children Day.

This special day is an opportunity to educate Canadians about what they can do to protect their children from becoming the victims of crime.

It is also an opportunity for all Canadians to recognize the outstanding work of law enforcement agencies and other partners in finding missing children.

[English]

Under our missing children's program, the RCMP's missing children's registry in partnership with Revenue Canada's interna-

tional project return, the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and the Department of Citizenship and Immigration has helped to search for, locate and return missing children.

In 1997 alone customs and immigration assisted in the safe recovery of 111 children at the border, a 28% increase from 1996. A key element of this government's public safety mandate—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca.

* * *

HEAD START PROGRAM

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, programs from Moncton to Hawaii to Michigan all demonstrate that early intervention programs improve parenting skills, healthy babies, and reduce substance abuse and crime.

They have shown a reduction of 50% in crime, 40% in teen pregnancies, less dependence on welfare and a much more productive life for these individuals.

Today we are going to vote on Motion No. 261, a motion which calls for a national head start program.

If we are to win the battle against crime, teen pregnancies, fetal alcohol syndrome and provide our children with the tools to become functional members in an increasingly hostile world, a head start program will do just that. It will give parents the tools to enable their children to grow up in an environment free of rancour and abuse.

So far five provinces and territories are on side. I implore the House to vote for Motion No. 261 to work together with the provinces and build a stronger, secure and safe environment for all our children.

* * *

[Translation]

DAVID LEVINE

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Canada has been unworthy of his functions again. Instead of condemning without reservation the intolerant reaction against the appointment of David Levine as head of the Ottawa Hospital, he launched an attack against the Quebec government which he accuses of all evils.

In the Levine case, the Prime Minister should have reminded Canadians that freedom of opinion is a fundamental right for everybody. Instead of doing his duty, he preferred to engage in partisan politics and to contribute directly to the climate of intolerance that has developed in the Canadian capital.

The Bloc Quebecois hopes that in the future the Prime Minister will state clearly that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms applies to all without discrimination.

[English]

IRELAND

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Fanshawe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 22 the people of Ireland opened the door to peace in their beautiful island.

Both in the north and south the Irish people voted decisively to end the tragic era of brutal violence and sectarian hatred and to move forward in peace. Both in the Republic of Ireland and in Northern Ireland the results of the voting demonstrate clearly that people of good will in Ireland are united in their desire for peace, equality and justice for all.

• (1410)

As Canadians we can understand very well the compromise that was necessary in Ireland to reach a peace accord which has been so overwhelmingly endorsed by the Irish people.

As Canadians we are proud of the good work being done by General John De Chastelaine. We join with peace loving people everywhere in applauding the historic breakthrough just achieved in Ireland. We pray that this historic and courageous first step will succeed in creating an enduring peace throughout all of Ireland.

* * *

MISSING CHILDREN

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or, NDP): Mr. Speaker, 19 years ago this morning a six-year old boy left home to catch a school bus and disappeared. His name was Etan Patz. He is still missing but he has not been forgotten. In 1986 the Canadian Government declared May 25 national missing children's day in commemoration of Etan and the thousands of children like him who have disappeared without a trace.

To honour and remember those children and their families still grieving over their loss, the Missing Children Society of Canada asks all Canadians to participate in the third annual light the way home campaign. The society asks all Canadians to turn on their porch lights this evening as a sign of solidarity. Through this simple act we show the families of the missing that they are not forgotten. We shine the lights, expressing our hope that some of these children will find their way home.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 125 years ago this month the House of Commons adopted a law that created the North-West Mounted Police, the forerunner to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

S. O. 31

Originally the RCMP was established as a frontier police force which went west to prepare the way for a peaceful development of the prairies. As the country grew in population and its communities became more established, the RCMP adapted and expanded its jurisdiction.

Today the Mounties and their proud record of service are recognized throughout the world.

[Translation]

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to all those men and women who have dedicated their whole life with honour and pride to the protection of their fellow Canadians.

I am sure all members in the House will join me in congratulating the RCMP for having reached this turning point in the history of this country and in wishing its members all the best in keeping their commitment to the security of all Canadians.

Congratulations to all members of the RCMP.

* * *

QUEBEC FLAG

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in Quebec, thousands of people marked the 50th anniversary of the Quebec flag.

Adopted in 1948 by the government, the flag was well received by the people. The *Gazette* even pointed out that the Fleur de Lys "takes heraldic data into account and is an emblem of exceptional beauty".

At the beginning of the quiet revolution, the Fleur de Lys became the symbol of Quebec's distinctiveness and desire to achieve self-determination. Today, Quebecers of all political stripes feel that their flag is the symbol of a pluralist community open to the world and that continues, as the Council of Europe pointed out, to be an example to follow in the treatment of minorities.

Since respect for one another is the rule in Quebec, the Bloc Québécois is confident that the Fleur de Lys will remain for all Quebecers a symbol of rallying and tolerance and a guarantee of the freedom of speech and opinion.

* * *

[English]

YARMOUTH FERRY SERVICE

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, on May 28 the Yarmouth tourism officials along with local businesses will celebrate the beginning a new high speed ferry service between Yarmouth and Bar Harbour, Maine.

Bay Ferries Ltd., led by President Mitch McLean, has taken over the services previously provided by Marine Atlantic, replacing the

Oral Questions

old Bluenose ferry with a high speed catamaran capable of carrying 900 passengers and 250 vehicles.

This new ferry is capable of reaching speeds of 90 kilometres per hour, reducing the length of the crossing from 6 hours to 2.5 hours, making West Nova a much more attractive destination area for our U.S. neighbours. It is anticipated that this new service will create 400 tourism related jobs and generate \$15 million in direct economic spinoffs.

As May is officially designated national tourism month, I take this opportunity to wish Bay Ferries Ltd. every success with its huge endeavour and at the same time welcome all members of this House to vacation in my beautiful constituency of West Nova.

* * *

[Translation]

FOREX PLANT

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, May 20 marked the opening of the FOREX plant, a major wood panel plant in the municipality of Bois-Franc, in the Haute-Gatineau region.

This project will create 325 jobs for plant and forestry workers and give a boost to the whole region that I represent.

I am proud that the Canadian government has contributed \$1.2 million to this project for manpower training programs.

• (1415)

The FOREX plant will require a \$120 million investment, which will make it one of the most important in the world for the production of oriented strand panels.

This is another issue that shows that our government is committed to help Quebec regions and to ensure the development of such a strategic area in terms of the exploitation and processing of our natural resources.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has insulted all the victims with hepatitis C from tainted blood by comparing them to people who contracted hepatitis C from dirty needles. Hepatitis C from dirty needles is off the street and hepatitis C from tainted blood is actually from government approved blood.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister apologize today to those victims with hepatitis C from tainted blood?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised an interesting question. The important thing to note is that there is a working group of officials from all the provinces and the federal government looking at options in this matter. They are working to develop fair solutions. We should allow them to do their work. We invite the co-operation of all Canadians with this working group.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister does not get it and I guess the Deputy Prime Minister does not get it. This blood was tainted. It is quite different from getting hepatitis C from dirty needles.

I again ask the Deputy Prime Minister if he will apologize to these victims of hepatitis C who did absolutely nothing wrong.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member should know by now the commitment of this government to look after the interests of those with any disease and particularly hepatitis C. As a result of the initiative of this government there is an offer of assistance that has been made to those who received tainted blood between 1986 and 1990 when those responsible could have acted to prevent it and did not.

All provinces at present are taking part in the working group looking at options to take other steps.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this is just like a broken record. However this is a new issue. The Prime Minister insulted all these victims. He said that if we compensate those victims we are going to have to compensate those who got hepatitis C from dirty needles. This is not about heroin. This is not about crack. This is not about a dirty alley. This is about people who did nothing wrong. Will they apologize now?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike the hon. member, I have the exact transcript of what the Prime Minister said. He did not insult hepatitis C victims. He did not intend to insult them. He was merely talking about some factors that deserved to be considered. That is all he did and the hon. member should recognize that.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, what the Prime Minister did was insult hepatitis C victims regardless of any comments he may or may not have made.

Before the Prime Minister left on this latest junket of his, he could not bring himself to admit that he was wrong regarding compensation for hepatitis C victims.

I would like to ask the following question of the government. Is it not true that the Prime Minister gave one instruction and one instruction only for the health minister when he left on this latest junket which was to scuttle the deal?

Oral Questions

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was this government that put the deal in place. It was this government that involved the provincial and territorial governments in making the deal. Until the Prime Minister and this government initiated the process every health minister in the country was refusing to talk about compensating those with hepatitis C.

The instructions of the Prime Minister and the position of this government are that the interests of the hepatitis C victims should be taken into account and compensation to be offered on proper principles. That is exactly what we have done.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, that is some line from the health minister who said the file is closed.

The Prime Minister wrote to Premier Mike Harris stating the following "I note your recent decision to move beyond this principled initiative to play a role in those areas where no government responsibility has been identified".

• (1420)

I would like to ask the health minister on behalf of his Prime Minister, when is the Prime Minister going to become principled, admit that he was wrong and compensate all hepatitis C victims?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was principles that led us to persuade the provinces to join with us in the agreement to offer assistance to 22,000 people who contracted hepatitis C through the blood system.

We have now organized a working group to look anew at all the options for dealing with those with hepatitis C as a result of the fact that at least two of the provinces have changed their positions from the original agreement.

If the member would let that working group get its job done, let ministers and governments examine the options, she would be a lot farther ahead.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, according to an internal memo from the Department of Human Resources Development obtained through access to information, 72% of the \$6 billion in surplus generated by successive employment insurance reforms was the result of government cutbacks.

Will the minister admit that, out of the \$6 billion saved in the EI plan in 1996, \$4.3 billion was saved through repeated cuts made on the backs of the unemployed?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in working on this employment insurance reform, we have tried to strike a balance in the best interest of all Canadians. We believe that this balance has improved the situation of Canadians with respect to job market.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew: For instance, as a result of the EI reform, we are more focused on a number of active measures. Members across the way never discuss the reform as a whole or other initiatives which help Canadians get back to work instead of staying on EI.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about balance and improved situation. In 1990, 72.5% of unemployed youth received UI benefits, while in 1997, only 26% did.

Does the minister realize that, while making fine-sounding speeches on youth, he is excluding three young persons out of four from his so-called employment insurance plan?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have stated repeatedly in the House that we are concerned about the participation rate of the unemployed in our employment insurance system, and we have asked Statistics Canada to determine why this is so.

I would appreciate it if the Bloc Québécois also paid attention to the numerous youth programs we have developed. Instead of forcing them unto employment insurance, we provide them with internship and community work opportunities to help them get into the workforce. That is what we are doing for our young people, and I think this is much more helpful.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Young people are not the only ones suffering because of the minister's so-called reform. Women too, the very people the minister kept telling everyone would benefit greatly from the reform, are also among the victims.

If he truly wished to help advance the cause of women, what is the minister waiting for to end the discrimination to which they are subject and give them maternity leave benefits under the same conditions as other workers?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our reform has substantially improved women's access to maternity leave.

An hon. member: Wrong.

An hon. member: Liar.

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew: Up until now, the number of women on leave and women who worked part time—

Oral Questions

The Speaker: The hon. member for Québec.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon: Mr. Speaker, the minister should get with it and look at the facts—

The Speaker: I apologize. I thought the hon. minister had finished. The hon. Minister of Human Resources Development has the floor.

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew: Mr. Speaker, what I was attempting to say, when I was interrupted by opposition members, who are unable to face up to the facts of this EI reform, is that 500,000 part-time workers, largely women therefore, were not covered under the system the Bloc Québécois keeps wanting to bring back.

• (1425)

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister should get with it and look squarely at the facts instead of trying to hide his lack of compassion for women behind a cloud of fine words.

How does the minister explain that, with the birthrate down by 1% in 1997, maternity leave benefits were down by 6%?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the member also continually fails to mention is that women who were not covered in the past are covered now.

Women who were on maternity leave or who decided to raise a family now have access to active measures and training to which they did not have access before, once they have raised their families and decide to re-enter the job market.

Our reform seeks to strike a balance. Once women have raised their families, they are now entitled to assistance in re-entering the job market because of EI reform and they are glad of it.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, unlicensed albumin blood product is being used on Canadians. Health officials say “Don’t worry, no problem. It has been approved in the U.S.” The truth is that this blood product manufacturer has been hauled into the courts for extensive safety violations.

The health minister has a responsibility to protect the blood supply. Can the minister honestly assure Canadians that this blood product is safe?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as recently as an hour ago I asked that very question of officials. I was assured that the product in question meets safety standards not only in the United States but also in Canada.

Last week we invited the caucus colleague of the leader of the NDP to meet with officials in my department. She was given a full explanation of what is going on. The member now knows because officials told her that as a result of a shortage under the special access program we have imported albumin into this country at the request of physicians. It meets standards of safety both here and in the United States.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, they are laxing out standards to try to evade the fact that this minister is not attending to his responsibilities.

Judge Krever recommended that the federal government “retain the duty and authority to make decisions about products to be distributed in Canada”. Yet this government has gutted the health protection branch to the point where the safety of blood products for Canadians can no longer be assured. Has the minister learned nothing from the hepatitis C tragedy?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think we are going to have them over to the department again and take them through the facts one more time.

The reality is that for the first time, Health Canada under this government is requiring all foreign blood product manufacturers to sell their product through a licensed Canadian importer. We put new and stringent requirements in place. The product referred to by the member meets health and safety standards both in the United States and in Canada.

* * *

SOMALIA INQUIRY

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, any communication between a lawyer and a client is privileged information, yet the Minister of Justice’s own officials gave a confidential letter dated May 4 received from the chairman of the Somalia inquiry to the defence department. The inquiry’s findings of course were reviewed by the federal court and further litigation is pending.

The minister’s own government shut down the Somalia inquiry early. Can she now explain why she would violate solicitor-client privilege in further undermining this important public inquiry?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the letter in question was not impressed with solicitor-client privilege. Neither Mr. Justice Létourneau nor the functus commission were the client in this case. It is the Government of Canada that is being sued.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, it would appear that this government is leaking like a sieve.

Oral Questions

The minister's own justice officials gave a confidential letter that was dated May 4 to the department of defence. On April 28, Justice Barbara Reed threw out some of the findings of the Somalia inquiry because the inquiry's representatives from the Department of Justice did not file adequate affidavits. The department has an obligation to represent the client with diligence.

Is the justice minister prepared to fully defend the client, the Somalia inquiry, and to announce that she will be appealing the commission's findings?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, because in fact this government is in the process of making a decision as to whether we are going to appeal the decision of Madam Justice Barbara Reed, I will not comment on the specific case.

Let me assure the hon. member that the client in this case is not Mr. Justice Létourneau. The client is not the Somalia commission. In fact the hon. member as a lawyer should know that the commission is functus. The client in this case is the Government of Canada.

* * *

• (1430)

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yet another terrible mess is coming to light in the defence department. Not only do women and men in the military suffer appalling living conditions and subsistence wages. It has now been revealed that the government has been sitting by while military officials regularly cover up cases of rape and physical abuse.

Why is the Liberal government condoning such abuses by its years of inaction?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me say unequivocally that the government will not tolerate matters of sexual abuse or sexual harassment in the Canadian forces.

The government is taking action. We have established harassment advisers in each of the units across the country to help us deal with these issues. We have established the national investigation service which provides for military police independent of the operational chain of command to be able to investigate these matters.

Very soon I will be announcing—

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

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister thinks a little high flown rhetoric will cover up the Liberal government's complicity and the suffering and humiliation of victims in our military.

Is it not true that the minister is more interested in political damage control than in any real control of abuse in the military?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. We want justice to prevail in these cases. We want to fully integrate men and women into the Canadian forces. We want them to be able to work side by side in a harassment free and an abusive free environment.

We have put new training procedures into effect. We will do whatever is needed to make sure in future the message is clear that there will be no such discrimination in the Canadian forces.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, while the Minister of Human Resources Development keeps trying to defend the indefensible, while he is trying to convince the unemployed who cannot collect benefits that the reform is good for them, the surplus in the employment insurance fund continues to grow. Between the beginning and the end of oral question period, the surplus will have increased by \$700,000.

Will the minister admit that, if the surplus increases at the incredible rate of \$700,000 per hour, it is, among other reasons, because there are 500,000 more people than before who are contributing to the fund, even though they have little chance of ever collecting benefits?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we took office, there was a \$6 billion deficit in the employment insurance fund. We had to eliminate this deficit and that is what we did.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Paul Martin: Yes, we did. I am very pleased to say that there is now a surplus, a reserve in the employment insurance fund. This is our guarantee against an increase in premiums.

An hon. member: Another liar.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, instead of chatting endlessly with technocrats in the comfort of their offices, why do the ministers not undertake to meet tomorrow morning the unemployed coming to Ottawa to tell us about the disastrous consequences of the government's reform?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to travel across the country, to meet with Canadians and discuss the impact of our reforms with them.

Oral Questions

Before I left and upon my return, I noticed that members of the opposition promised to put to us in this House any question they may have. They were very active last week and we will be pleased to hear what they have to say.

The unemployed know full well that the purpose of the transitional job fund, along with the active measures, is to get them back to work as quickly as possible and to help them once they are back in the labour force.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

When some female soldiers in the Canadian forces complained of being sexually harassed, they were ushered out of the military and given what was called a trauma based disability pension.

Is it not true that this trauma based disability pension is just another way of saying to some sexual harassment victims “If you leave without making a fuss, we will pay you some hush money?”

• (1435)

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, but according to the defence critic of the Reform Party the problem is having women in the military to start with.

He is suggesting, so it seems, that what we should do is get rid of the victims. What the government is suggesting is that we should get rid of the perpetrators.

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what some of these pensions are: a way for the top brass in the Canadian military to sweep these problems under the rug.

Not only are these victims being told to go away quietly, but the perpetrators of these offences are being allowed to go free, to continue working for the Canadian forces.

Why is the minister turning a blind eye to this problem instead of bringing these offenders to justice?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is simply not true. Again their research is faulty.

Many of these people have been brought to justice. Many of them have been convicted and in fact have been put out of the Canadian forces.

We intend to continue to get to the heart of these matters. We intend to deal with matters that are past, present and future in a just way.

[Translation]

DAVID LEVINE

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this weekend the Prime Minister found that the hue and cry over David Levine was, and I quote “rather artificial and unacceptable”.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister not acknowledge that the Levine affair is first and foremost a political attack against freedom of opinion and that the last time this fundamental right was abused in Canada was during the October crisis, when the Trudeau government arrested 500 Quebecers without grounds?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, people attached to their country and fearing its loss because of the secessionist threat posed by the leaders of the Bloc and the PQ allowed their fear to find expression in a deplorable reaction.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, so now what is happening to Mr. Levine is our fault. Really, I have seen it all.

Today the Prime Minister laid it on a little thick saying that, if the sovereigntist question were resolved—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Dear colleagues, I am sure all members want to hear the question and the answer. The hon. member for Roberval has the floor.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I understand that it hurts them to be reminded of their past and of what is currently happening to francophones and to Quebecers.

Since the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is waxing eloquent, the Prime Minister said as he did that, if the problem of independence were resolved, there would be no more problem in the Levine matter. In the minister’s opinion, will the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms not apply to sovereigntists so long as we exist?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think most Canadians, including Quebecers, will consider the attempt by the House leader of the Bloc Quebecois to promote separatism by using the Levine affair deplorable. It is totally deplorable.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, from day one the Minister of National Defence said that he would not tolerate issues of sexual harassment in the military, but Canadians also recall the government saying that the Somalia inquiry would be allowed to do its work. Instead, what Canadians

Oral Questions

saw was the delay of documents delivered to the inquiry of commission and the eventual silence of the inquiry by shutting it down early.

Now we see that Justice Létourneau, the chairman of the Somalia inquiry, has accused the government of conspiracy to undermine the inquiry.

Given the government's track record, how can the defence minister expect any member of the Canadian Armed Forces—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Justice.

• (1440)

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the government had staunchly defended the findings of the commission. We did so in the case referred to here this afternoon. We will continue to defend the Government of Canada which is the client in this case.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government's record on investigations in the military is absolutely tragic. The government has shredded documents, lied to military police and undermined the Somalia inquiry.

Canadians cannot rely on the government to investigate the dozens of sexual harassment allegations with its past record. How can the members of the Canadian Armed Forces trust the government when all the minister cares about is cover-ups of the government and not protecting their interests?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me remind the hon. member that the Somalia commission got three extensions, went on three times as long as it originally indicated it would.

Lo and behold when it did make its recommendations, 83% of them were fully agreed to by the government and are presently being implemented as is gender integration and our policy of not allowing sexual abuse, getting to the bottom of all these issues and making sure that men and women can work together in a harassment free atmosphere.

* * *

[Translation]

MILLENNIUMSCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, all political parties in the Quebec National Assembly, and the education coalition headed by Rector Bernard Shapiro of McGill Univer-

sity, are unanimous in calling for the federal government to amend its bill on the millennium scholarships.

Does the Minister of Human Resources Development realize that his refusal to do so until now reveals his true intentions and proves he never had a mandate to negotiate, as well as how obvious it is that he never intended to honour Quebec's request to opt out with compensation?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to point out that the Government of Quebec was the one that broke off negotiations 10 days ago. It even cancelled the schedule of the two days of negotiations that were planned.

The hon. opposition member has just confirmed what we have been saying here in the government since the start, which is that their only desire was to have the right to withdraw with full compensation. Quebec has no intention to negotiate. There was no desire whatsoever to commit to anything that could have led to an arrangement between the two governments.

I believe the hon. member has just given absolutely clear proof of this. He is saying the exact same thing, while the Prime Minister had already stated that this was not open to negotiation.

* * *

[English]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for Children and Youth.

One of the challenges facing aboriginal people is access to employment and training opportunities. Could the minister tell the House what action is being taken to address the serious issue of high unemployment among aboriginal people?

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to say that there are many exciting and promising initiatives being undertaken by Human Resources Development Canada.

To begin with, HRDC is developing a five year aboriginal human resources development strategy and is in the process of establishing an aboriginal human resources development sector council to improve aboriginal people's access to training and employment in many different sectors of the Canadian economy.

This is an important part of the government's response to a key recommendation of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. This strategy—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Fraser Valley.

*Oral Questions***TRADE**

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the tourists are back on Parliament Hill. Of course I am referring to the 15 Liberal backbenchers who returned from their junket to Italy, otherwise known as the taking care of favours tour. Now Canadians would like to ask a few questions about it.

Will the Prime Minister and the MPs have a slide show so that we can all benefit collectively from their experience? Will they be throwing their souvenirs from the gallery right after question period? Did they serve Canadian ice wine from Pillitteri Estates at all the official functions?

Most important, just how much did this taking care of favours tour actually cost taxpayers, or are we even allowed to know?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians would like to know why the Reform Party does not want Canada to strengthen trade relations with the seventh biggest economy in the world.

• (1445)

Canadians would like to know why the advantages of having 1.5 million fellow citizens of Italian origin should not be used to promote that trade. It just shows how off base the Reform Party is when it comes to recognizing the strengths of Canadian diversity.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my, my, are we not a bit sensitive about this trip?

I understand that among Liberal MPs there are a few hurt feelings about this. People are upset. I understand that the Liberal MPs who went said they were upset because they were left in Rome while the actual business took place in Milan.

A Canadian diplomat said he was a little upset. He said a junket is a junket. It is a waste of taxpayers' money. Taxpayers are upset. They had to foot the bill for this.

Could the Prime Minister explain why he once criticized Brian Mulroney so much for his travel, but now it is all right for him to take his backbenchers on this taking-care-of-favours tour?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talks about being left behind. The Reform Party, through his words, confirms it was left behind years ago when it comes to recognizing the value of Canadian diversity, especially the contribution of Italian Canadians, the 1.5 million who are represented in this House but not by his party, and they never will be if he keeps talking like that.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of National Defence. There are now widespread reports of sexual harassment and rape in the armed services and the minister has called this poor behaviour.

Can the minister indicate if there is a policy of zero tolerance in the armed forces? If there is not, why not? If there is, when will he appoint an independent inquiry to find out why this policy has gone so wrong?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes there is zero tolerance. We have zero tolerance for this kind of incident of sexual abuse. We do not want those people who are the perpetrators of sexual abuse to be a part of the Canadian forces.

We have, in fact, taken a number of measures to create better training. We have a new program called the SHARP training program on harassment prevention. We have harassment advisers. We have the new national investigation service that operates independently of the operational chain of command, and soon we will appoint an ombudsman. We are taking every measure that is necessary to put that policy into effect.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated that his department has no statistics on sexual harassment cases. As I said, he called this behaviour poor performance. How does he expect the armed forces to take anything like this seriously when all he does is call it poor performance? Does he not know it is more than that, that it is appalling performance?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I also used words like disgusting. I used words like unacceptable, in addition to all of those words.

We simply are not going to tolerate it. We are dealing with the matter and will continue to deal with the matter.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Greg Thompson (Charlotte, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is understood that the Minister of Health has had trouble with the concept of compensation for all hepatitis C victims.

It is reported, and I stress the word reported, that the health minister has frozen all new funding for breast cancer research and AIDS treatment. He is saying that he is doing this pending the outcome of the hepatitis C compensation package.

I want some clarification. Is this in fact the minister's position? If it is not his position, what is his position?

Oral Questions

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, those reports are absolutely false. Health Canada continues to do business as always. Last December 1, for example, we announced the renewal of the AIDS strategy, phase three. We had long planned to announce later this week particulars of the allocation of that money.

Our work continues in preparing the breast cancer initiative.

Health Canada continues to serve the people of Canada properly by putting programs in place for their health.

• (1450)

Mr. Greg Thompson (Charlotte, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that and I appreciate that coming from the minister.

The question today, and we have been pounding away on this for weeks and weeks, concerns compensation for those hepatitis C victims before and after the years 1986 to 1990.

I ask the minister, where are those negotiations leading? Has the minister accepted the fact that all victims should be compensated?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada continues to believe that it is in the interests of all of those who contracted hepatitis C through the blood system that there be a national approach to this issue. That is why we are taking part in and leading a working group which is already under way, looking at options available to governments to deal with the interests of all of those who got hepatitis C through the blood system.

As soon as that work is concluded and governments have a position I shall report it to the House.

* * *

SCIENCE, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Reg Alcock (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, research and development is vital to a healthy and prosperous economy.

Would the Secretary of State for Science, Research and Development please tell the House what the government is doing to foster world class scientific research in western Canada?

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, science, research and development continue to be priorities of the Western Economic Diversification.

There have been a number of important announcements, the most recent in Winnipeg, Manitoba on Friday, where it was announced that \$2.1 million will be provided to fund a centre on expertise for the aging. It will be at the forefront of research in this

area. It will address certain diseases such as Alzheimer and certain cardiovascular problems associated with aging.

The best news of all is, not only will it be at the forefront in the world, it will create 100 good jobs for western Canadians.

* * *

TRANSITIONAL JOBS FUND

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, how is this for a job buying fiasco? In October last year human resources development spent a cool \$1 million of taxpayers' money for the transitional jobs fund for BPS Imaging, a call centre in Newfoundland. Now, a mere seven months later, BPS has closed its doors and 124 people are out of work.

Why did the minister not secure the funds with BPS assets or put the money into job training that actually works?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will look into the particular case that the opposition member is raising.

However, what I can tell him is that on every project involving the transitional jobs fund there is a lot of consultation with the provincial governments. We look at every one of them in a very serious fashion.

With \$300 million the government has created thousands of very good jobs in Newfoundland and in the rest of Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, day after day, we hear stories of women in the Canadian armed forces who were raped, sexually mistreated or sexually harassed.

The response of the Minister of National Defence is as follows, and I quote "I have no statistical information that would indicate that the problem is more serious in the armed forces than in the rest of Canadian society".

Are we to understand from this irresponsible statement that the minister views rape, sexual mistreatment and sexual harassment in the armed forces as acceptable, as long as they stay within the national average?

[English]

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I had no statistical information which would indicate that it is any worse than in Canadian society.

Oral Questions

I would also say that it runs against the core values of Canadians and of the vast majority of the men and women in our Canadian forces.

What the hon. member does not seem to have heard is that I also said that what I read in those articles with respect to that kind of conduct, behaviour and attitude is disgusting. That kind of behaviour is not going to be allowed in the Canadian forces. We have taken action and will continue to take action.

* * *

FISHERIES

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

I want to say that we welcome the important steps taken by the minister to save B.C.'s endangered coho salmon last week.

Will the minister tell the House what new steps he is taking to get a treaty that stops Alaskans from fishing our coho while B.C. fishers stand by?

When will the minister respond to the important recommendations of the Copes commission on fisheries renewal and saving our threatened small boat fleet and coastal communities?

• (1455)

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the question of the discussions with the Government of Alaska and the Government of the United States of America, last Thursday I requested that the Canadian negotiator, Dr. Donald McRae, get in touch with his American counterpart to pass on the information with respect to the coho conservation plans of Canada.

On Friday I had a discussion with the governor of Alaska. We agreed that we would resume the negotiations between the United States and Canada this week, and I believe that will be on Thursday in Juneau.

* * *

*[Translation]***HEPATITIS C**

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Mr. Speaker, for weeks, not to say months, the opposition has been urging the Minister of Health to compensate all hepatitis C victims.

The minister has even said that compensating all victims fairly would lead to the collapse of Canada's health system.

How can he say such a thing when the exact number of hepatitis C victims is not even known right now? What is he doing to find a

solution for these victims, when their numbers and the associated compensation figures are not even known?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, these are the very questions now before the task force set up ten days ago by the federal and provincial governments.

The task force has already begun its work. We expect results to be available shortly. I advise the hon. member to wait for the results of the task force's work, at which time its conclusions can be examined.

* * *

*[English]***THE ECONOMY**

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

There has been a great deal of suffering felt by thousands in Asia as a result of the recent economic crisis. This weekend Canada hosted the Asia-Pacific finance ministers. Can the minister tell us what action will be taken to address the human and social impact of this crisis?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in situations of economic crisis such as occurred in Indonesia and other Asian countries the IMF must move very quickly in order to recreate confidence in capital markets.

The hon. member is very justified in pointing out that the real cost is borne by individual populations, by women and by children who are forced to drop out of school. As a result of that Canada took a very strong position at the APEC meeting that the World Bank must move in parallel with the IMF in order to directly alleviate the suffering that is being felt.

I am glad to say that the president of the World Bank was there. He also spoke to the same position. The vast majority of finance ministers supported it. I take the hon. member's question as support from this House for that position.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this government has failed the people of B.C. during the last five years by its inability to resolve the Pacific salmon dispute. Unless the minister is ready to put some teeth into this we will never get it resolved.

Is the minister prepared to take some actions against the U.S. fishermen and prevent U.S. fishing vessels from crossing into Canadian waters until this dispute is resolved?

*Routine Proceedings***POINTS OF ORDER**

COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. member has been these last few months.

We will be resuming negotiations with the Americans. This follows the offer of the Alaskan government to communicate, co-operate and collaborate on the issue of coho preservation.

We have had discussions with the American federal government. We expect that there will be negotiations taking place in Juneau on Thursday of this week. In addition, the governor and I have agreed that we will meet together sometime in the next two weeks.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

I would like to remind the minister that there are women who have had to abandon their career in the Canadian armed forces, and that others are afraid to enlist.

What action does the minister propose to take, aside from making ridiculous and irresponsible statements, to bring an end to the problem of harassment?

[*English*]

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the chief of defence staff has made it quite clear that our policies are to be adhered to with respect to a harassment-free atmosphere. That is going right down the chain of command.

In addition, we have put in place harassment advisors. There is the national investigative service that I mentioned before. As well, good training programs have been put into effect over the last couple of years.

• (1500)

We will continue in this way to ensure that men and women can work together in an harassment free atmosphere.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of the House to the presence in the gallery of Mr. Ibrahim Ferradaz, Minister for Foreign Investments and Economic Collaboration, Cuba.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in today's question period I said that Italy had the seventh biggest economy. Actually it has the fifth biggest economy. Canada has the seventh. I appreciate the opportunity to make this correction.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I heard a member use what I believe to be unparliamentary language.

I heard the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot call the Minister of Human Resources Development a liar not once but twice. I ask that he withdraw his insulting and unparliamentary comments.

The Speaker: Dear colleagues, I too heard the word "liar" during question period, but I could not tell who had uttered it. The member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine is saying it was the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot.

He is not in the House at the moment, therefore I shall wait for his return. We can then discuss the matter.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table in both official languages a number of Order in Council appointments which were made by the government.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(1), these are deemed referred to the appropriate Standing Committees, a list of which is attached.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Adams (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 10 petitions.

Routine Proceedings

• (1505)

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the third report of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development on the subject of the enforcement of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act and the pollution provisions of the Fisheries Act.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to the report within 150 days.

* * *

[English]

BANK ACT

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Qu'Appelle, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-407, an act to amend the Bank Act (bank mergers).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to make it a requirement, unless there is an insolvency where a bank is going down, that before any merger can take place there must be a vote in the House of Commons so every member of the House can have a chance to vote on whether it is a good idea. This would not leave the decision solely in the hands of the Minister of Finance which is the status quo. It is a way of democratizing this place and making our roles more meaningful on a very important issue that will face the Canadian population in the fall.

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

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-408, an act to amend the Criminal Code (wearing of war decorations).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce my private member's bill, an act to amend the Criminal Code regarding the wearing of military decorations of order for military services. The bill provides that relatives of deceased veterans may wear, without facing criminal sanctions on Remembrance Day, at a public function or ceremony commemorating veterans, or in a circumstance prescribed by cabinet, any order, decoration or medal listed in the Canadian orders, decorations and medals directive of October 25, 1990.

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

PETITIONS

MARRIAGE

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to present a petition from members of my riding of Bruce—Grey, in particular those around the Owen Sound area. They ask that parliament define marriage in the Canadian statutes as a union between an unmarried male and an unmarried female.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present today. The first is from Mr. Bud Boomer and June Boomer from my constituency. They pray that parliament enact Bill C-225, an act to amend the Marriage Act to define in statute that a marriage can only be entered into by a single male and a single female.

JUSTICE

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from Mr. Ted Turner who asks parliament to enact legislation to repeal the Young Offenders Act and at the same time to implement prevention programs such as a head start program to address the root causes of crime.

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the privilege to present to the House a petition from 83 concerned citizens from my riding of Cambridge and surrounding areas. The petitioners draw the attention of the House to their concern for all Canadians who contracted hepatitis C from the federally regulated blood system through no fault of their own.

• (1510)

The petitioners pray and request that the Parliament of Canada show compassion and fairness by acting on the recommendations of the Krever report calling for compensation to all those infected, as was done for those who contracted AIDS.

FISHERIES

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to table a petition from the citizens of Guysborough county in eastern Nova Scotia pursuant to Standing Order 36.

This petition calls on parliament to revisit the issue of enterprise allocation of shrimp quota in eastern Canada with respect to a proposal made by Seafreez and ACS, respectively, of Canso and Mulgrave. The petitioners are very concerned about this allocation. They feel it is essential to the survival of the community in question and is consistent with the efforts to Canadianize the fisheries.

Routine Proceedings

It gives me great pleasure to table this petition on their behalf. Hundreds of citizens have signed this petition and call on the government to give this urgent attention.

KOSOVO

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I present to this House a petition signed by 114 of my constituents of Serbian descent petitioning this government to take action in reaching a peaceful solution to the Kosovo crisis.

EMERGENCY PERSONNEL

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions today signed by a number of Canadians, including from my riding of Mississauga South.

In the first the petitioners draw to the attention of the House that police officers and firefighters are required to place their lives at risk on a daily basis as they execute their duties and that employment benefits often do not provide sufficient compensation to the families of those who are killed in the line of duty.

The public mourns the loss of these police officers and firefighters killed in the line of duty. Therefore the petitioners call on parliament to establish a public safety officers compensation fund for the benefit of families of public safety officers killed in the line of duty.

TAXATION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition deals with the family and 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.

The petitioners also agree with the national forum on health which reported that the Income Tax Act discriminates against families that choose to provide care in the home to preschool children.

The petitioners therefore call on parliament to eliminate tax discrimination against families that choose to provide care in the home to preschool children.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Paul Steckle (Huron—Bruce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by a good number of petitioners from my riding. These petitioners are condemning the unwarranted increases in gasoline prices brought about by the pricing policies of major oil companies operating in Canada.

The petitioners are calling on the Parliament of Canada to adopt legislation which would require gasoline companies to give 30 days written notice to the Minister of Natural Resources of an impending significant increase in the price of gasoline and that such a notice should also contain the reason or reasons for the increase and when it will take effect.

MARRIAGE

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I am pleased to present this petition on behalf of my constituents from Wardsville, Newbury and Bothwell area of my riding.

The petitioners call on parliament to support private member's Bill C-225 which would define marriage as a union between a single male and a single female.

TAXATION

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I also have the honour to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36. I know that if I had asked the petitioners they would have supported the previous petition regarding high gas prices, but this is not about high gas prices.

This petition is concerned about the unfair tax system Canada has. The petitioners point out a number of reasons why they think certain working people are being punished and unfairly treated by the tax system and they are calling for total tax reform.

PENSIONS

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in the second the petitioners are concerned about some of the changes in the present legislation Bill C-36 in terms of tinkering with the pension system. The petitioners believe it may reveal that the government is planning a major overhaul of the pension system and they are simply pointing out that a complete public information process ought to be launched before any changes are contemplated.

MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the third deals with the multilateral agreement on investment. The petitioners point out that while it is set aside for the next six months they continue to be opposed to it as they understand it. They call on parliament not to sign the multilateral agreement on investment ever.

• (1515)

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition from almost 100 people in the Peterborough area who are concerned about the multilateral agreement on investment.

They ask parliament to impose a moratorium on ratification of the MAI until full public hearings are held across the country so that all Canadians can have an opportunity to express their opinions.

I notice that the signatures include representatives of the Peterborough Diocese, Development and Peace, the King/Rubidge Community Kitchen, the Peterborough Presbytery, the United Church of Canada, the Peterborough Coalition for Social Justice,

Routine Proceedings

the Peterborough Ten Days for Global Justice and The Kiros Prayer Group in Peterborough.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 38, 67 and 93.

[Text]

Question No. 38—**Mr. Gilles Bernier:**

With respect to the procurement of new maritime helicopters for the Department of National Defence, (a) how much will it cost to procure replacement helicopters for both the shipborne Sea King helicopters and the Labrador search and rescue helicopters; (b) what is the total cost of maintaining the Labrador and Sea King helicopters an extra six to ten years beyond the time they were to have been replaced under the EH-101 contract; (c) what was the total compensation paid to suppliers of the EH-101; and (d) what was the cost to the department of National Defence to operate the project management office for the procurement of the EH-101 helicopters?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): (a) The total project budget for the Canadian search and rescue helicopter, Labrador replacement, includes: a maximum of \$593 million to E.H. Industries; plus approximately \$200 million in government costs for project management, training, spare parts, integrated logistics support, and a small contingency allowance.

The estimated cost for the replacement of the Sea Kings will not be known until the government approves a Sea King replacement project. The final cost will be known when the government announces its decision.

(b) The annual steady state cost of supporting the Labradors is \$36.4 M, current year 1997-98 dollars, and the cost of supporting the Sea Kings is \$79.4 M, current year 1997-98 dollars. These costs include personnel, spares, modifications and engineering but not infrastructure costs such as base facilities and services. It should be noted that new helicopters will also have an annual steady state support cost. The delivery delay between the first delivery of a search and rescue SAR configured helicopter from the cancelled new shipborne aircraft new search and rescue helicopter project, and the first delivery of a helicopter from the current Canadian SAR helicopter project is approximately 12 months. The delay associated with the delivery of the new maritime helicopter is unknown since the project has not been approved.

(c) The total compensation paid to suppliers of the EH-101 is detailed in the Public Works and Government Services Canada and E.H. Industries Limited joint news released dated January 23, 1996 which follows.

(d) The cost to the Department of National Defence to operate the project management office during the implementation phase for the procurement of the EH-101 helicopters was \$15.5M in 1993-94 dollars.

NEWS RELEASE

Public Works and
Government Services Canada and
E.H. Industries Ltd.

For immediate release

Date: January 23, 1996.

Settlement reached with E.H. Industries for EH-101 helicopter program.

Ottawa—The Government of Canada and E.H. Industries Ltd., a company jointly owned by Westland Helicopters Ltd. and Agusta Spa, have negotiated a settlement agreement for E.H. Industries' claim arising from the cancellation of the \$5.8 billion EH-101 helicopter program.

The details of the agreement, reached in October 1995, were announced jointly today by the Honourable David Dingwall, Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Enrico Striano, Managing Director, E.H. Industries Ltd.

“Negotiating this settlement has been a long process and I am pleased that the Crown and E.H. Industries have reached this mutually satisfactory agreement,” the Minister said. “It is fair to say that the Government of Canada has closed the books on the EH-101 helicopter program.”

The announcement of this agreement was delayed pending the conclusion of negotiations between E.H. Industries and its subcontractors.

Following a promise outlined in the Government's Red Book, the contract with E.H. Industries for the supply of helicopters, valued at \$1.45 billion (1992 dollars) was terminated in November 1993.

The settlement agreement with E.H. Industries totals \$157.8 million. This includes \$136.6 million for the cost of work completed prior to termination and work in progress at the time of termination, and \$21.2 million for termination costs.

The total termination costs include a \$68 million settlement reached earlier with Loral, the project's other prime contractor and the \$21.2 million settlement with E.H. Industries.

The Government allocated \$250 million in 1994-95 Main Estimates for termination costs of which only \$89.2 million has been required.

To ensure that the approach to settlement was undertaken in a fair and reasonable manner and to provide an independent and

Routine Proceedings

commercial perspective on various issues, the Crown enlisted the services of an independent consulting firm, Lindquist, Avey, Macdonald, Baskerville Inc.

Funding for this consulting contract was provided in the February 1995 federal budget and is therefore built into the existing fiscal framework.

Mr. Striano, expressing satisfaction with the final settlement stated, "Although we regret the loss of this contract, I am pleased we have been able to close the matter with the Crown to our mutual satisfaction and now look forward to future opportunities for our products in Canada."

Information:

Franca Gatto
Communications
Public Works and
Government Services Canada
(819) 997-5421

Andy Moorhead
Deputy Managing Director
E.H. Industries
011 44 125 238 6404

NEWS RELEASE

For immediate release

Date: January 23, 1996

Erratum:

The english version of the news release issued by PWGSC this morning concerning the settlement with E.H. Industries did not include a paragraph that was included in the French version.

"The total termination costs include a \$68 million settlement reached earlier with Loral, the project's other prime contractor, and the \$21.2 million settlement with E.H. Industries."

The following information provides further clarification:

EH-101 total project costs

Work related on the project that included project definition, research and development and project implementation:

\$154.6 million

Costs of work completed prior to termination and work in progress at the time of termination. These monies were paid out prior to termination of the contract in November 1993:

E.H. Industries—\$136.6 million

Loral—\$98.4 million

Cost of contract termination:

E.H. Industries—\$21.2 million (announced today)

Loral—\$67.5 million (announced March 31, 1996)

Total—\$478.3 million

PWGSC regrets the inconvenience and any confusion this may have caused. The English and French releases will be re-issued.

Question No. 67—**Mr. John Duncan:**

Since the 1985 Pacific salmon treaty was signed what have been the Canadian and American catches of salmon on the Taku and Stikine Rivers and specifically (a) the total catch by year; (b) the catch for each country by year; and (c) the catch by salmon species by year?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Canadian and American catches of salmon on the Taku and the Stikine Rivers in individual units are outlined in the tables attached.

Comparative Canadian and U.S. catches of Canadian-origin salmon from the Stikine River: 1985-1997 (data source is Canadian interception estimates: 1997; DFO, Whitehorse, Yukon)

Year	Chinook			Sockeye			Coho			Pink		
	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total
1985	1,411	4,622	6,033	25,464	39,339	64,803	2,175	79,166	81,341	2,356	16,724	19,080
1986	2,236	4,609	6,845	17,434	9,910	27,344	2,280	45,830	48,110	107	402	509
1987	2,501	7,274	9,775	9,615	6,051	15,666	5,731	15,320	21,051	646	3,220	3,866
1988	2,660	10,699	13,359	15,291	5,183	20,474	2,117	9,897	12,014	418	936	1,354
1989	2,969	7,349	10,318	20,032	19,296	39,328	6,098	53,879	59,977	825	2,596	3,421
1990	2,550	6,783	9,333	18,024	12,959	30,983	4,037	23,510	27,547	496	1,337	1,833
1991	1,811	6,667	8,478	22,763	41,658	64,421	2,648	47,760	50,408	394	1,953	2,347
1992	2,140	9,738	11,878	26,284	88,595	114,879	1,855	51,497	53,352	122	644	766
1993	2,103	16,204	18,307	47,197	119,186	166,383	2,616	24,684	27,300	29	97	126
1994	2,090	9,275	11,365	45,095	91,455	136,550	3,381	52,633	56,014	90	201	291
1995	1,946	4,827	6,773	53,467	87,932	141,399	3,418	27,923	31,341	48	106	154
1996	2,771	7,451	10,222	74,281	208,005	282,286	1,404	67,581	68,985	25	49	74
1997	4,783	9,000	13,783	65,404	131,613	197,017	401	14,144	14,545	269	401	670
Averages:												
1985-92	2,285	7,218	9,502	19,363	27,874	47,237	3,368	40,857	44,225	671	3,477	4,147
1988-92	2,426	8,247	10,673	20,479	33,538	54,017	3,351	37,309	40,660	451	1,493	1,944

Routine Proceedings

Comparative Canadian and U.S. catches of Canadian-origin salmon from the Stikine River: 1985-1997 (data source is Canadian interception estimates: 1997; DFO, Whitehorse, Yukon)

Year	Chinook			Sockeye			Coho			Pink		
	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total
Averages:												
1985-88	2,202	6,801	9,003	16,951	15,121	32,072	3,076	37,553	40,629	882	5,321	6,202
1989-92	2,368	7,634	10,002	21,776	40,627	62,403	3,660	44,162	47,821	459	1,633	2,092
1993-96	2,228	9,439	11,667	55,010	126,645	181,655	2,705	43,205	45,910	48	113	161

Year	Chum			Steelhead			Total		
	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total
1985	536	3,833	4,369	240	NR	240	32,182	143,685	175,867
1986	307	1,111	1,418	194	NR	194	22,558	61,862	84,420
1987	459	2,012	2,471	219	NR	219	19,171	33,876	53,047
1988	733	1,663	2,396	261	NR	261	21,480	28,379	49,859
1989	674	2,062	2,736	127	NR	127	30,725	85,182	115,907
1990	499	1,365	1,864	199	NR	199	25,805	45,954	71,759
1991	208	1,001	1,209	71	NR	71	27,895	99,039	126,934
1992	231	1,176	1,407	132	NR	132	30,764	151,649	182,413
1993	395	1,262	1,657	67	NR	67	52,407	161,432	213,839
1994	173	396	569	84	NR	84	50,913	153,960	204,873
1995	263	574	837	270	NR	270	59,412	121,362	180,774
1996	232	462	694	183	NR	183	78,896	283,547	362,443
1997	222	336	558	33	NR	33	71,112	155,494	226,606
Averages:									
1985-92	456	1,778	2,234	180		180	26,323	81,203	107,526
1988-92	469	1,453	1,922	158		158	27,334	82,041	109,375
1985-88	509	2,155	2,663	229		229	23,848	66,951	90,798
1989-92	403	1,401	1,804	132		132	28,797	95,456	124,253
1993-96	266	673	939	151		151	60,407	180,076	240,483

Note:

(a) includes catches taken in traditional fisheries (excludes test and ESSR fisheries).

(b) Canadian Excess Salmon to Spawning Requirements (ESSR) catches of sockeye (terminal harvests of salmon in excess to spawning requirements):

1993	1,752
1994	6,852
1995	10,740
1996	14,339
1997	2,393

(c) 1997 data are preliminary.

(d) NR—not reported.

(e) Pacific Salmon Treaty catch sharing arrangements for 1988 to 1992 provided for: a minimum Canadian catch based on Total Allowable Catch (TAC) of sockeye; maximum 4,000 coho; and bycatches of other salmon species. U.S. directed or undirected fisheries were based on estimated TACs. The discrepancy in catch shares has escalated due to expiry of catch sharing arrangements in 1992.

(f) There is a rounding off process in the catch data program which accounts for discrepancies in totals.

Routine Proceedings

Comparative Canadian and U.S. catches of Canadian-origin salmon from the Taku River: 1985-1997 (data source is Canadian interception estimates: 1997; DFO, Whitehorse, Yukon)

Year	Chinook			Sockeye			Coho			Pink		
	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total
1985	830	2,211	3,041	14,411	85,258	99,669	1,792	100,494	102,286	3,373	477,716	481,089
1986	785	3,526	4,311	14,939	68,912	83,851	1,833	105,467	107,300	58	17,736	17,794
1987	627	2,714	3,341	13,650	60,917	74,567	5,712	144,611	150,323	6,250	405,517	411,767
1988	1,082	4,113	5,195	12,259	31,497	43,756	3,221	100,550	103,771	1,030	71,997	73,027
1989	1,401	4,573	5,974	18,598	72,193	90,791	3,022	141,962	144,984	695	655,988	656,683
1990	1,758	5,853	7,611	21,189	119,880	141,069	3,213	177,056	180,269	378	77,284	77,662
1991	1,677	4,953	6,630	25,217	116,364	141,581	3,435	310,154	313,589	296	384,149	384,445
1992	2,066	5,475	7,541	29,824	137,121	166,945	4,264	210,919	215,183	0	232,852	232,852
1993	2,144	6,509	8,653	33,357	155,247	188,604	3,041	266,212	269,253	16	227,927	227,943
1994	2,684	5,010	7,694	29,001	109,130	138,131	14,693	259,084	273,777	168	663,058	663,226
1995	2,147	4,437	6,584	32,711	103,675	136,386	13,738	162,045	175,783	2	56,986	56,988
1996	3,894	9,806	13,700	42,025	203,344	245,369	5,052	115,936	120,988	0	125,908	125,908
1997	3,335	6,932	10,267	24,595	78,624	103,219	2,999	97,139	100,138	0	0	0
Averages:												
1985-88	831	3,141	3,972	13,815	61,646	75,461	3,140	112,781	115,920	2,678	243,242	245,919
1989-92	1,726	5,213	6,939	23,707	111,389	135,096	3,484	210,023	213,506	342	337,568	337,910
1993-96	2,717	6,440	9,158	34,274	142,849	177,122	9,131	200,820	209,951	47	268,470	268,516
Year	Chum			Steelhead			Total					
	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total			
1985	136	84,178	84,314	32	NR	32	20,574	749,857	770,431			
1986	110	72,204	72,314	48	NR	48	17,773	267,845	285,618			
1987	2,270	93,814	96,084	223	NR	223	28,732	707,573	736,305			
1988	733	62,398	63,131	100	NR	100	18,425	270,555	288,980			
1989	42	27,193	27,235	50	NR	50	23,808	901,909	925,717			
1990	12	48,124	48,136	42	NR	42	26,592	428,198	454,790			
1991	2	56,050	56,052	46	NR	46	30,673	871,670	902,343			
1992	7	84,514	84,521	119	NR	119	36,280	670,881	707,161			
1993	15	106,239	106,254	24	NR	24	38,597	762,133	800,730			
1994	18	89,356	89,374	233	NR	233	46,797	1,125,637	1,172,434			
1995	1	33,029	33,030	209	NR	209	48,808	360,173	408,981			
1996	0	30,339	30,339	98	NR	98	51,069	485,334	536,403			
1997	3	68,695	68,698	183	NR	183	31,115	251,390	282,505			
Averages:												
1985-88	812	78,148	78,961	101		101	21,376	498,957	520,333			
1989-92	16	53,971	53,986	64		64	29,338	718,164	747,503			
1993-96	9	64,741	64,749	141		141	46,318	683,319	729,637			

Note:

(a) 1997 estimates are preliminary.

Government Orders

- (b) NR—not reported.
- (c) Pacific Salmon Treaty catch sharing arrangements for 1988 to 1992 provided for: maximum Canadian catch of 18% of TAC for sockeye and maximum 3,000 coho; and bycatches of other salmon species. The discrepancy in catch shares has escalated due to expiry of catch sharing arrangements in 1992.
- (d) There is a rounding off process in the catch data program which accounts for discrepancies in totals.

Question No. 93—Hon. Lorne Nystrom:

Can the Minister of Finance specify for each year starting in 1990: (a) how many requests for surplus refunds has the OSFI, Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, received from sponsors of terminated workplace pension plans in the federal jurisdiction; (b) what was the total amount requested; (c) how many requests did the OSFI approve each year; and (d) how much money was involved?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): According to the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, OSFI:

Requests for Surplus Refunds Received and Approved by OSFI
for Terminated Pension Plans⁽¹⁾

Calendar Year	(a) Number of Requests Received	(b) Total Amount Requested \$	(c) Number of Requests Approved	(d) Total Amount Approved ⁽²⁾ \$
1990	5	1,437,614	6	482,200
1991	6	3,683,210	4	3,368,595
1992	6	4,563,029	3	1,483,130
1993	6	12,084,687	5	1,712,101
1994	7	21,623,692	6	12,345,155
1995	8	1,780,778	6	13,702,183
1996	1	103,079	6	2,017,298
1997	0	0	2	112,344
1998 (to April 21)	0	0	0	0

- (1) Based on information contained in OSFI records as of April 22, 1998.
- (2) Includes surplus refunds to plan beneficiaries, if any; OSFI did not keep separate records on the allocation of surplus between plan sponsors and beneficiaries.

Note that requests are not necessarily approved in the same fiscal or calendar year in which they are received.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: The questions as listed by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Are the remaining questions allowed to stand?

[English]

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, again reluctantly I rise of a point of order.

Question No. 21 is absolutely languishing on the order paper. Months and months have gone by. The clock continues to tick. The question remains outstanding. When might we expect the answer?

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I point out that as of today we have replied to almost 70% of the almost 1,000 petitions presented.

With regard to the question the member is referring to—and I know he has particularly Question No. 21 in mind—we are in the range of a 75% response rate, which I do not think is bad.

I assure the member we have been working specifically on Question No. 21 during the constituency break. I assure him that I will be tabling the reply very soon.

The Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions then stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 1998

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-36, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 24, 1998, as reported (with amendment) by the committee, and of Group No. 1.

The Deputy Speaker: Because of the interruption for Oral Question Period, the hon. member for Argenteuil—Papineau has six minutes left to speak.

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the January 1994 throne speech, the federal government, which was faced with an unprecedented deficit, committed to clarifying the role of the federal government with respect to the other levels of government in order to eliminate duplication and overlap.

Why not make better use of proven education structures within the provinces rather than creating more? As Minister Landry told *Le Devoir* last February 25, Quebec “will again be penalized... by endless discussions and mechanisms of all kinds.... This is not the way a system that respects the various levels of government operates”.

Has the government forgotten that, in the February 1996 throne speech, in response to the referendum, it made the promise to no

Business of the House

longer make use of the federal government's spending power to create programs in areas under provincial jurisdiction?

Does the federal government not acknowledge all of Quebec's accomplishments in education over the past 30 years?

Quebec is a leader in the area of education in Canada. To the people of Quebec, education represents a vital tool for cultural, economic and social development. What is more, education is the cornerstone of any society.

Thanks to its lack of political logic, and the creation of the millennium fund, the federal government has managed to create consensus in Quebec. All those consulted, who are involved in the education field, are opposed to Bill C-36.

• (1520)

The federal government will have once again shown its complete ignorance of the Quebec reality. It is not the first time a consensus is achieved in Quebec against any federal interference in education.

We will recall that, in May 1991, in a motion passed in the National Assembly, Liberal and PQ members unanimously condemned the federal government's unacceptable urge to interfere further in education.

The Prime Minister of Canada is doing his best to and will go down in history as the first government leader to so bluntly and obviously interfere in the provincial jurisdiction that is education.

However, the Government of Quebec has made itself quite clear: any additional funding for education must be directed to the Government of Quebec, which will redistribute it according to its own priorities. Any other form of funding will be considered as interference.

The Prime Minister will be known as the founding father of the millennium scholarships: a fine waste of public funds and a rather unoriginal way for the current government to send students in Quebec cheques with the Canadian maple leaf on them.

There is no logical and rational reason to create yet another scholarship system in Canada. Instead, the government should improve the system already in place in Quebec. It seems obvious to us that Ottawa's only motivation for establishing the millennium scholarships is to raise its profile.

In fact, the purpose of these scholarships is visibility at the expense of efficiency. The Prime Minister has said so himself. These scholarships run counter to Quebec's practice of entitling all students desiring to further their studies to financial assistance.

According to their criteria, the millennium scholarships will help only about a third of low and middle income students. In addition, they are only a medium term solution, as they will become available only in the year 2000. It will therefore be of absolutely no assistance to those currently completing their studies with a significant debt.

It is unacceptable that the millennium scholarships will be given out not only according to need but also on the basis of merit. Linking the subsistence of disadvantaged students to their academic performance is unconscionable. The scholarships fall short of the expectations of student associations because assistance is not based solely on need.

Even if the millennium fund focused its assistance on the most needy students, the Government of Quebec also administers merit scholarships. Regardless of the name given these scholarships, Quebec will no doubt most effectively manage the new money.

Allow me to quote Premier Bouchard in a letter to his Canadian counterpart: "Quebec will not be told what approach to take with respect to financial aid to students, an area that is under its jurisdiction".

In conclusion, the millennium scholarship has given rise to a veritable outcry of protest, not only from sovereignists, as the Prime Minister of Canada had hoped, but also from all those with any sort of interest in Quebec's education system.

With one voice all those involved in education in Quebec have told the federal government that while C-36 is good for Canada it is not good for Quebec.

* * *

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Discussions have taken place between all parties and I believe you would find consent for the following order:

That the recorded divisions scheduled today at the conclusion of government orders take place in the following order:

all necessary questions to dispose of report stage of C-36.

the motion for third reading of C-19.

M-75.

the motion for second reading of C-247.

and all questions to dispose of M-261.

• (1525)

The Deputy Speaker: Does the House give its unanimous consent that the deputy government whip may propose this motion to the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon: Mr. Speaker, I did not really grasp the procedure and what the hon. member proposed. We are debating Bill C-36. Could it be repeated, please.

The Deputy Speaker: I will repeat the motions moved by the hon. member: "That the recorded divisions scheduled today at the conclusion of government orders take place in the following order: all necessary questions to dispose of report stage of Bill C-36; the

Government Orders

motion for third reading of Bill C-19; Motion M-75; the motion for second reading of Bill C-247; and all questions necessary to dispose of Motion M-261.”

Is it clear to the hon. member?

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

[English]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 1998

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-36, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 24, 1998, as reported (without amendment) from the committee; and of Group No. 1.

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every Canadian needs and deserves an equal chance to live up to his or her full potential. I am in favour of the legislation establishing the millennium scholarship foundation because it will help Canadians reach their goals. In so doing it will also play a part in helping our country live up to its full potential.

No nation can rely solely on its resources in the ground for economic growth. In today's global economy and in the growing knowledge economy of the future the key to economic success is the development of our human resources.

Quite simply we need to have a highly skilled, highly adaptable and highly motivated workforce if we are to continue to prosper into the next century and beyond. The new reality for every Canadian is that getting and keeping a job in the growing knowledge economy demands ever higher levels of learning.

As we all know the result is that not everyone has the financial means to take advantage of the learning opportunities that are out there. It is certainly true that the Canada student loans program and provincial student programs have helped millions of young people over the years including myself. Indeed without these essential supports many thousands of low and middle income young people would not have been able to participate at all.

Even so, today far too many people are facing enormous student debt burden upon graduation. Too many others are simply not going on to post-secondary institutions because the costs are just too high. We all recognize that the problem has become progressively worse and that there is a need to act.

Last November a national all stakeholders working session on Canada student loans brought students, teachers, administrators,

federal and provincial governments, lenders, colleges and universities together to reach consensus on student assistance reform.

The Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities undertook an extensive study of the issue. It consulted Canadians across the country and the report it tabled last December made 16 specific recommendations for change. At its meeting last December the Prime Minister and the premiers made a commitment to work together to reduce student debt.

As hon. members know, in response to these recommendations and discussions the Minister of Finance outlined the Canadian opportunities strategy in the budget of last February, a strategy that directly reflects the sentiments and the directions offered by many Canadians.

• (1530)

It is a seven-part strategy that puts the following measures into place: to help graduates manage growing debt; to give Canadians access to the financing required to upgrade their skills throughout their careers; to help families pay for their children's education; to help graduate and post-graduate students continue to develop their skills and carry out research that benefits the whole country; to help young people make the transition from school to work; to help connect Canadians to the information age technology; and to greatly improve access to learning by helping students in financial need cope with the increasing cost of education.

In the time remaining I would like to concentrate my remarks on the last point, in particular the Canada millennium scholarship foundation. The endowment that the Canada millennium scholarship foundation will manage is the largest single investment ever made by the federal government in support of access to post-secondary education for all Canadians.

I agree with what the Prime Minister said in the House when he announced this initiative last fall. There can be no greater millennium project for Canada and no better role for government than to help young Canadians prepare for the knowledge based society of the next century.

The 10 year endowment of \$2.5 billion will provide over 100,000 scholarships to low and middle income students every year for the next decade. The scholarships will be available to young and old, to full time and part time students. Students in universities as well as students in community colleges, technology institutes and other post-secondary education systems will all be eligible. That is over one million new scholarships.

We believe that a million new scholarships devoted to equalizing access to learning is a fitting way to commemorate the next millennium, a millennium in which all societies will look more and more to the knowledge, skills and creative intelligence of their people for growth and prosperity. Contrary to the assertions of some people, the Canada millennium scholarship foundation does not intrude into a provincial area of jurisdiction. Quite the opposite.

Government Orders

It will help more people benefit from the educational opportunities provided by provincial governments.

Hon. members can understand our deep disappointment when the Government of Quebec chose to break off the discussions on the Canada millennium scholarships. Our government demonstrated much flexibility during negotiations with the Government of Quebec to ensure the alignment of a new foundation with the Quebec system.

There is nothing new in our desire to help people help themselves. Since Confederation the federal government has helped people improve their education. Following the second world war for example, thousands of returning soldiers benefited from grants to help them upgrade their skills and rejoin the peacetime economy.

Today, in addition to the Canada student loans, several billion dollars each year are transferred to the provincial governments in Canada health and social transfers to help fund post-secondary education, social assistance and health care.

We believe as do most Canadians that all governments have a role to play in providing everyone with an opportunity to improve themselves, an opportunity for a better life for themselves and for their families.

If the Government of Quebec would accept the principle of the millennium scholarships for what it really is, namely an ad hoc and unique contribution to help young people access opportunities in the new economy, it would be proud to be associated with this initiative.

The Quebec government can rest assured that the foundation will be able to build on the existing needs assessment processes and complement provincial efforts to provide accessible, affordable post-secondary education to all its citizens.

The foundation will have nothing at all to do with determining curricula, setting tuition levels or managing educational institutions. Those are questions for the provincial governments and the institutions themselves. That has been clear from the very beginning.

As the Prime Minister has said in the House, we are satisfied that this bill gives us the needed flexibility to resolve the situation in a reasonable manner.

An independent foundation will manage the fund. It will not be run by government but by private citizens. Among other things, this fund will also facilitate a greater degree of student mobility, allowing students the opportunity to complete all or part of their studies in different parts of Canada.

• (1535)

With it we are marking a unique event in the history of our country, a passage into the new millennium. At the same time we are also improving the prospects of all Canadian students by giving

them a better chance at starting the next millennium with the skills and knowledge they will need to become full and contributing members of this economy.

Again, I believe that every Canadian deserves the chance to live up to his or her full potential. I believe that this legislation will help them do just that. I sincerely hope that all hon. members of the House will give it their enthusiastic support.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to take part in the debate on the Group No. 1 amendments to Bill C-36, the budget implementation act.

I am sure Canadians will be pleased to know that once again we are being pushed to limit the debate on this important topic by the time allocation motion that the government has introduced to the House. Many speakers who were planning to take part in this debate will now be prevented from doing so.

I was happy to speak on this bill at second reading. At that time the millennium scholarship foundation was one of the hottest issues of the budget. It has now been three months since the federal government announced its budget and the \$2 billion legacy to our current Prime Minister, also known as the millennium scholarship fund, is still a hotly debated issue particularly in the provinces.

From day one the government was criticized for entering into an area of provincial jurisdiction, especially by the province of Quebec. The government was strongly criticized not only by members of the official opposition but by parliament's watchdog, the auditor general, whose job is to keep an eye on the government's questionable accounting methods.

I would like to spend some time on this issue because this is an important issue which needs to have some emphasis. As a member of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts I am well aware of the work of the auditor general. As I have stated on several occasions not only in committee but here in this place as well, I hold the Office of the Auditor General in the highest esteem for the integrity, perseverance and determination to see that value is received from every dollar that the government spends. It is largely because of the work of the Office of the Auditor General that the government has worked toward cleaning up its act in the spending of the hard-earned tax dollars of Canadians. I am sorry to say there is still a long way to go in this.

This government has shown Canadians all too frequently that if given the opportunity it loves to tax Canadians to the very hilt while providing them with useless programs having little if any tangible benefit. As I speak on this issue I am reminded of the distribution of \$15 million to \$20 million worth of flags. I would like to know what tangible benefit that had to the economic well-being of Canadians. Some of these programs do not provide Canadians with good value for their money, something on which as a member of the public accounts committee, as a member of

Government Orders

parliament and perhaps most of all, as a Canadian taxpayer I work to hold the government accountable.

The auditor general has criticized the finance minister for his accounting practices in previous budgets and has gone so far as to offer a qualified opinion on last year's budget. It is obvious by this qualified opinion that the government is not producing a transparent picture of the nation's finances. The year before, the auditor general also questioned the manner in which the government crafted its budget.

Canadians need to know and have a right to know and have a clear picture of the financial situation of this government, how it intends to spend the money and not have those numbers fudged by moving figures from one year to another.

• (1540)

The finance minister has responded by saying that the government has to evolve and change as events change. However as the auditor general has reminded the government time and again, the finance minister does not have the liberty to make the rules up as he goes along for his own political purposes. The federal government blatantly ignored standard budget guidelines and tried to brush off legitimate criticism by changing the rules for its own political purposes.

We have heard the same line of reasoning in the hepatitis C debate that this government is doing what is best and right. We all know how the general Canadian public feels about the government's idea of what is best and right in the hepatitis C debate. Here also in the budget what is best and right falls far short of the standards set up in the general rules of accounting.

Group No. 1 deals largely with the millennium scholarship fund. I am happy to support many of the amendments in this group. I would like to spend some of my time talking about the amendments proposed.

The motions proposed by the Bloc Quebecois delete all the clauses which establish the millennium scholarship foundation. As I mentioned earlier, those in Quebec have made it perfectly clear to the federal government that they do not want the federal government intruding in matters of provincial jurisdiction. The Quebec government is also worried that this will detrimentally affect its system of grants and loans. I can sympathize with Quebec's complaint.

I can also assure the government that there is a growing chorus of dissatisfaction from British Columbians. This growing chorus must not be ignored.

Every province has experienced similar problems. As the government has waged its war on the deficit, it did not cut out inefficiencies in many government departments and eliminate needless grants and programs; rather it cut transfer payments to the

provinces. Now that the federal government is continuing to meddle in provincial affairs instead of restoring transfers, after the millennium fund is spent many students will not benefit from it. The provinces however will still be responsible for all these students, even though they lack the money that should be theirs to fulfil this responsibility.

Cuts to the transfer payments to the provinces over the past few years were brutal and swift. That was money the provinces needed and counted on to ensure that their people would receive adequate programming in areas such as health and education. We have clearly seen the effects of the federal government's approach to balancing the books in the province of British Columbia. Services have been dramatically reduced due to the reduction of these federal payments.

Motion No. 67 speaks specifically to the provinces being able to opt out of the millennium scholarship fund and to enter into an agreement where the foundation pays the province the amount that would have been spent in a particular province allowing the province to use these funds for their own purposes. This would help the provinces make up for some of the lost funds from the cuts to these transfer payments.

Before my time is finished, I would like to touch on several other motions which touch on the accountability issues surrounding this initiative.

Motion No. 66 from the fifth political party, the Progressive Conservatives, would make the millennium scholarship foundation subject to the Access to Information Act. This would be a great idea.

Canadians demand that the government provide them with value for their money. Having federal departments and programs subject to Canadians having access to information explaining how each department spends its tax dollars in essence makes it more accountable to the public.

I would like to comment on several of the amendments put forth by the Progressive Conservative Party which deal with the appointment of an auditor for the foundation. Motion No. 56 would have the auditor general be that auditor of the foundation, something which I wholeheartedly support.

• (1545)

As I mentioned earlier, the office of the auditor general has done a splendid job in evaluating how various departments and programs operate and, in cases where value for money is not achieved, the office of the auditor general can present that program or department with several options on how to improve its operations. That evaluation would surely benefit the operation and spending of the millennium scholarship foundation.

Government Motions Nos. 55, 57 and 58 are a different story. They give all the power of appointing and terminating the auditor

Government Orders

of the foundation to the government. Motion No. 55 allows the government to appoint the auditor of the foundation.

The difficulties we have with Bill C-36 are headlined in the last *Hill Times*. The headline reads "The decline of the Canadian Parliament and the escalating deterioration of public information and debate in Canada's Parliament". This is a serious issue that cuts through this debate and the bill that is presented here.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my Bloc Québécois colleagues who have spoken on Bill C-36, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 24, 1998.

Today, we are primarily dealing with the motions relating to the millennium scholarships. More than 40 of these motions were tabled by the hon. member for Québec and their overall objective is to eliminate the millennium scholarship foundation from Bill C-36.

In so doing, the Bloc Québécois is echoing the consensus reached among all the Quebec stakeholders who appeared before the Standing Committee on Finance and who unanimously condemned these scholarships and asked for withdrawal with full compensation.

It is rather difficult to understand the policies of this government. After adopting a resolution recognizing the distinct character of Quebec society, the Chrétien government is now trying to get involved in education, which is a vital component in the development of a people.

As for us in the Bloc Québécois, we know that the flexibility of Canadian federalism is nothing but a myth and that what the government gives with one hand, it takes back with the other hand.

The millennium scholarships show the true face of federalism as a centralizing, if not levelling, force. The Chrétien government really does not understand anything about Quebecers' aspirations.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows she must refer to members by using their titles, not their names. I hope she will comply with the standing orders in this regard. The hon. member for Jonquière.

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold: Liberal members from Quebec either do not have the Prime Minister's attention or are insensitive to their constituents' needs.

Need I remind my colleagues opposite that all the witnesses from Quebec who appeared before the Standing Committee on Finance were in favour of a withdrawal with full compensation?

Some 14 groups and individuals from the education community came to express their disagreement with the Prime Minister's idea.

To put in perspective the outcry caused by this Liberal initiative, it is interesting to note that 41% of the witnesses who appeared before the standing parliamentary committee to express their views on the millennium scholarships were from Quebec.

• (1550)

And yet, the federal government continues to turn a deaf ear and is not proposing any amendments to Bill C-36. The comments made by those witnesses from Quebec were very clear to those who understand French, one of the two official languages of this great country that is Canada.

For example, the Coalition des ex-leaders étudiants québécois eloquently said that with its millennium scholarships, the federal government is proving its ignorance and its incompetence in the area of education.

As for the president of the Fédération des cégeps, he said just as eloquently that Bill C-36 does not take into account what Quebec has accomplished over the last 30 years in the area of financial assistance to students.

One has to wonder if the government that concocted these infamous scholarships lives on the same planet as we do. How many times, since Quebec joined the federation, have Quebecers of all parties condemned duplication and overlap between federal and provincial programs? Today, with the millennium scholarships, the federal government is trying once again to invade Quebec's education system by competing directly with the province's loans and scholarships program. Has the federal government even looked at the needs of Quebecers in this area? Certainly not.

After making drastic cuts in transfers to the provinces and threatening the balance in Quebec's education system, the federal government comes up with a wall to wall solution that simply does not suit Quebec.

In 1997 the task force on funding for Quebec universities concluded that previous cuts were the main reason for the increase in the number of students per classroom and in lecturers' workload and for the decrease in the number of teaching assistants. These choices led to a decrease in the overall supervision of students, which is directly related to the quality of education.

The opinion of Mrs. Boileau, of the Fédération nationale des enseignantes et des enseignants du Québec, a member of the CSN, is totally in sync with the suggestion of the Bloc Québécois to opt out of part I of Bill C-36. She said that the only way out is for the federal government to give back to the provinces what it has cut from the transfers, not to hand out millennium scholarships.

Government Orders

As several people said before, Quebec has proven its ability in the loans and scholarships area. The way it manages its program is quite innovative. More needs to be done in order to ensure equal access to university studies for young Quebecers. However, the implementation of a parallel system will not help to improve the system we now have in Quebec, especially since eligibility for the millennium scholarships will be based on an elitist approach.

By contrast, Quebec's loans and scholarships program focuses on the needs of students, to promote greater accessibility and equal opportunities.

We need to enhance our current system, not create more duplication that would only further distort the Quebec loans and scholarships program. I therefore urge my colleagues in this House to listen to the 1.2 million Quebecers who, through their associations, expressed their views on the millennium scholarships to the Standing Committee on Finance.

Just like them, and on their behalf, we ask members for nothing less than the right to opt out with full financial compensation, so that we can spend the money according to the needs and realities of Quebec.

[English]

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to discuss this bill which will actually implement some of the items that were announced in the budget.

• (1555)

I listened to members opposite earlier today, in particular those of the Reform Party, as they ranted about the fact that the government passed time allocation to get some of these items through. Yet time allocation has been used three months almost to the day after the budget was introduced. The budget was brought down by our finance minister on February 24. Here we are on May 25 dealing with this bill that will implement the policies that were announced.

Members opposite shake their heads as if they do not understand. Why do they think we have to bring in time allocation? This bill is part of the government's policy and program. If they had their way they would simply delay and obstruct. They would simply be negative. I do not hear anything positive coming from over there.

I do not understand what members opposite have against a scholarship fund being established to help students go to school. Explain that to me. What do they have against students and higher education? What do they have against allowing all Canadians to have continuing education?

The NDP members chirping from left wing would wipe out all tuition. They would say that everything is free, that life is just a

bowl of cherries. They have their heads in the clouds. They have no idea of the fiscal realities.

This bill shows that for the first time in over 40 years we have a government that is fiscally responsible. We have a government that has balanced the books in spite of the ranting from the left. We have a government that has eliminated the deficit and has finally put this country on the route to financial prosperity.

One of the things that will help to build a prosperous Canada is access to education. Yet I hear members talk against greater access to education.

I know about opposition politics. I spent five years opposing an NDP government in Ontario. I understand that it is fundamentally the opposition's job to be negative. It is difficult to get up every morning, to look in the mirror and to ask "How can I be negative today?" But they do it. It is their job. Although I did hear the member for Burnaby—Douglas congratulate our fisheries minister in question period today for his latest decision on coho salmon. It took a lot of courage for him to do that and I congratulate the member for Burnaby—Douglas for his courage to stand and make a positive statement. In the one year I have been in this place that is the first time I have heard an opposition member make a positive, constructive statement about something.

They cannot tell me that every bill and policy that this government or any government proposes is without merit. It is simply not possible.

An hon. member: The millennium fund.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: They go on about the millennium fund. Should it come as a surprise? Let us take a look at our electoral system.

The Canadian electorate sent a majority government here. They said "Fundamentally we like what you stand for. We like the proposals on how the budget will be balanced and on how the surplus will be dealt with. We think it makes sense". They sent us here. So we introduced a budget. We introduced a historic millennium scholarship fund of \$2.5 billion to help young people. On average it will mean \$3,000 per year per student. It will not only be based on merit, it will be based on need.

We recognized that these young people needed help so we introduced measures to help with debt repayment which are unprecedented. There will be tax relief for interest on all student loans. Why would you be opposed to that? It is unbelievable. It is unthinkable. It is outrageous. Phone your constituents. Members of the Reform Party always say they are to vote this way unless their constituents call and tell them to vote a different way. Phone them on this one. I think you will find by and large, they will support it. Check with them. Maybe just maybe, you might change your position.

Government Orders

• (1600)

Interest relief extended to more graduates. We are not talking about holus-bolus elimination of all tuition as the NDP in its somewhat myopic and naive view of the world would do. "Just wipe out the cost. Taxpayers will take care of everything. There is nothing to worry about. It is okay". In the world of socialism, they are totally out to lunch on that.

Then on the other extreme, an extended repayment period for those who need it. Imagine that the Reform Party is against that. Of course the Reform Party's solution and the right wing solution to all of this is simply to reduce taxes. They have no concern whatsoever for those young people who are struggling through school whose last concern is how much they are paying in taxes. Their concern is how they can afford their post-secondary education.

We believe very strongly that the millennium scholarship fund will not solve all the problems but it will sure go a long way toward helping people have better access, more affordable access to post-secondary education.

There are lots of examples in the world. The Republic of Ireland is one of the most dynamic successful economies in Europe with much of it coming I would admit from EU financing. Why are people interested in investing in the Republic of Ireland? It is not only because of the historic peace agreement but they have been doing it for years in the Republic of Ireland because of the quality of the training and the education of the young people in that country. It actually is a model we should look at.

It is interesting to hear members from the Bloc stand up and say that we are interfering in provincial jurisdiction. They are the same people who stand up and whine and complain because the government will not give them more money, will not give them more authority, will not give them more autonomy, will not allow them to separate and destroy this country. They got that right. We are not going to let them do that.

What this plan does is it allows for co-operation with the provincial governments. It allows for co-operation. It actually allows for money from the \$2.5 billion to be invested and to grow and the interest to be used. It allows for endowments to come from the private sector and that can increase the amount of money available. There would be a lot of interest in that.

I think of the agreements the University of Waterloo has entered into in the Kitchener—Waterloo community. Members opposite should look at how the university community works well with the private sector. Why? Because it has an interest. It wants to turn out good quality graduates.

Members opposite really should take a serious look at the future and the need to help our young people increase their education.

An hon. member: We are doing it.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: You are doing it because you want to give it away in the NDP. They want to jack up the prices, cut the taxes, help the wealthy. That is all they want. They are absolutely off base.

This is balanced. This is good government policy. It is receiptable and it is going to help build a great dynamic country for your children and mine.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for rescuing the member opposite who, near as I can tell, did not take a breath for almost 10 minutes. It was an impressive sight. It is like the old saying when a preacher dropped his notes and someone said when you are unsure of what you are saying, just speak louder and maybe someone will believe it. I think the hon. member opposite was probably a case in point. Lots of volume, lots of rhetoric, no facts and I am not sure he is even convinced of his position.

• (1605)

On the budget implementation act it is a shame we cannot question one another during this period. It would be so much fun to debate with a member who relies so much on rhetoric and so little on facts.

For example, why has the bill taken so long to come to the House of Commons? And why now is there time allocation? Every single bill that is brought into the House is brought in by the government as it sees fit. If it does not want to bring the bill in until June, then it will run shy of time before the summer holidays. It has had three months in which to run the bill, every day since the budget announcement if it had wanted to.

This bill and the budget have been botched in several ways right from the word go. On the grouping we are talking about on the millennium fund the minister appointed the person in charge of the millennium fund before the legislation was passed in the House of Commons.

Imagine something this big. As the member opposite has said, this thing is practically as big as sliced bread. It is almost as miraculous as getting the milk inside the Caramilk bar. It is so huge it is practically a memorial fund for the Prime Minister in years to come. It is such a big thing you would think the legislation would come before the House to be debated. Once it was debated the minister would move ahead and enact the legislation as it was passed. But no, the Minister of Finance chose to appoint the person in charge of the millennium fund before parliament had a look at it.

Reform raised that in the House. We have this funny little quirk on this side of the House. We think that perhaps democracy in parliament should have a say in things, not just ministerial

Government Orders

departments. The member set an alarming trend on behalf of the government and an alarming tendency to ignore parliament to legislatively put the cart before the horse. That was the first mistake on this.

The second mistake is in the budget itself in its entirety. The focus of the budget was that the government could probably continue to tax Canadians at this rate. Canadians are long suffering and fairly patient. They are not prone to dementia. Perhaps the government could continue to tax Canadians at a rate that would make most sane people cringe and business people cry and they will just put up with it.

That is exactly what happened. The budget continued the time honoured tradition of Liberal parliamentarians that the only good taxpayer is a well taxed taxpayer. With this bill we continue to have the highest personal income taxes in the G-7.

Today during question period there was a little bit of a kerfuffle and a point of order to straighten out the facts by the Deputy Prime Minister who was trying to decide whether Italy was the fifth biggest economy in the world and Canada was seventh, or was it the other way around. What he did not get into regardless of which way it was, and of course Canada is the seventh, is that we have the distinction of being number one when it comes to personal tax levels in the G-7. We get taxed higher than anybody else, including Italy and the Americans. That side of the House just cannot seem to understand that it affects people's business decisions.

I just heard talk a minute ago about Ireland and some other bright spots in the world for investment. Business people look at the education levels. They look at the political stability. They look at lots of things. One of the factors they also look at is the tax rate in the economy they are going to build their business in.

You only have to come out to British Columbia. Even within a small jurisdiction like Canada we can see with a high tax rate like that in British Columbia, which is a provincial problem, that the people in British Columbia are voting with their feet and are moving to Alberta to start up new businesses there. I can tell a litany of sad business stories of people from my riding, including people in the farming community who have given up on the high taxes in British Columbia and have moved to Alberta where there are the lowest taxes overall in Canada. There is no PST and Alberta has the lowest income taxes.

• (1610)

Taxes were botched right from the start. The attitude was that there was no tax relief needed for Canadians because after all, they can take it. They have not revolted. There is no rioting in the streets, so let them get by on what they are getting by on and we will just continue to spend the money.

It has long been my belief and the belief of the Reform Party that what taxation means at the federal level is the government takes our money, deducts 50% for handling and then gives it back to us in services we never asked for and it generally goes to the people who did not deserve it or want it to begin with. But the government makes sure that everyone is taxed. It is almost biblical in nature in that all must go to be taxed. It has been going on for a long time. The Liberal government has perfected it. The Liberals never met a taxpayer they did not like. They make sure that taxpayers are well fleeced so that they feel as lucky as any other Canadian I guess because they are treated equally that way.

That is unfortunate because dollars left in the hands of people in the community, in the hands of homemakers, in the hands of business people and students now and in the future are dollars that are more likely to be well spent than when the government gets its sticky little fingers on it.

In a previous speech about the tax system in Canada I mentioned the long chain of books that the tax collector, the hon. Minister of Finance has lying out behind him, the long catalogue of thousands of pages of tax laws, income tax increments and the broken promises of Christmas past, present and future. It kind of streams out behind him like a dead weight on the economy and forever must be pulled around like a chain while saying "Woe is me and woe is you because this thing is going to drag us down".

Imagine if some of the tax burden was relieved from people. Imagine if some of that weight was taken off their shoulders. Imagine as we discuss this millennium fund if students had the prospect that as they earned money they would be able to keep more of it.

Canadians do not have to make a lot of money to start paying a lot of taxes in this country. I met with someone on Sunday who goes to the same church as I do. This fellow is in his mid-fifties, has been on and off social assistance and has held down a steady job for the last couple of years. He is working at a machine shop doing clean up and basic chores around the place. He makes \$17,000 a year which is his total income. He said "What is it about our tax system that I have to send \$3,000 a year to Ottawa? What gives in a system that taxes me, a \$17,000 a year guy, and asks me to send money to Ottawa so they can take it, deduct 50% for handling and give it out to other people who get the services and are just a selected few?" I did not have an answer for him.

We could point out the following. On the millennium fund, who does not want to see our children educated? My goodness sake, I have four of them at college age. I would love to see them all educated with somebody else's tax dollars.

Why is it this millennium fund is going to affect 7 out of 100 students? And this is going to turn the world on its ear. A student who happens to be one of the seven blessed, a student who happens to be chosen will be a happy camper. But for the other 93 students, what are their prospects? Their prospects are to continue to pay

Government Orders

GST, continue to pay income tax, continue to pay road taxes, tariffs, fees, customs duties, hidden user fees. Those students will continue to pay all of that and the government will take their money and give it to the 7 out of the 100 who will receive a benefit. The other 93 will pay and the 7 will receive a benefit.

I do not think that is the way it should be. There would be a lot more students with a lot more smiles on their faces, 93 at least, saying "Thank you, Mr. Minister, for reducing my taxes. Thank you for reducing my debt load. Thank you for giving me some prospect for hope for the future".

• (1615)

I think that is the way we could get general support for any kind of millennium fund or scholarship fund because that would benefit all Canadians equally.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, many members spoke to Bill C-36, a bill aimed at setting up a \$2.5 billion millennium scholarship fund to help students.

A lot has been said about this bill. As far as I am concerned it clearly shows that Canada is a failure as a country because, with Bill C-36, the government is trying once again to interfere in education, which comes under Quebec's jurisdiction.

Canada's history proves that education is critical to Quebec's survival. It is at the heart of Quebec's plan for the future. If Canada had learned to respect Quebec, the federal government would not be pushing pieces of legislation such as Bill C-36. Since Duplessis and Lesage, Quebec premiers have been fighting to preserve the integrity of Quebec's jurisdiction over education. It is essential that Canada recognize the importance of education for Quebec.

We know that throughout history one of the ways Canada has been trying to assimilate francophones has been to attack the education system. This is what every province outside Quebec has done. They challenged the use and teaching of French, thus speeding up assimilation. This is one of the reasons why today the assimilation rate is 40% in Ontario and up to 70% in the western provinces.

As a matter of fact, just out of respect for Quebec, proposed legislation like Bill C-36, which interferes in a field as important to Quebec's future as education, should not even be introduced. One can see, once again, from this bill, that motions that are moved in the House to recognize Quebec's distinctiveness are not respected. A motion was moved shortly after the last referendum to have Quebec's distinctiveness recognized and it was passed in the House. But the government introduced Bill C-36, which ignores

Quebec's uniqueness or distinctiveness yet again. It is to be expected that the Calgary declaration will not change much either.

Indeed, as long as the government introduces legislation such as Bill C-36, which heaps scorn on something that is central to what Quebec represents, this will only be a further gesture, somewhat like what Pierre Elliott Trudeau did in 1982 with the constitution in an attempt, which succeeded, to reduce the powers of Quebec's national assembly in the area of education. It is since the Constitution Act of 1982 was passed that we have experienced so many constitutional problems in Canada. Since 1982, we have had a great number of commissions and some referendums in Canada to talk about national unity, and English Canada did not learn its lesson.

The government comes back, once again, with Bill C-36, which is a small copy, so to speak, of the bad gesture made by Mr. Trudeau at the time. However, the current Prime Minister probably wants to make the same kind of gesture, that is compromise the integrity of Quebec's powers in the area of education. In fact, this is what is being done.

• (1620)

No one is against better education in Canada. We heard the hogwash of Liberal members who told the House that a stand against Bill C-36 is a stand against better education. Naturally, that is sheer nonsense.

We want students to benefit from this \$2.5 billion. Of course we do, but we would rather have the funds paid directly to the provinces, which would administer them. Our loans and grants system in Quebec is one of the best if not the best system in Canada today. The debt load of students in Quebec is one of the smallest in the country.

We do not need another federally appointed agency to come to solve problems we do not have in Quebec. We want Quebec to get back its share of the \$2.5 billion, but not this way, not funds managed by individuals appointed by the Prime Minister, no doubt friends of the party, 12 directors who will sit in private, behind closed doors, manage the funds and distribute them as they see fit, without being accountable in any way.

Basically, the federal government will be putting money in the hands of a private agency that will not be accountable to elected representatives. That is contrary to democratic principles. After all, why appoint 12 commissioners or board members to manage these funds when each province in Canada already has a ministry of education managing education funds?

Not only does this bill dismiss the existing system in Quebec, but it shows once again that Canada does not understand a thing about the problems in Quebec and Canada. Once again, the Constitution is flouted. We know full well that this private agency appointed by the Liberal government will be duplicating services

Government Orders

currently provided by the ministry of education in Quebec and the other provinces. This is a blatant case of duplication, which entails extra costs of course.

Take for example the millennium office to be set up in Ottawa in preparation for the year 2000 celebrations. It is estimated that the administration costs for managing the \$166 million earmarked for celebrating Canada and the millennium in the year 2000 will amount to 10% of the total budget.

What does this mean, with respect to the \$2.5 billion budget for the millennium scholarships? Does it mean that \$250 million will be spent on managing these scholarships and not on those who should benefit from it, the students? Does it mean that new jobs will be created for the friends of the Liberal government? Are we creating a \$250 million slush fund for the friends of the government?

We have the right to wonder, because there is no real need for these millennium scholarships. They will not necessarily help the students, because if we really wanted to help our students, we would give the money directly to the provinces, which would be a good thing. It would reduce the administration costs.

Who benefits from these millennium scholarships? It is pretty obvious that the Prime Minister of Canada is trying to create something to be remembered by, and in a rather arrogant way, too.

• (1625)

This scholarships program is to remind Canadians how much he cares about our youth, when, in fact, his primary goal is only to give his Liberal government more visibility at a very high cost.

Bill C-36 is another fine illustration of the fact that Canada is a failure.

[English]

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill-36, the Budget Implementation Act, which is a culmination of the Minister of Finance's budget that he tabled back in February.

There are a couple of issues about the budget which I would like to discuss. Number one, of course, is that the minister announced a balanced budget. However, there was actually a surplus of \$2.5 billion, because the minister charged \$2.5 billion to this fiscal year to set up his millennium scholarship fund.

I take exception to the way he has been doing his accounting. The auditor general pointed out the previous year that the finance minister had made an \$800 million charge for an expenditure that had not been made. I would have thought the Minister of Finance would have listened to the Auditor General of Canada who is the watchdog for all Canadians. He ensures that the books of the

Government of Canada are clear and prepared in a manner consistent with normal accounting practices and that they do not contain misleading information.

The Minister of Finance has unilaterally decided to change the accounting policies of the Government of Canada to allow him to make a charge when he decides to make an announcement regarding a new program, and in this particular case \$2.5 billion for the millennium scholarship fund.

That means that we have taken \$2.5 billion out of the books for the year ending March 31, 1998 and have set the money aside. We have not spent the money. We have not even set it aside at this point in time. But the Minister of Finance has made this expenditure or charge on the financial statements with the idea that after the turn of the millennium, which is closer to the next election, the government is going to have \$2.5 billion to spread around to young people in our country who will benefit by having assistance with tuition and education expenses.

We Reformers have never had a problem helping kids to get their education, but we do have a problem with this sleight of hand type of accounting that is being proposed by the Minister of Finance and being condemned by the Auditor General of Canada who says this cannot be the way.

I think that for the second time in a row the Minister of Finance should listen to the auditor general, rather than thumbing his nose at the auditor general, because we need to have integrity in our financial statements. We need to have integrity in our government. Surely, if there is no integrity in the financial statements being prepared by the government, then the government loses its integrity, and that is not in anybody's best interest.

I hope the Minister of Finance will take the auditor general's serious criticisms to heart, that he will recognize the error of his ways and will ensure that our financial statements are prepared in a manner that is acceptable to the Auditor General of Canada. That way not only Canadians but international investors can have faith in our financial statements.

While we have a balanced budget, we must remember that we still have a debt of almost \$600 billion, which is \$20,000 for every man, woman and child in Canada. That debt is being funded and financed by overseas investors, bankers and so on who look at our financial statement and if they find that it is qualified by the auditor general then we may end up having to pay higher interest rates on that debt. That is also not to anybody's benefit.

• (1630)

I have to laud the government for achieving a balanced budget. With prodding by the Reform Party it has finally got itself there. We take exception to the fact, however, that it got there by

increasing revenues from taxation rather than by cutting expenditures and bringing the government down to a more appropriate size.

The employment insurance fund now has a surplus of almost \$20 billion, which is far in excess of any surplus it has ever had before. It is ten times larger than any surplus it ever had before. The government has taxed employment and jobs to balance the budget rather than cut the size of government. Taxing jobs seems to be a backward way of trying to achieve economic growth so that the government can get its finances in order while everybody else has to pay through the nose and find out that their personal budgets are being squeezed to pay for extra taxes to the government.

That tax revenue comes with a potential price. We have now had seven years of economic expansion. We know economic expansions come to an end. When that happens, government expenditures go up by increased unemployment insurance premiums, reduced taxation revenues, additional welfare costs and all other government costs. Since we have relied on increased revenues to balance the budget, we run the risk of slipping back into a deficit if economic activity slows down.

Last weekend the Minister of Finance was in Kananaskis, Alberta, to enjoy the fine scenery and accommodation of my part of the world. He was at the APEC conference, the Asia Pacific Economic Council, dealing with economic issues in the far east. Things are not as rosy over there as perhaps they could be or even should be.

We are glad to see the resignation of President Suharto. However we have some doubts about his successor who may follow in the same vein. There is an economic crisis there that is already impacting on the province of British Columbia. Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank, said over the weekend that the impact of the economic slowdown in Asia could have a small but not negligible impact on North American economies.

I read in the *Financial Post* today that the Bank of Tokyo Mitsubishi reported a loss of \$10 billion. When banks start to lose \$10 billion we should begin to take a look at what is going on in financial markets. Therefore I point out to the Minister of Finance and to all Liberals that although they may have a balanced budget today, it may not be as rosy as it could be or should be if they had taken this opportune time to cut government when the economy was chugging along quite nicely. When the economy turns downward is no time to squeeze Canadians with fewer and fewer services.

The government should be very cautious and careful about spending any money it has or any surpluses it has. It should still be vigorous in its efforts to root out waste. I publish a waste report periodically. I brought one out last week with all the different grants. For example, we gave some money to somebody to study

Government Orders

dress in 19th century Istanbul. I wonder what benefit that is to Canadians.

• (1635)

The auditor general pointed out that in one of our embassies we had spent \$3,500 a month to store furniture, but when we looked at the furniture being stored we found it was only worth \$1,000. We have idiotic expenditures right across government. We have waste, mismanagement and incompetence in many areas. It requires accountability. It requires to be rooted out, and that is what the government has failed to do.

When we next see a Budget Implementation Act for which the government is asking the approval of the House to implement the recommendations of the Minister of Finance, I would find it very difficult to do so based on the fact that they have not put their own fiscal house in order.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Charlotte, hepatitis C; the hon. member for Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, employment insurance reform.

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate, but I am not delighted to rise today in this House to speak to Bill C-36.

It implements certain provisions in the latest budget of the Minister of Finance including the Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation. I will return to this a little later in my speech.

Perhaps you would allow me right off to put all the nonsense in the latest budget into perspective. The government opposite is continuously heaping praise on the Minister of Finance for his work in balancing the budget.

Let us get things clear from the start. There is no question of congratulating a government so irresponsible about the job it has to do as to have others do it, namely the provinces. This, in my opinion and that of the Bloc, makes the entire budget operation totally unacceptable. The federal government achieved its zero deficit by scandalously dumping its financial obligations and responsibilities into the yards of the provinces.

To eliminate its deficit, the Liberal government has cut annually, since 1994, \$7.2 billion in transfers to the provinces, which represents 52% of all the federal government's spending cuts. In its two terms, the government opposite will literally have chopped \$42 billion in social transfer payments to the provinces.

In 1995, the federal government promised, through its finance minister, to cut departmental expenditures by 19% over three years. Once again, it did not do its homework, since it cut only 9%,

Government Orders

proving yet again that nearly all efforts to improve government finances came from elsewhere.

What this year's budget neglects to say, and the public must be aware of this, is that there will be an additional \$30 billion in cuts by 2003 to the health, education and social assistance sectors.

To give an idea of the size of the cuts, for Quebec alone, between 1993 and 2003, a cumulative total of \$13 billion will be cut from the budget for transfers to Quebec. It is not for nothing that the Quebec minister of state for the economy and finance, Bernard Landry, told the federal government that its federalism was "predatory and abusive". I will add "irresponsible, centralizing and creating poverty" to that.

If we examine the effects of these cuts in the daily lives of people in Quebec and Canada, we will see they are totally devastating. We must keep in mind that, when the Liberals took office in 1993, 61% of the unemployed were eligible for employment insurance benefits. Now, five years later, fewer than 40% of them are.

The latest employment insurance report states in black and white that young workers are the age group most affected by this drop in eligibility.

• (1640)

But what is most objectionable about the employment insurance situation is the surplus accumulated in the fund, which is up to about \$14 billion at this point. It is expected to hit \$25 billion by the year 2000. Imagine what could be done with all that dormant money.

Since 1993, the Bloc Québécois has been shouting itself hoarse about the budget cuts being made at the expense of the disadvantaged in our society, and here is proof of it. I would describe these budget practices as fraudulent and a real theft.

The Bloc Québécois is therefore attuned to the problems of the population, unlike the government over there, which keeps its head buried in the sand. Proof of this is the number of occasions we have begged the federal government to stop using the employment insurance fund to balance its books. The Bloc has always maintained that these funds are there to support the unemployed and to help get them back into the work force.

In addition, the Bloc Québécois, with the backing of the labour movement, businessmen and the general public, has fought constantly to get the federal government to substantially cut workers' and employers' EI contribution rates, which are currently far too high and hamper job creation.

The Bloc Québécois has picked up on the signals coming from the public by proposing concrete and practical measures including a \$3 billion overall reduction in contributions, which represents an additional cut of about 35 cents in the contribution rate. Compared

to the present rate of \$2.70, the planned drop to \$2.60 by the year 2000, or a mere 10 cents, will have no significant impact on job creation.

In spite of the unprecedented room to manoeuvre it has in the current budget, the government opposite chose to do nothing to stimulate job creation. No tax reform geared to job creation, no special budget measure to improve the fate of thousands of unemployed Quebecers and Canadians.

In short, when it comes to job creation this budget is a failure. And yet the unemployment rate is stuck at around 9%.

Instead of creating jobs, the government prefers to create new programs resulting in more duplication and interference in areas of provincial jurisdiction, such as the Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation, and keeps on doing what it knows best, namely how to spend somebody else's money.

A case in point is the hasty purchase of submarines to the tune of \$750 million, a real bargain. After cutting billions of dollars from social transfer in the areas of health, education and welfare, the federal government is investing in youth and job creation by purchasing armament. These are the real priorities of this government.

Imagine what we could do with the \$750 million it sunk into ships. I am asking the members opposite: Why not invest this money to feed the 1.4 million poor children we have in Canada?

This is one child out of five. Imagine all this money to help the five million Canadians who are living below the poverty line, which is 17.4% of this country's population. These are the priorities of the government across the way.

Another reason people in Quebec and Canada have been getting poorer since this government came to power is probably the \$30 billion more they have to pay in taxes to the federal government.

In order to help stop this hemorrhage, the Bloc Québécois asked the finance minister and other ministers to stop creating new programs. But of course, he did not listen and set up new programs including the millennium scholarships, a cornerstone of Bill C-36. This \$2.5 billion fund, which will only come into force in the year 2000, is an unprecedented and blatant intrusion into an area of provincial jurisdiction, education.

• (1645)

The Prime Minister of Canada knows very well that, for over 30 years, we have had in Quebec the most comprehensive loans and scholarships plan in Canada.

Federalists, sovereignists and the education circles in Quebec have voiced strong opposition to this federal visibility campaign. This program does not in any way meet the needs of Quebec and

its quite distinct education system. That is why Quebec rejects this program and wants to opt out with full financial compensation.

This is not a whimsical demand. It is part of a rational effort aimed specifically at meeting the immediate needs of the education system in Quebec and compensating for the \$10 billion in federal cuts to transfers for education, with Quebec's share of these cuts amounting to \$3 billion between 1993 and 2003.

This is outright hypocrisy. But students and the general public in Quebec will not be fooled. They know very well that these scholarships are a blatant effort to win the support of students in Quebec and in Canada. But sooner or later, the government will pay for these serious mistakes. Quebecers will understand once and for all that the only way out of this federal quagmire is Quebec sovereignty.

[*English*]

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to debate Bill C-36.

I begin by expressing my regret that debate on this bill has been limited by the government's time allocation motion. I understand this is the fourth time in this parliament alone that closure or time allocation has been implemented. It was done on Bill C-2 regarding the Canada pension plan, on Bill C-4 with respect to the Canadian Wheat Board, on Bill C-19, the Canadian Labour Code amendments which we dealt with before parliament broke, and now twice on Bill C-36.

This is not a new trend. The Liberal government, the very same party when it was on this side of the House criticized the Mulroney government for its habit of invoking closure and time allocation, has done so 41 times since 1994.

Mr. Speaker, I know you have a particular concern for parliamentary reform and helped chair a committee dealing with reforms to ensure that the closure and time allocation powers of government were not abused as they were in parliaments previous to 1993. It is regretful, and I say this as a new member, that the government has failed to restrain its excessive use of what really should be a very rare lever to limit debate in this place.

This is parliament. The purpose of this place is to deliberate on legislation brought forward by the government. It is not to rubber stamp legislation brought forward by the bureaucracy or the executive branch. It is to deliberate, to debate, to amend, to consider, to ensure that those who pay the bills for the legislation we pass have their concerns fully and exhaustively expressed with respect to every single piece of legislation, particularly pieces of legislation like Bill C-36 which have such an enormous impact on the fiscal and economic condition of Canadians.

Government Orders

I came to this place expecting frustration as a member, knowing this parliamentary system is dysfunctional, knowing the way it has been abused by successive governments, that serious substantive debate and deliberation on legislation of this nature happens all too rarely. Even my low expectations as a close observer of this place and a keen observer of parliamentary history have not been met. My low expectations for democratic deliberation have been exceeded by the government's autocratic abuse of the sledge hammer of debate known as time allocation and closure.

• (1650)

I turn my comments to the substance of the bill. The part we are dealing with today deals with the establishment of the Canada millennium scholarship foundation. It is a quaint convention in democratic countries such as Canada that governments seek consent from the voters in an election before they embark on major new program initiatives. That is what the concept of a democratic mandate is all about.

When I review the election literature distributed by candidates of the Liberal Party in the federal election conducted a year ago I fail to find any mention of the Canada millennium scholarship foundation. There are all the usual bromides in that election literature about how the government is committed the future of young people, to education and so forth, but nowhere did I find this commitment to spend billions of tax dollars which would otherwise be used for tax relief and debt reduction on what amounts to a huge political advertisement project for this outgoing Prime Minister.

By invoking closure with this bill not only has the government run roughshod over democratic conventions of parliament by failing to seek a mandate from voters, not only has it disrespected a longstanding convention in our system that one needs a democratic mandate to proceed with major spending programs, it has also run roughshod over the principles of sound, transparent public accounting as articulated by the auditor general.

Let us be clear. Bill C-36, by establishing the Canada millennium scholarship fund in this year for a public expenditure which will not be made for at least two fiscal years into the future, breaks every single rule and convention of clear, transparent and principled public accounting. That is not my view as a member of the opposition. It is not the view of partisans. It is the view of the non-partisan authority appointed by this place to review and comment on the accuracy of the public accounts.

The auditor general in talking about the change in reporting the millennium fund in the current fiscal year as opposed to the year in which it will actually be expended said: "I believe the change will open the door for governments to influence reported results by simply announcing intentions in their budgets and then deciding

Government Orders

what to include in the deficit or surplus after the end of the year once preliminary numbers are known”.

He went on to say in a letter: “Indeed it is not possible to use the contingency reserve for new policy initiatives unless parliament has approved them and the amount is included in the main or supplementary estimates. In effect, unless parliament has voiced its approval neither a program nor an expenditure can exist”.

It is absolutely clear what the auditor general told parliament and told this government. It does not have the legislative authority to expend the money in two years but to book it on this year’s budget. As somebody who has watched public finances very closely for a very long time, this is probably the most notorious instance of a government’s cooking the books and misleading the public about how public money is actually being spent that I have ever witnessed.

Provincial governments over the past several years have made great strides in improving the transparency of their public accounts. I refer to the Government of Alberta which conducted an exhaustive review of what had become very problematic public accounts in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

In 1993 Premier Ralph Klein commissioned an independent review of the entire public accounts and budgetary practices by a panel of experts. That government adopted almost every single recommendation of the independent panel, almost every recommendation of its auditor general, and every recommendation of the chartered accountants of Alberta to reform the way the public accounts are presented and to bring them into compliance with generally accepted public sector accounting practices.

• (1655)

Even the Government of B.C., famous for its shell games with public finances, had an independent commission on public accounts. But the federal government really seems to believe that it can just design the books any way it wants and essentially mislead the Canadian public about how its money is being spent. That is shameful.

What are the Liberals doing with this \$2.5 billion? They are creating the Prime Minister’s millennium memorial fund. They have decided, in a country with 17% youth unemployment, to say we will help as a federal government to further subsidize your higher education but we are not going to give you an environment where you can work.

For instance, my brother went to a Canadian law school with a subsidized post-secondary program. It would be further subsidized by the Canadian millennium scholarship fund. Because of the taxes imposed by this and previous governments, he and tens of thou-

sands of other talented Canadian trained young people have gone abroad where they can find better economic opportunities afforded by lower tax regimes.

We will vote against this bill to stand up for democracy. We will vote against time allocation, as we did this morning, and we will vote for tax relief to give younger Canadians the real economic opportunities they need and deserve.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réjean Lefebvre (Champlain, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to this important bill and to the group of motions we have introduced, which consist essentially in deleting any reference to the existence of millennium scholarships.

Why are we introducing this group of motions? Our reason is a good one. We are doing so because, with these millennium scholarships, the federal government is poking its nose into other people’s business. During the three weeks of hearings held by the Standing Committee on Finance, 14 Quebec organizations appeared, all saying the same thing, which was that the federal government has no business interfering in an area of exclusive provincial jurisdiction. According to the very Constitution that these people claim to be defending, the federal government does not have the right to interfere and the organizations are asking for the right to opt out with full compensation for Quebec.

Those who appeared before the committee did so on behalf of organizations as important as the FTQ, the CSN, and university and college student groups. A group of former student movement leaders who presided over the reform in the education sector over the last eleven years came to deliver essentially seven messages to the committee, and more particularly to the federal government. The first of these messages is that, with these millennium scholarships, the federal government is revealing its complete lack of familiarity with Quebec’s reality.

Once again, the government is demonstrating its bad faith. If it had wanted to do the right thing, it would have amended the Canada Student Loans Act. We know that all that was needed was to add the scholarships to that legislation and it would have possible to opt out with full compensation.

My first point is this government’s bad faith. My second is this. The negotiations under way could have been given a chance, without this rush to pass a bill that, as we know, does not give the foundation authority to allow a province to opt out with full compensation if it so wishes.

Why? It is obvious, the Prime Minister said so himself, that the government needed to be visible. It therefore introduced a bill that does not allow opting out with full compensation.

Government Orders

The board of directors will not have the power to delegate to the provinces. That is why the Bloc Québécois will be speaking to Bill C-36 today, and it is not in favour because the millennium scholarships do not reflect the reality of Quebec and of Quebecers.

If there had not been pressure from the Government of Quebec, if there had not been pressure from the coalition in favour of Quebec opting out with full compensation, we would never have had the opportunity to speak on behalf of Quebec.

• (1700)

Forty one per cent of the witnesses heard. This means the committee heard 1.2 million people through their associations. It means 80,000 owners of small and medium size businesses.

As we know, the business world, including the Conseil du patronat du Québec, the Quebec chamber of commerce and the Quebec and Canadian association of manufacturers et exporteurs came and told the committee that Quebec should be allowed to manage its education sector, and that opting out with full compensation should be allowed, so that the money could be used based on Quebec's needs and realities. This is very disappointing.

Several student associations from outside Quebec came to tell the government to listen to Quebec. They said the federal government should, for once, listen to Quebec's demands. I attended a few meetings with various representatives, associations officials and witnesses, and I can tell you that several witnesses realized that the government was acting in bad faith on this issue.

The consensus in Quebec included stakeholders from the education sector and union representatives, but polls were also conducted. In one of them, 71% of the respondents were more supportive of the Canada social transfer. People said it had been very difficult for them to go through the period of austerity created by the cuts, and they felt that, perhaps, the surpluses were not being managed properly, since the government was giving \$2.5 billion to a private foundation which, as we know, will have a rather wide mandate. I do not think we should expect a great deal of transparency from that foundation, and I am very disappointed.

Therefore, I ask the consent of this House to postpone consideration of this bill until we have seen the outcome of the negotiations between Quebec and Ottawa. Why not defer consideration of the bill? Mr. Speaker, I am urging you to ask if the House would agree to defer consideration of this legislation.

The government is acting in bad faith. We sovereignists know that many Quebecers are not acting in bad faith, because they still had hopes that the federal system would undergo a reform. The millennium foundation, because it arrogantly encroaches on the rights of the provinces, has shown the true colours of the federal government. We hope that many Quebecers who did not yet

realize it will now understand that federalism—regardless of which party is in office—cannot be reformed. This government showed incredible contempt for Quebecers when it thought that this would go through smoothly and that Quebecers would quietly put up with it, because it is a monetary issue.

Just to top it all off, two weeks ago the three main employer associations in Quebec, the Conseil du patronat, the Quebec chamber of commerce and the Association des manufacturiers et des exportateurs du Québec testified before the committee. These are not exactly sovereignist people. The representatives of these three associations came to tell the government to stop the study of the bill until negotiations were complete. If an agreement is reached, it will be included in the law. If none is reached, the government will assume its responsibility and the opposition its. But there will be no pretence of democracy as is being imposed on us today.

This is why the Bloc has presented motions to eliminate everything to do with the foundation from this bill. Quebec will never allow the government to tromp all over a system it has developed, which is the best in the world. We will never let it happen. We will ensure it does it by gagging us at every stage, otherwise this bill will never be passed.

[English]

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege again to be able to make some remarks on Bill C-36, the Budget Implementation Act, and specifically on the amendment with respect to the millennium scholarship fund.

There are four problems the government has created for itself, to a large degree, with the bill. Canadians need to know about these problems and need to recognize that the government has not handled the issue well at all.

• (1705)

These are the problems. The first problem is the whole business of the design of the fund. Not only was it designed in such a way that it contravenes a lot of the jurisdictional realities of our country but it also causes some heightened interprovincial tensions quite unnecessarily. The second problem is with the accounting that was used to fund this initiative. The third problem was the trouble we ran into with the legislation and then closure being put into place to cut off debate and ramming the legislation through, which is a typical Liberal tactic that is becoming more typical as time goes on. The fourth problem is that the legislation does not go very far in addressing the problems of students.

I would just like to touch on each of these problems a bit. With respect to the design of the fund, the government after it took office slashed funding by 35% to 40% to the provinces for programs like post-secondary education. It wasted the money that was to go to the

Government Orders

provinces to keep post-secondary education services available to our citizens. That was the first act in this drama.

The second act in the drama began in February with the budget. The 1995 budget was the family budget, the child poverty budget. Liberals like to have a theme or a cause. They like to be able to say they care about something. The theme of the last budget before this one was poor children. There was much violin playing about poor children, mostly poor because of the terrible fiscal policies of the government.

The theme of the last budget was education. Students were to be helped. If we listened to government speakers we could hear them going on and on about the value of education and how wonderful it was that we looked after our children and their training, et cetera. There was no mention of the fact that the Liberals had slashed education funding just shortly before this wonderful education budget. That was all forgotten, but this budget was to do something for students.

There are over one million students in the country, many of whom are in retraining or upgrading because the economy is changing. Yet this so-called program only helps 7% of all people who are trying desperately to gain the educational and training skills they need to compete in the emergent economy.

Further, the millennium scholarship fund has all the earmarks of a grand gesture by the Prime Minister. This was the Prime Minister's legacy. This was a memorial to the Prime Minister's generosity toward students and concern for youth. The fact of the matter was that the concern was kind of newborn. It came after the slashing of funding to post-secondary education. Now we are to wear education on our heart and the Prime Minister is to have a millennium scholarship fund for only 7% of our students.

Those 7% who get scholarships will find it taxed. They will give part of it back to the federal government. Their families may actually give a whole lot more back to the federal government if the student who qualifies for a scholarship loses dependant status in the context of the family tax structure. Here we have a few students getting a scholarship who will be taxed on the scholarship which may rearrange the family tax status.

Who are the students to be given the gift of a scholarship by the federal government? If the track record of the Liberal government holds true, the scholarships will be largely targeted as rewards to good and faithful Liberals and Liberal supporters and those who the Liberals want to court.

• (1710)

I do not think it is too unkind to say that this is how the Liberals have operated in a whole range of areas and how they are very likely to continue to operate. It will be a nice slush fund for

Liberals to be able to help other good and deserving Liberals for political purposes. That is a genuine concern of the opposition in this whole matter. It also disrespects provincial jurisdiction in the area of education.

The constitution says that the provinces have control over the delivery of post-secondary education services, but the federal government as usual feels it knows best. Did the federal government go to the education minister of Manitoba? Did it go to the education minister of New Brunswick and say that due to thrift and good management, and maybe due to heavier taxation, it has some extra money to spend on education? Did it ask how someone responsible for delivering educational services in the provinces on the post-secondary level feel the money should be spent? Did the government do that?

The answer is no. There was not a word said to the provincial ministers responsible for these services. The federal government just decided it would spend \$2.5 billion on this grand gesture to show that the Prime Minister was a fine fellow who cares about youth and students. That was the flavour of the day. The government must have done some polling to show that people were worried about education.

Another aspect of the millennium scholarship fund was the way it was put on the government books. The government said it was to spend the money and therefore deduct it right now from its cash flow. It was not to be spent until the year 2000 but it was to be deducted from cash on hand, from the revenue stream right now.

Let us think about this point for a minute. Suppose a farmer in Saskatchewan says his tractor is getting worn out but thinks it will do for a couple of more seasons. In the spring of 2000 he plans to buy a new tractor but he wants to deduct that capital expense now because he has already made up his mind that he will spend the money. What happens if he tries to count it as an expenditure in 1998?

Let us think of the response of Revenue Canada to the farmer who intends to spend the money in the year 2000 and would like to use it a capital expense today. The farmer would get a horse laugh from the government or the revenue department.

What about a business person who intends to upgrade facilities or any person who intends to make a tax deductible expense in the future and tries to claim it today? That would never be allowed, but the government thinks it is not subject to those reasonable rules of accounting and is cooking the books to hide a surplus so that at the end of the day it can make even more spending announcements close to an election.

I see you are cutting me off, Mr. Speaker, and rightly so since my time is up. The government uses closure and cutting off debate so that these badly designed measures can be rammed through. It is a

Government Orders

shame. It is a disrespect of parliament. I ask the House not to support the measures the government is trying to push through.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as the member of the Bloc Québécois for the riding of Manicouagan, I am pleased to rise today to express my party's opposition to one particular element of Bill C-36, namely the creation of the Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation.

That part of the bill provides for a \$2.5 billion endowment. We are opposed to this unspeakable intrusion of the federal government in an area that is exclusively under Quebec's and the other provinces' jurisdiction. It must be noted that the bill contains two clauses that make it impossible for the Quebec government to get its fair share of the money.

• (1715)

Had the Liberal government wanted to show some goodwill, it would have respected Quebec's jurisdiction in the area of education by amending the Canada Student Loans Act to include scholarships. This would have allowed Quebec to exercise its right to withdraw with full compensation, as it is currently entitled to do under the Canada Student Loans Act.

This bill is specifically designed not to allow a province to withdraw with full compensation. Ottawa puts its need for visibility before the needs expressed unanimously by Quebec.

For more than 30 years, Quebec has had its own loans and scholarships system that is infinitely more sophisticated than that of any other province. The entire education community in Quebec is opposed to this plan. The only way to avoid duplication is to recognize the consensus that exists in Quebec and give the Quebec government the right to withdraw with full compensation.

Let us look at history since it shows clearly the federal government's bad habit of wanting to interfere in the area of education. In 1953, the Liberal federal government of Louis Saint-Laurent tried to subsidize Canadian universities through the National Conference of Canadian Universities.

The Quebec government of Maurice Duplessis killed the federal plan. It opposed the federal government, which wanted to replace with federal subsidies some financial powers that were essential to provinces and, thus, intrude into education, which was an area of exclusive provincial jurisdiction.

In January 1957, in *L'Action nationale*, Mr. Trudeau wrote, on page 438, and I quote: "Consequently, if a government has such an overabundance of revenues that it undertakes to provide for a part of the common good which is not in its jurisdiction, one can

assume that this government has taken more than its share of taxable capacity".

Today, we can say that the Liberal government has done worse than taking more than its taxable share. It has found room to manoeuvre at the expense of the sick, schools and the poor and by forcing provinces to do the dirty work.

The Liberal government intrudes into Quebec's jurisdiction and refuses to take its responsibilities by compensating all hepatitis C victims.

In 1964, the federal government led by Mr. Pearson proposed to offer loans to students and to repay the interest for them. Jean Lesage opposed the proposal because that repayment was a direct grant by the federal government to education.

In the statement he made at the end of the federal provincial conference held in Quebec, from March 31 to April 2 1964, the man whose election campaign slogan was "Maîtres chez nous", Jean Lesage, declared: "As a matter of fact, we will have to go to court to ensure the constitutional rights of the province are respected, if they do not act on the comments we made".

On April 16 1964, in a telegram to Jean Lesage, Mr. Pearson said: "The federal government intends to propose arrangements according to which guaranteed bank loans would be made to university students. If a province prefers to go on with its own loan program, it will be eligible to equivalent compensation".

• (1720)

In short, the federal government made several unsuccessful attempts in the past to invade the education system, and neither the PQ nor the BQ were there to oppose this.

According to the Fédération des travailleurs du Québec, Bill C-36 illustrates the Canadian government's ignorance of the Quebec loans and grants system and of its priorities in the area of education.

According to the president of the Fédération des cégeps, which comprises 48 colleges, Bill C-36 totally ignores what Quebec has understood in the past 30 years with regard to student financial assistance.

The millennium scholarships are only an excuse. The federal government is using the establishment of the fund to encroach on the area of education, which comes under Quebec's exclusive jurisdiction.

In doing so, it is not helping Quebec reduce student debt or fund universities and post-secondary educational institutions. It is just after additional visibility.

There are two major reasons why we strongly oppose the establishment of this fund. Politically, the Bloc Québécois feels that the millennium fund is an unspeakable intrusion in a Quebec exclusive jurisdiction.

Government Orders

Moreover, the government has come up with such a confusing formula in order to deny Quebec the right to opt out with full compensation that its fund does not achieve the objectives that were set. It will only create inequity and confusion, while the problems of students and post-secondary institutions will remain intact.

Even though the federal government recognizes the tough financial situation of students, the solutions it puts forward ignore the source of the problem, that is the massive cuts in transfer payments. In addition, in the case of Quebec, the proposals put forward are ineffective, they overlap the measures put in place by the Quebec government and they are undoubtedly an intrusion in an area that comes under Quebec's exclusive jurisdiction.

Given the societal choices that Quebec has made over the years, the federal strategy is penalizing it. Indeed, the budget penalizes Quebec, which over the years has made major efforts to keep tuition fees and student debt at reasonable levels.

In Quebec, tuition fees average about \$1,700 a year whereas in the rest of Canada they average about \$3,200. Likewise, the average student debt in Quebec is \$11,000, whereas students in the rest of Canada owe between \$17,000 and \$25,000.

The government of Quebec suggested that its needs in the education area lie elsewhere and are not the same as those identified by the federal government.

The Quebec share of the millennium fund could be better used if the Quebec government were at liberty to invest this money where the needs in the Quebec education system are more pressing.

The government of Quebec is clear about that: any extra funding for education, whatever the means used, must be directed to the Quebec government which will redistribute it according to its own priorities. The right to opt out with full compensation has existed since 1964 in the area of financial help for students.

Quebec has built itself an effective and efficient system of scholarships that is the envy of students in the other provinces. The government says it is creating this fund to address the problem of student debt.

In conclusion, I must point out that it would be up to the foundation, which, under Bill C-36, has not even the mandate to negotiate with a province, to determine Quebec's fair share.

[*English*]

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to debate Bill C-36 although what is not such a pleasure is the time allocation aspect of this. I want to explain the problems with time allocation from where I sit. A lot of people who are watching and listening do not understand it.

• (1725)

Time allocation is when the government says "We are no longer interested in hearing what you have to say in opposition. We are going to limit the number of days and amount of time you have to speak on this issue". In a democratic world that is probably as far away from democracy as we can get when time is allocated on such an important issue as the budget.

There is another thing I want to address before I specifically talk about Bill C-36. It is bad enough we have limited time to speak to this but when there are a limited number of people on the other side listening it makes it even worse. I have a good mind to call quorum but I will not. The real problem here is where is the audience? It is pretty sad indeed.

Some hon. members: Three Liberals.

Mr. Randy White: Yes, three. If they cannot stand the heat, get out of the Commons I would say.

One has to wonder why this government would call time allocation on a budget. Let us think about that for a minute. According to the parliamentary calendar we sit until June 23. We can extend days and so on and so forth. The legislation that is of priority to this government is now down to approximately three bills, not enough probably for five days work. We have to question why on earth the government would move time allocation when it has perhaps three priority bills and well over a month to debate them and get them in.

The answer to that lies in what has happened in this House in the last six months. Look at the Minister of Health and his hepatitis boondoggle and how this government mismanaged that whole issue. Look at the Minister of Justice who said that they are going to fix the Young Offenders Act but really it could take another two years when the government has already had five years and the media has now picked up on that. The heat is getting on the government which basically has no agenda.

The government is trying to get out of the House early by calling time allocation. I wish Canadians watching this truly understood what this is all about. It is not just about someone standing up here for 10 minutes and going on about an issue. This is really about the fundamental basis of democracy itself. It is too bad we live in these times when governments can essentially still do this to the opposition parties.

Let me get on to Bill C-36, budget implementation, and the implementation of what the Liberals proudly call the millennium fund. This millennium fund supposedly has approximately \$2.5 billion so that we can provide scholarships to students. There is nothing about bursaries. I do not think the government knows the difference between a scholarship and a bursary but I will explain that in a few minutes.

The real question is where does the money come from. It came from the 1997-98 budget. The government said we have a balanced budget and charged to that budget was \$2.5 billion. The fact is that the money will not be used until the year 2000 yet the government has charged it to the 1997-98 budget rather than the year 1999-2000.

To one of the three members opposite in the House—and for anyone out there watching, the government virtually has no one hear listening to this—it is pretty sick when the government says it can justify that. As an accountant, a CMA, a member of the Society of Management Accountants, I fully understand what the general accepted principles are in accounting.

• (1730)

Basically in government accounting one does not charge an expenditure in a year in which it is not expended. The fact is that the government should have charged the \$2.5 billion to the millennium fund in the year in which the costs are to be incurred and that is the year 2000.

Why am I saying that? The fact of the matter is, the government said it had balanced the books. The real fact of the matter is, it would have had a \$2.5 billion surplus, but it chose to second that money so it would not have to give the taxpayer a break and the public would not be able to ask why it did not write down the debt or lower taxes. The government said it had no money, that it had balanced the books to zero. The fact is, there was a surplus and the government chose to hide that surplus by seconding \$2.5 billion into something called a millennium fund for which the dollars will not even be used until the year 2000.

Out of 175 government members, there are three in the House. It is really disgusting. I guess I will talk to my colleagues. Not only do they understand it a little better, there are more of them in the House.

It is not just the millennium fund show that the government is putting on here. It is not just the show that the justice minister put on with respect to the changes to the Young Offenders Act. It is not just the show that government members are playing out for hepatitis C victims. The fact is that the government's agenda is just show. There is no depth to it. It is a mile wide and an inch deep.

An hon. member: Where is the beef?

Mr. Randy White: Where is the beef, my colleague says. Where is the meat in all of this?

The justice minister the other day commented on the \$32 million in the budget that the government is planning to spend on preventive measures for young offenders. There is not a red cent anywhere. The provinces do not even know about it, yet government members go to the media and say "Guess what we are spending on preventive measures for young offenders? We are

Government Orders

spending \$32 million". They have not spent a red cent. They have not even planned to spend it. It is just amazing when people fall into that kind of lunacy, that kind of deceptive measure.

Now we are down to two. Since the Speaker is not listening to this I might as well say the number of Reform members we have in the House. This is really sick. I have a good mind to call for a quorum and get some of these people in here to listen for a change.

It is amazing. We have a multibillion dollar budget and the government has not reduced anything. It has not really spent anything on anything meaningful. It really has not done much at all, except that when a little bit of heat gets put on a whole bunch of issues it calls time allocation so nobody can really speak in detail to the bill.

I think that speaks very loudly to the concern of average Canadians. The Liberal government not only has a very weak agenda, but it actually does not have programs that are substantive and valuable to most Canadians. Finally, since I only have a minute and there are only two members opposite, I might as well tell them this—

The Deputy Speaker: I think the hon. member knows that it is improper to refer to the absence of members in the House. I know he may have been trying to cover it by that age-old tradition of referring to the presence of a few, but I, myself, have tried that technique and it has been ruled out of order. I know the hon. member would agree with the previous ruling.

Mr. Randy White: Mr. Speaker, I will no longer say that there are only two Liberals in the House.

• (1735)

In summary, the issue of the budget and the issue of crime fall on deaf ears in this country because this is a government of press releases. This is a government of rumour, of show, but it is not a government of substantive issues. Meanwhile we are still waiting for a national victims bill of rights, for a young offenders act, for a real millennium fund. So those two members opposite ought to get with it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are considering Bill C-36. Bill C-36 has a big problem, which is called the millennium scholarships.

The scholarships are for the students. In principle, everybody will agree that we must help our students complete their education while maintaining their debt level as low as possible. Therefore again, at first sight, the scholarships are a good idea. I will explain in a moment that ideas that are good for some people are sometimes bad for others.

I would also like to talk of the term "millennium". Why the millennium scholarships? Because we will soon be in the year 2000

Government Orders

and our Prime Minister thought it would be a nice way to go down in history as the driving force behind these scholarships to be awarded starting in the year 2000.

You will agree with me that if Canadian students need scholarships, they need them now and not in the year 2000 and after, although they will still need them then. It is remarkable how the finance minister has deducted from this year's budget the \$2.5 billion which he intends to spend on this scholarship fund in the year 2000. But between now and the year 2000, not one Canadian student will see as much as a penny.

I have said earlier that the scholarships are a good idea for some but a bad one for others. They are a good idea for Canadian students outside Quebec but a bad one for Quebec students. Why? A bursary program has been in existence in Quebec for more than 30 years, since Jean Lesage was premier. We care for our students and we help them financially through bursaries and loans. It is a system that works well for Quebec.

Elsewhere in Canada, such a program will not come into existence until the year 2000. The provinces are admittedly a few years behind Quebec. In fact, they are more than 30 years behind Quebec. Now, the federal government decides to directly infringe upon a provincial area of jurisdiction and offer these bursaries.

Although, on the one hand, I am happy for the students in Canada, on the other hand, I should point out that Quebec's money is being used to provide a service we already have. In other words, we are paying twice for the same thing.

Quebec, with its 30-year-old bursary system, is pursuing some very precise objectives. For 30 years, higher education at college or university level has been far less expensive in Quebec than in the other provinces. Why? Because we in Quebec decided—and this is a societal choice based on Quebecers' values—to make higher education more accessible to everyone. Moreover, the number of college and university graduates in Quebec is much higher than anywhere else in Canada. In this regard, Quebec is a much richer country than Canada.

• (1740)

Let us come back to the scholarship fund. Quebec has its own scholarship system where money is given according to the needs of the students. Those in need may apply for and receive a scholarship.

What the Prime Minister proposes in Bill C-36 is to give scholarships on the basis of merit instead of need. The better the grades, the more chances of receiving a millennium scholarship.

Good grades are important for sure, but today, we need not only excellent but also decent students. Successful students all need financial support. It is not only the top students, the elite, that need financial support. Companies do not need only the students with the best marks. Of course, that is important and it is a very good thing, but companies also need adequate students.

In Quebec, students have access to scholarships according to their needs but this will not be the case in Canada. Canada may decide to award scholarships on the basis of merit rather than need. However, I cannot accept the fact that someone using Quebec money will try to impose on Quebec a system that is contrary to its convictions and its values, contrary to what Quebec has been doing for more than 30 years.

Do you know how much money Quebec will be forced to put into that foundation? In Quebec, everybody is against this millennium scholarship system. So how much more will be stolen away—pardon the expression—by this millennium fund? Just a bit over \$600 million. That is a lot of money.

Six hundred million dollars is almost twice what the province of Quebec has been forced to hand over to the municipalities because the federal government has cut transfer payments. Those \$600 million would solve a lot of health problems.

Six hundred million dollars is the amount that the people of Quebec will be forced to pay to fund these millennium scholarships which we do not need because we already have our own system. We end up paying twice.

Once again, here we are with a totally unacceptable duplication of effort. This is a total intrusion by the federal government into our affairs, forcing us into taking on something far less attractive than what we already have in place.

Such an attitude can only reinforce two feelings in me: first pride in being a Quebecker and in sharing these values that have been in place for 30 years or more, of encouraging our students through a scholarship system when Canada does not even have one of its own yet, not until the year 2000. I am proud to be a Quebecker because we are more advanced in a number of areas, this being one of them.

At the same time, I am proud to be a sovereignist, because sovereignty will be the only way to stop a federal government, a federal system that wants to use our money, my money, the money of all Quebeckers, for something we have no need of. Six hundred million dollars is a fortune.

The interest on that amount would pay for about \$3,000 in scholarship money to some 250 Quebec students. But there is more to it than that. In Quebec, our bursary system is working fine, and so is our loan system. What we do need is money to put back into

our cegeps, into our universities, so that they can provide students with the best quality education possible.

What is the point of having scholarship money in your pocket if your educational institution cannot afford to give you a top-flight education?

• (1745)

In recent years, the federal government has slashed transfer payments for post-secondary education and, as a result, our universities and colleges have to make do with smaller budgets. After slashing our institutions' ability to deliver very high quality education, it now wants to give money directly to students to enrol in educational institutions that are not as good as they should be.

Quebec's request, which is supported by the Bloc Quebecois, is quite simple: the federal government should give Quebec its \$600 million and let it invest in high quality education. We can continue to look after our students as we have been doing so successfully for more than 30 years.

[English]

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate Bill C-36.

What we are talking about here is the so-called millennium fund, about \$2.5 billion set up for scholarships. I have to question this. No doubt many of us here in the House remember quite well, as it was not that long ago, when this same government decided to rip the provinces off to the tune of \$7 billion right out of health and education. Now it turns around and says it will give back \$2.5 billion in a millennium fund. That is like ripping your arm off and giving you back the finger. This government is very good at it.

I have news for the government. It is not its money. It is taxpayers' money. We are the most heavily taxed nation in the G-7. It is our money. It is not the government's money. When I see something like this put in place, I know for a fact it has nothing at all to do with education.

It has to do with trying to make the Prime Minister look good. It has to do with the members on the opposite side, the so-called government of this country, able to pat themselves on the back and say look what we have done for you, the people. We rip it out of your education fund. We rip it out of your health fund. But we will give you back peanuts. We will give you back enough that maybe one in seven of your children might qualify for it, and if they do we will tax it back off them.

That is what this government is so proud of. That is why this government has decided all of a sudden that it will put time allocation on this bill, a budget bill.

It was not that long ago when I felt sorry for the Liberals when they were in opposition and the Conservatives decided to put time allocation, closure, on everything. I can well remember the plead-

Government Orders

ing and the whining and the crying from the Liberal caucus of the day. Not any more. These people well learned the fine art of dictatorship. It did not take a trip over to Cuba to learn that, I am quite sure.

We look at what is going on. I mentioned taxes. I would like to give a brief outline of where Canada sits now. Canada has the highest tax burden of all the G-7 countries. Our total tax burden is 28% higher than the G-7 average and 48% higher than our neighbour next door, the United States.

This government has a habit of standing up in this House and saying we are the greatest country in the world to live in. We are the sharing, caring country of the world. I have news for the government. It is killing everything in this country. It is running the entrepreneurs out of this country. It is forcing unemployment. Unemployment today is at an all time high. We have bankruptcies at record levels.

• (1750)

We have people who are truly suffering. What is the government's answer to this? A \$2.5 billion millennium fund so it and the Prime Minister can feel good in case there is an election within a year after that. Shame on them.

I see from some of the people nodding on the other side that I must be hitting a soft spot. They know it is true. The people out there know it is true. They know they are being taxed to death to supply nothing. The auditor general has raised grave concerns about what is going on with this fund. What does the government do? Nothing. It pays no attention to the auditor general. It does not even address his concerns about how this is being funded, about the discrepancy and about the argument on how the bookkeeping has taken place in order to create this so-called fund.

I would say these boys make the James boys look like kids in the candy store. They know full well how to rip off the Canadian taxpayer and get away with it. They have had years of experience.

Let us have another look at what is going on. In 1993 when the Liberals took office the tax revenue totalled \$116.5 billion or approximately \$8,951 per working Canadian. This year this government will collect \$160 billion or \$11,335 per working Canadian. That is an increase of 26% in five years. I know many stock promoters who would love to have that kind of increase. I know many people who hold investments would love to have that kind of increase in their portfolio. That is what this government is doing, 26% in five years.

To put it into perspective, the overall result according to Statistics Canada is that any improved family earnings acquired largely to the government between 1989 and 1995, the real after tax income of the average Canadian family fell by \$3,461. Are they not proud of that? It fell from \$41,084 to \$37,623. Are they ever doing

Government Orders

a wonderful job over there. They are for themselves but certainly not for the law-abiding taxpaying citizens of this country.

This is a continuing process. It goes on. In 1977 in the midst of the Trudeau years the government collected \$7,044 from every working Canadian. By 1986, two years after Mulroney, the take was \$14,593. By 1996 after this government took over, it reached \$22,792. That is a really a record to be proud of. It takes from the poor. It takes from anybody it can, it keeps on taking and it gives back a so-called millennium fund. Then it has the gall to say it is going to help our students.

Our students want jobs. They want to be able to work in this country. They want a better education. They do not like being taxed to death when they finally have it. They do not like the debt they owe when they get out. They have just cause to be worried about that. It is about time the government started to worry about what is going on and what is there for these kids when they get out. An education is fine, maybe one of the finest things there is. But if there is nothing out here when they come out it is of no use to anybody. We well know that. Maybe it is time this government started to realize that.

This is a total farce. It is a farce on Canadian taxpayers. It is a farce on the people who were elected to come back here and have a say when we have a government that decides you will keep your mouth shut, sit here and just be quiet.

• (1755)

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to add my voice in praise of the visionary budget tabled in this House on February 24. On that date Canadians found a reason to have hope and faith in a better future. From that day forward we have begun to rebuild Canada from a blueprint based on opportunities.

Of all the remarkable achievements outlined in the budget, the Canadian opportunities strategy stands out as the hallmark of this government's plan for Canada in the 21st century.

The 1998 budget builds on progress achieved in previous budgets to provide Canadians with greater opportunities to acquire the knowledge and the skills needed for jobs both now and in the future.

[Translation]

Under the Canadian opportunities strategy, this government introduced and promoted measures to help Canadians make the transition from school to work, pay off their student loans, return to school to upgrade their skills or contribute to the education savings plan on behalf of the next generation of workers. This strategy takes comprehensive and co-ordinated action on seven fronts.

Arising from a commitment made by the first ministers to implement an action plan for youth employment, the Canadian opportunities strategy makes knowledge and skills more readily accessible and affordable.

[English]

The foundation of the strategy is the Canada millennium scholarship fund which will provide more than 100,000 low and middle income students with scholarships averaging \$3,000 a year for each year of the first decade in the new millennium. Individuals can receive up to \$15,000, reducing the debtload many recipients would otherwise incur by over half.

Up to 50,000 more students with children or other dependants will be able to take advantage of Canada study grants to help them cope with rising costs. These grants will help people who are in financial need to continue with their education, increasing their own and their children's prospects for prosperity.

The study grants, in addition to the increased child care tax credit that all Canadians now enjoy, will help young parents get their children off to a good start in life.

[Translation]

Our government is particularly proud of the measures announced in this budget that will help our students gain the knowledge they need through strategic investments in science and technology, which are the driving force of the new economy and can be most attractive to young inquisitive minds. These investments are crucial to the competitiveness of our country.

The Canadian opportunities strategy will provide additional funding for advanced research for our graduate students as well as for the three granting councils in Canada, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, the Medical Research Council of Canada and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. The combined budget of these three granting councils will be increased by \$400 million over the next three years.

[English]

Equally important, this budget increases funding for the Canadian network for advancement of research in industry and education as well as SchoolNet and the community access program to bring the benefits of information technology into more classrooms and more communities across Canada.

Another area of crucial importance to young people is helping graduates manage their student debtloads. Witnesses appearing before the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities were unanimous in their position that to ensure access to post-secondary education a positive system of student financial assistance is paramount.

• (1800)

The Canadian opportunities strategy provides tax relief on student loan interest payments as well as an education credit and child care expense deduction for part time students.

About one million Canadians will benefit from the improvements to the Canada student loan program which will help graduates better manage the debt they incur and which will direct grants to those in greatest need.

Countless more of today's children will be able to attend colleges, vocational schools or universities because their parents can now take advantage of federal incentives under the Canada education savings grants program.

These government grants will encourage families to start setting aside money early for their children's post-secondary education under the registered education savings plan.

[Translation]

The opportunity for Canadians to withdraw tax free from their registered retirement savings plan to enrol in full time education and training is another well thought out innovation that will help to ensure that Canadians have easier access to professional development. Canadians already in the workforce will be able to benefit from this continuous learning process throughout their careers.

Together, these measures will help Canada to develop a highly skilled and competitive workforce for the new world economy based on knowledge.

Whatever satisfaction I might get from these remarkable reforms, I am also very proud of the fact that our government will do everything it can to ensure that no one is forgotten. The preservation of social peace implies that everyone must have equal opportunity to benefit from what our society has to offer.

[English]

In addition to the Canadian opportunities strategy, the February budget strengthened other progressive programs which will help Canada's children and youth to succeed in the 21st century.

A major infusion of new moneys will support youth employment and participation in society. The government has doubled its funding for youth at risk, principally those who have not completed high school and who lack basic education and job skills. Through partnerships with employers, organizations and non-profit groups the new funds will be used for on the job training, career counseling, mentoring and literacy upgrading.

Governments have a role to play in tackling the issue of youth unemployment but clearly we cannot solve the problem alone.

Government Orders

Many private sector employers are responding to this challenge by providing opportunities for young Canadians.

[Translation]

This government has taken measures to encourage a larger number of employers to create new jobs for workers. We will give these employers an employment insurance premium holiday for young people hired in the years 1999 and 2000. This means that, each year, employers will make savings of about \$100 million in their payroll expenditures.

[English]

The 1998 budget speaks to Canadians' profound belief that we can build a strong economy by building a secure society. The two are flip sides of the same coin.

[Translation]

The balanced approach on which this legislation is based will result in sustainable dividends that will benefit Canadians now and for decades to come. This is the way to go for Canada, on the eve of the new millennium, to have the opportunity to live in a more prosperous society that cares about the well-being of all its members.

When Bill C-36 becomes law, it will be a moment of great pride, not only in the life of parliamentarians but of all Canadians.

• (1805)

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to speak today, because it is probably the last time. I have only ten minutes, but I could talk for an hour.

Naturally, you will understand that, on the subject of Bill C-36, I will be talking about the millennium scholarships. In this bill, there is some pretty strong language, I must say.

My colleagues have spoken at length today on various matters concerning the bill on the millennium scholarship fund. Canadians ask us what Quebeckers want. It is so simple. As part of its values, Quebec decided to establish a loans and bursaries system—not a perfect one, I admit—but one that met the expectations of many young Quebeckers. It has been operating for years, and a number of students have told me that it is one of the most effective systems in Canada.

When I say that Quebeckers have values, I mean their values. We have never tried to impose these values on the rest of Canada. If another province wants to do what it wants with its loans and bursaries system, that is fine with me.

At one point, faced with a growing demand probably from the rest of Canada, the Prime Minister decided, saying he wanted to do his share, to make a bequest. He is attacking the problem of student debt. A very commendable thing to do. I have no complaint up to

Government Orders

this point. Except that where things start to get serious, we have to make sure they are done responsibly and efficiently.

Creating the millennium scholarship foundation means creating duplication. There will be a system of loans and bursaries in Quebec City and another in Ottawa. This spells a loss of efficiency right off, in my opinion.

In addition, I recall asking the Prime Minister at one point if there was not a certain element of visibility involved. I think the federal government is looking for ways to leave its mark on the cheques. I must say I have no problem with that. It can leave its mark everywhere, so long as the students get help. The Prime Minister answered my question by saying that visibility was indeed involved. He could have pretended he wanted to help students without mentioning he wanted visibility, but no, he acknowledged it in the House of Commons. I could not believe my ears.

There are many points I could talk about. I will discuss some which have not been mentioned as often as they should. The Millennium Scholarship Foundation will be managed by a board of directors. This arm's length body will not be accountable to the people. It is as if we, the democratically elected members of Parliament, were to say that we are not responsible enough to be entrusted with managing such a huge amount of money, that we had better bring in people from the private sector who will undoubtedly do a much better job than us. But if people do not agree with this concept, they cannot go through their MPs, the very persons they elected. I have a moral problem with this.

Another point. Not only are we delegating our authority to a board of directors, but we do not know who they all are. I feel like I am signing a blank cheque. I have serious reservations about that.

Another point, the issue of equal opportunity. This bill is attacking some very basic principles our society is founded upon.

• (1810)

It is said these scholarship will not necessarily be based entirely on need, but also on merit. Today I sat on the committee studying the bill. I found it ridiculous for the committee to review a bill which is not even complete. Today, a lot was said against the fact that part of these scholarships would be decided on merit and part on need. But what will the proportion be? Is it 10%, 50% or 90% of these scholarships which will go to the best students?

I have several friends who are going to university and who do not have much money and have to work. It is tough to work and go to university at the same time. Of course, working lowers a student's academic performance, but it is the last resort.

Students whose academic performance suffers because they have to work need more money, but our very good government came up

with a plan to help only the best students. But the new reality is that our young people need to work to pursue their education.

We do not know what proportion of these scholarships will be based on merit and what proportion will be based on need. The government could have said in committee that, for example, 10% of the scholarships will be awarded to the elite, to the best students. It could have said that it chose to help the best students and to encourage them to go as far as they can so they can become the future leaders of our society. We could at least have debated this, but we cannot. Why? Because we do not know what proportion of these scholarships will be based on merit and what proportion will be based on need.

I have serious questions about our work here today, and that also goes for the members opposite. After all, as democratically elected representatives of the people, we are saying that it is not our responsibility to make societal choices, but the responsibility of a private board of directors. And we do not even know who is going to be on that board. Moreover, we do not know the essence and the intent of this plan. We can certainly change a few commas and make insignificant revisions but, overall, what is this leading to? And there is also the students of Quebec who, in the end, will see a reduction in the assistance they receive.

I met students from Alberta. Their system of loans and scholarships is not as good or perhaps not as generous as Quebec's system. They see that the federal government will intervene and they are very happy. If it wants to proceed in this way, I have no problem with that. But I do not want it to intrude into my values, in Quebec's values. Then people wonder why we want our own country. It seems quite obvious to me.

How would it have bothered the rest of Canada if Parliament had said "It is true that in Quebec you have a consensus and different values. We do not want to disturb you with that. We think this may not be bad in itself. We are giving you the money and you may use it as you wish"? But instead the government is imposing its rules. Then it wonders why there are sovereignists in Ottawa. It seems so simple to me. Then it asks "What does Quebec want?"

This is incredible. When I talk about Quebec's values, I do not talk about a political party that took a stand, but about a consensus among students and university associations and presidents. In short, everyone in Quebec opposes this measure, even the national assembly. The Liberal Party of Quebec said "No, this is not a good thing". All this for the sake of the federal government's visibility. This disappoints me, because education is the future.

The Deputy Speaker: It being 6.15 p.m., it is my duty, pursuant to the order adopted earlier today, to interrupt the proceedings and

put forthwith all questions necessary to dispose of report stage of the bill now before the House.

• (1815)

[English]

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I seek consent for the following motion. I move:

That all motions at report stage of Bill C-36, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 24, 1998, be deemed moved, seconded and read, and that a recorded division be deemed requested for each such motion.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Medicine Hat have the unanimous consent of the House to propose this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 68

That Bill C-36, in Clause 58, be amended by replacing lines 25 and 26 on page 24 with the following:

“(b) raw leaf tobacco intended for retail sale and leaves and stems of the tobacco plant if these leaves and stems have been processed further”

Motion No. 69

That Bill C-36, in Clause 59, be amended by adding after line 17 on page 26 the following:

“(9) Notwithstanding subsection (8), the council shall provide the Minister with copy of every by-law that is made under this Division, including a by-law that amends a by-law.

(10) The Minister shall maintain a list of every by-law provided to the Minister under subsection (9).”

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 70

That Bill C-36 be amended by adding after line 17 on page 26 the following clause:

“59.1 (1) Where the council has made a by-law imposing a tax under this Division, the council shall maintain books of account and other records in respect of all such taxes that have been collected and expended and the nature of those expenditures.

(2) The council shall, within six months after the end of each fiscal year, prepare an annual report in respect of the taxes referred to in subsection (1) that were collected and expended in that year which shall include

(a) the total amount of taxes collected in that year;

Government Orders

(b) the total amount of taxes expended in that year;

(c) a detailed account of the nature of the expenditures; and

(d) any other information the Minister prescribes by regulation.

(3) The report referred to in subsection (2) shall be made public and a copy sent to the Minister of Finance.

59.2 (1) A person authorized under subsection (2) shall, as soon as possible after the end of the fiscal year carry out an audit of the books of account and records required to be kept by the council under subsection 59.1(1).

(2) The Minister shall authorize a person in the Minister's department to carry out an audit under subsection (1).”

Motion No. 71

That Bill C-36, in Clause 60, be amended by replacing lines 18 to 25 on page 26 with the following:

“60. Where the council has made a by-law imposing a tax under this Division,”

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 72

That Bill C-36, in Clause 62, be amended by replacing line 11 on page 28 with the following:

“a fine of not more than \$50,000 or to”

Motion No. 73

That Bill C-36, in Clause 64, be amended by adding after line 32 on page 28 the following:

“(5) Notwithstanding subsection (4), the council shall provide the Minister with a copy of every by-law that is made under this Part, including a by-law that amends a by-law.

(6) The Minister shall maintain a list of every by-law provided to the Minister under subsection (5).”

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 74

That Bill C-36, in Clause 67, be amended by adding after line 29 on page 29 the following:

“45.1 (1) Where the council has made a by-law imposing a tax under this Part, the council shall maintain books of account and other records in respect of all such taxes that have been collected and expended and the nature of those expenditures.

(2) The council shall, within six months after the end of each fiscal year, prepare an annual report in respect of the taxes referred to in subsection (1) that were collected and expended in that year which shall include

(a) the total amount of taxes collected in that year;

(b) the total amount of taxes expended in that year;

(c) a detailed account of the nature of the expenditures; and

(d) any other information the Minister prescribes by regulation.

(3) The report referred to in subsection (2) shall be made public and a copy sent to the Minister of Finance.

45.2 (1) A person authorized under subsection (2) shall, as soon as possible after the end of the fiscal year carry out an audit of the books of account and records required to be kept by the council under subsection 45.1(1).

(2) The Minister shall authorize a person in the Minister department to carry out an audit under subsection (1).”

Government Orders

Motion No. 75

That Bill C-36, in Clause 71, be amended by adding after line 25 on page 31 the following:

“53.1 (1) Where the council has made a by-law imposing a tax under this Part, the council shall maintain books of account and other records in respect of all such taxes that have been collected and expended and the nature of those expenditures.

(2) The council shall, within six months after the end of each fiscal year, prepare an annual report in respect of the taxes referred to in subsection (1) that were collected and expended in that year which shall include

- (a) the total amount of taxes collected in that year;
- (b) the total amount of taxes expended in that year;
- (c) a detailed account of the nature of the expenditures; and
- (d) any other information the Minister prescribes by regulation.

(3) The report referred to in subsection (2) shall be made public and a copy sent to the Minister of Finance.

53.2 (1) A person authorized under subsection (2) shall, as soon as possible after the end of the fiscal year carry out an audit of the books of account and records required to be kept by the council under subsection 53.1(1).

(2) The Minister shall authorize a person in the Minister department to carry out an audit under subsection (1).”

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 76

That Bill C-36, in Clause 71, be amended by adding after line 25 on page 31 the following:

“(4) Notwithstanding subsection (3), the council shall provide the Minister with a copy of every by-law that is made under this Part, including a by-law that amends a by-law.

(5) The Minister shall maintain a list of every by-law provided to the Minister under subsection (4).”

Motion No. 78

That Bill C-36, in Clause 81, be amended, in the English version only, by replacing line 6 on page 38 with the following:

“Prince Edward Island who purchases the cigarettes or tobacco sticks for consumption by the”

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-36, in Clause 81, be amended, in the English version only, by replacing line 19 on page 38 with the following:

“Province of Prince Edward Island who purchases the cigarettes or tobacco sticks for con-”

Motion No. 80

That Bill C-36, in Clause 82, be amended by replacing line 11 on page 39 with the following:

“package where the cigarettes are marked and”

Motion No. 81

That Bill C-36, in Clause 82, be amended by replacing line 26 on page 39 with the following:

“package where the cigarettes are marked and”

*[Translation]***Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved:**

Motion No. 82

That Bill C-36 be amended by deleting Clause 91.

Motion No. 83

That Bill C-36, in Clause 91, be amended by replacing line 3 on page 44 with the following:

“Supplementary Child Tax Benefit”

Motion No. 84

That Bill C-36 be amended by deleting Clause 100.

*[English]***Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP) moved:**

Motion No. 85

That Bill C-36, in Clause 100, be amended by replacing lines 16 to 23 on page 49 with the following:

“100. Paragraph 15(1) of the Act is replaced”

*[Translation]***Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved:**

Motion No. 86

That Bill C-36, in Clause 100, be amended by replacing lines 19 and 20 on page 49 with the following:

“which an interest-”

Motion No. 87

That Bill C-36 be amended by deleting Clause 103.

Motion No. 88

That Bill C-36, in Clause 104, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 4 to 11 on page 51 with the following:

“(8.2) With respect to 1999, the Minister shall refund, in the prescribed manner, to designated persons the prescribed portion of the amount determined by the following formula if that amount is more than \$1:

$(E2-E1) \times P1999$

where

E1 is the total of all insurable earnings paid in 1998 by the employer, for which premiums were deductible, in respect of employees who were 18 years of age or older but younger than 25 at any time during 1998;

E2 is the total of all insurable earnings paid in 1999 by the employer, for which premiums were deductible, in respect of employees who were 18 years of age or older but younger than 25 at any time during 1999; and P1999 is 1.4 times the premium rate for 1999.

(8.21) For the purposes of subsection (8.2), designated persons means persons who have paid the employee's premium or the employer's premium in 1999.”

(b) by replacing lines 3 to 40 on page 52 with the following:

“(9) If at any time during a year for which a refund is sought two or more employers are associated, as defined by the regulations, they shall be considered a single employer for the purposes of subsections (6) to (8.3) and any refund shall be allocated to them in the prescribed manner.”

*Government Orders**[English]***Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC)** moved:

Motion No. 89

That Bill C-36, in Clause 104, be amended by replacing lines 4 to 23 on page 51 and lines 1 to 40 on page 52 with the following:

“(8.2) With respect to 1999 and 2000, the Minister shall refund to the employer the amount by which the total of all amounts paid by the employer as the employer’s premium during each of these years exceeds 2.8% of the total insurable earnings paid by the employer to his employees for each of these years.

(8.3) With respect to 1999 and 2000, the Minister shall refund to each employee the amount by which the total of all amounts paid by the employee as the employee’s premium for each of these years exceeds 2% of the total of all insurable earnings received by the employee for each of these years.

(8.4) The refunds provided for in this section are payable by the Minister within three months after the end of the year for which the premiums were deducted or payable.”

*[Translation]***Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 90

That Bill C-36, in Clause 104, be amended by replacing lines 12 to 23 on page 51 and lines 1 to 40 on page 52 with the following:

“(8.3) With respect to 2000, the Minister shall, in the prescribed manner, refund to designated persons the prescribed portion of the amount determined by the following formula if that amount is more than \$1:

$$(E2-E1) \times P2000$$

where

E1 is the total of all insurable earnings paid in 1998 by the employer, for which premiums were deductible, in respect of employees who were 18 years of age or older but younger than 25 at any time during 1998;

E2 is the total of all insurable earnings paid in 2000 by the employer, for which premiums were deductible, in respect of employees who were 18 years of age or older but younger than 25 at any time during 2000; and P2000 is 1.4 times the premium rate for 2000.

(8.31) For the purposes of subsection (8.3), designated persons means persons who have paid the employee’s premium or the employer’s premium in 2000.

(9) If at any time during a year for which a refund is sought two or more employers are associated, as defined by the regulations, they shall be considered a single employer for the purposes of subsections (6) to (8.3) and any refund shall be allocated to them in the prescribed manner.”

*[English]***Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP)** moved:

Motion No. 91

That Bill C-36, in Clause 104, be amended by replacing lines 10 to 13 on page 52 with the following:

“payable to the employer, the employer shall pay to the Minister by way of penalty, an amount equal to twice the amount of the refund that was applied for or received, as the case may be, by the employer.

(8.41) An amount required to be paid by way of penalty by an employer under subsection (8.4) and any interest thereon constitutes a debt to Her Majesty in right of Canada and may be recovered as such in any court of competent jurisdiction.”

Motion No. 92

That Bill C-36, in Clause 104, be amended by deleting lines 14 to 20 on page 52.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medecine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 93

That Bill C-36, in Clause 104, be amended by adding after line 40 on page 52 the following:

“(11) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, where the total amount of monies expended in a year to pay benefits is less than fifty per cent of the total amount of monies paid in that year by any of premiums, the Minister shall, in the next year, reduce the premium rate by the amount of unexpended monies that exceeds the amount of those monies that is equal to the amount of monies expended to pay those benefits. The Minister shall, by regulation, carry out such calculations as the Minister deems necessary to effect the reduction.”

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC) moved:

Motion No. 94

That Bill C-36, in Clause 105, be amended by deleting lines 4 to 26 on page 53.

Motion No. 95

That Bill C-36, in Clause 108, be amended by deleting lines 5 to 13 on page 56.

Motion No. 96

That Bill C-36, in Clause 109, be amended by deleting lines 36 to 45 on page 56. Group No. 9

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 97

That Bill C-36 be amended by deleting Clause 125.

Motion No. 98

That Bill C-36 be amended by deleting Clause 126.

Motion No. 99

That Bill C-36 be amended by deleting Clause 127.

Motion No. 100

That Bill C-36 be amended by deleting Clause 128.

Motion No. 101

That Bill C-36 be amended by deleting Clause 129.

Motion No. 102

That Bill C-36 be amended by deleting Clause 130.

*[Translation]***Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC)** moved:

Motion No. 103

Government Orders

That Bill C-36, in Clause 130, be amended by replacing line 17 on page 78 with the following:

“Monetary Fund arrangement;

(a.1) the foreign state has either human rights record that is acceptable to the Canadian government or if it does not have such a record, is making substantial progress towards improving its human rights record so that it will be acceptable to the Canadian government;

(a.2) the foreign state has ratified or signed the Convention on the prohibition of the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines and their destruction; and”

[English]

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 104

That Bill C-36 be amended by deleting Clause 131.

Motion No. 105

That Bill C-36 be amended by deleting Clause 132.

Motion No. 106

That Bill C-36 be amended by deleting Clause 133.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 107

That Bill C-36, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 9 on page 80 with the following:

“133. (1) Sections 2 to 46 shall not come into force unless, on a day following the day this Act receives royal assent, the amount referred to in section 46 is, in accordance with objective accounting standards recommended by the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants, credited to the Consolidated Revenue Fund as a liability for the fiscal year 1998-99, in which case those sections shall come into force on the day that amount is so credited.

(2) Sections 127 to 132 come into force”

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the several deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of this bill. Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

• (1835)

The Speaker: Order, please. We are to have a series of votes tonight.

We will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C-36, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 24, 1998.

A vote on Motion No. 1 also applies to Motions Nos. 4 to 6, 8 to 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20 to 41, 43, 44, 47, 49, 53, 54 and 59 to 64.

The first question is on Motion No. 1.

• (1845)

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

(Division No. 159)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Cadman
Canuel	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis)	Duceppe
Dumas	Earle
Epp	Forseth
Fournier	Gagnon
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Hardy
Harris	Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lefebvre	Lill
Loubier	Lunn
Mancini	Marceau
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McDonough
Ménard	Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Nunziata	Nystrom
Obhrai	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Riis	Ritz
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Solomon	St-Hilaire
Stinson	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vautour
Vellacott	Venne
Wasylcia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—102	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brison	Brown
Bryden	Bulte

Government Orders

Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Matthews
McCormick	McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Charlotte)
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Wappel	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert —154

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collenette
Dalphond-Guiral	Finestone
Galloway	Guimond
Lebel	McKay (Scarborough East)
Perron	Proud

[Translation]

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 lost.

I therefore declare Motions Nos. 4 to 6, 8 to 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20 to 41, 43, 44, 47, 49, 53, 54, and 59 to 64 lost.

[English]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following items: Motion No. 88 and Motion No. 90.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, included in subsequent votes I would ask you to include the member for Nanaimo—Alberni and the member for Vancouver Island North. After the initial vote they will be included in our total. On those votes I will be voting with my Reform colleagues.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: I believe the motion was that the vote taken on the first one applied in its entirety. We all voted the same way on all of them. The Reform Party will vote yes to this one.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 159]

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 88 and 90 defeated.

● (1850)

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find that the House would agree to the proposal that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: Before I ask if there is agreement to proceed, just so we keep everything in order I want members to know that the question is on Motion No. 2 and a negative vote on Motion No. 2 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 3.

Is there agreement to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members will vote no, with the exception of the hon. member for Lévis, who had to leave.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, New Democrat members in the House today vote no to this motion except for the member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar who votes yes to this motion only.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, members of our party will vote yea.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of York South—Weston I will support this motion which extends the millennium scholarship fund to private institutions.

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 160)

YEAS

Members

Abлонczy	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brison
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Harris	Hart
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary—Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Konrad	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Matthews
Mayfield	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Nunziata	Obhrai
Ramsay	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (Charlotte)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vellacott	Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—60

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blondin—Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	

Brien	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Canuel	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Harb	Hardy
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne
Lee	Lefebvre
Leung	Lill
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Massé
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
Nystrom	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pratt	Proctor
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rochelneau
Rock	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Solomon
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Government Orders

Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Venne
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert—197

Turp
Valeri
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie
Bennett
Dalphond-Guiral
Galloway
Lebel
Perron

Asselin
Collenette
Finestone
Guimond
McKay (Scarborough East)
Proud

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 3.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following items: Motions Nos. 3, 12, 13 and 19.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, we agree on that particular recommendation with the notice that the member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar will vote with the NDP on this motion, which is no, and on the other motions as well.

The Speaker: I address myself to the whip of the New Democratic Party. Are we to understand that the hon. member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar votes yea on the previous vote and nay on these votes? Is that correct?

Mr. John Solomon: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: It will be recorded.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 160]

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 3, 12, 13 and 19 defeated.

• (1855)

The next question is on Motion No. 7.

[Translation]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motions be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[English]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote nay to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, members of my party will vote nay.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, this motion would grant scholarships to reflect the relative population size of each province. On behalf of the residents of York South—Weston I would support this motion.

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

(Division No. 161)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bailey
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Davies	Desjarlais
Dockrill	Duncan
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hardy
Harris	Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lill	Lunn
Mancini	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McDonough
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Nunziata	Nystrom
Obhrai	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Riis	Ritz
Robinson	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Solomon	Stinson
Stoffer	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Vautour
Vellacott	Wasylycia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—66

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair

Government Orders

Bélanger	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Bevilacqua	Bonin
Blondin-Andrew	Borotsik
Bonwick	Bradshaw
Boudria	Brison
Brien	Bryden
Brown	Byrne
Bulte	Calder
Caccia	Canuel
Cannis	Carroll
Caplan	Cauchon
Catterall	Chan
Chamberlain	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Charbonneau	Coderre
Clouthier	Comuzzi
Cohen	Crête
Copps	de Savoye
Cullen	Desrochers
Debien	Dhaliwal
DeVillers	Discepola
Dion	Drouin
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duceppe	Easter
Dumas	Finlay
Eggleton	Fontana
Folco	Fry
Fournier	Gagnon
Gagliano	Girard-Bujold
Gauthier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Godfrey	Graham
Goodale	Grose
Gray (Windsor West)	Guay
Guarnieri	Harvard
Harb	Herron
Harvey	Ianno
Hubbard	Jackson
Ifody	Jones
Jennings	Karetak-Lindell
Jordan	Keddy (South Shore)
Karygiannis	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Keys	Kraft Sloan
Knutson	Lastewka
Lalonde	Lavigne
Laurin	Lefebvre
Lee	Lincoln
Leung	Loubier
Longfield	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
MacAulay	Malhi
Mahoney	Manley
Maloney	Marchand
Marceau	Marleau
Marchi	Massé
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	McCormick
Matthews	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McGuire	Ménard
McWhinney	Mifflin
Mercier	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Milliken	Mitchell
Minna	Murray
Muise	Nault
Myers	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Normand	Pagtakhan
O'Reilly	Patry
Paradis	Peterson
Peric	Phinney
Pettigrew	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pillitteri	Provenzano
Pratt	Reed
Redman	Robillard
Richardson	Rock
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Saada	Sekora
Scott (Fredericton)	Shepherd
Serré	Steckle
St. Denis	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stewart (Brant)	
St-Hilaire	

St-Julien	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (Charlotte)	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanciel
Venne	Wappel
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert—191	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collette
Dalphon-Guiral	Finestone
Galloway	Guimond
Lebel	McKay (Scarborough East)
Perron	Proud

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 defeated.

The next question is Motion No. 11. A negative vote on Motion No. 11 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 12.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, if the House agrees I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

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

[English]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, members of my party will vote yea.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I would vote yes to this motion.

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

(Division No. 162)

YEAS

Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Brison	Davies
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Earle	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hardy	Harvey
Herron	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Laliberte
Lill	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)

Government Orders

Mancini
Matthews
Muisse
Nystrom
Riis
Solomon
Thompson (Charlotte)
Wasylycia-Leis

Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Nunziata
Proctor
Robinson
Stoffer
Vautour
Wayne—34

Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Ménard
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Plamondon
Provenzano
Redman
Reynolds
Ritz
Rocheleau
Saada
Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)
Serré
Solberg
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Valeri
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—223

Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Mayfield
McGuire
McWhinney
Mercier
Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Obhrai
O'Reilly
Paradis
Peric
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pratt
Ramsay
Reed
Richardson
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Venne
Whelan
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bellemare
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Bryden
Byrne
Cadman
Cannis
Caplan
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Cohen
Copp
Cullen
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Drouin
Duhamel
Duncan
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Fournier
Gagliano
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale
Graham
Grewal
Grose
Guay
Harris
Harvard
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kerpan
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Laurin
Lee
Leung
Longfield
Lunn
Mahoney
Maloney
Marceau
Marchi
Marleau

Adams
Anders
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Calder
Canuel
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
Cummins
Debien
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
Epp
Folco
Forsyth
Fry
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godfrey
Goldring
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarmieri
Harb
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Ifody
Jaffer
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Keyes
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lefebvre
Lincoln
Loubier
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Marchand
Mark

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collenette
Dalphon-Guiral	Finestone
Galloway	Gummond
Lebel	McKay (Scarborough East)
Perron	Proud

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 defeated.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following items: Motions Nos. 55, 57, 58, 97 and 103.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Perhaps I could clarify my votes on these matters.

On Motions Nos. 55, 97 and 103 I will vote yea.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 162*]

Mr. John Nunziata: On Motions Nos. 57 and 58 I will vote nay.

Government Orders

The Speaker: That will be recorded.

(The House divided on Motion No. 57, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 163)***YEAS**

Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Brisson	Davies
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Earle	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Harvey	Harvey
Herron	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Laliberte
Lill	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Matthews	McDonough
Muise	Nystrom
Proctor	Riis
Robinson	Solomon
Stoffer	Thompson (Charlotte)
Vautour	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne—33	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Anders
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Béclair
Bélangier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bevilacqua
Bertrand	Blondin-Andrew
Bigras	Bonwick
Bonin	Bradshaw
Boudria	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Brown
Brien	Bulte
Bryden	Caccia
Byrne	Calder
Cadman	Canuel
Cannis	Carroll
Caplan	Catterall
Casson	Chamberlain
Cauchon	Charbonneau
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chatters	Coderre
Clouthier	Comuzzi
Cohen	Crête
Copps	Cummins
Cullen	Debien
de Savoye	DeVillers
Desrochers	Dion
Dhaliwal	Dromisky
Discepola	Duceppe
Drouin	Dumas
Duhamel	Easter
Duncan	Epp
Eggleton	Folco
Finlay	Forseth
Fontana	Fry
Fournier	Gagnon
Gagliano	Gilmour
Gauthier	Godfrey
Girard-Bujold	Goldring
Godin (Châteauguay)	Gouk
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Graham	
Grewal	

Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Harb	Harris
Hart	Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoeppner
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lee
Lefebvre	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	Lunn
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Marchi
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Massé	Mayfield
McCormick	McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nunziata
Obhrai	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pratt	Provenzano
Ramsay	Redman
Reed	Reynolds
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Saada
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Scott (Skeena)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Solberg
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	Stinson
St-Julien	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Torsney	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vellacott
Venne	Wappel
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wilfert	Williams —224

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collenette
Dalphon-D-Guiral	Finestone
Galloway	Guimond
Lebel	McKay (Scarborough East)
Perron	Proud

• (1900)

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 55, 57, 58, 97 and 103 defeated. I also declare Motions Nos. 98 to 102 and Motions Nos. 104 to 106 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 16.

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

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

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

[English]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members vote yes on this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, members of my party will vote yea.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, this motion would require board members to be skilled in the management of investments and I would vote yea.

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

(Division No. 164)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brisson
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Davies	Desjarlais
Dockrill	Duncan
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hardy
Harris	Hart
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lill	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
Mayfield	McDonough
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muisse	Nunziata

Nystrom
Proctor
Reynolds
Ritz
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vellacott
Wayne
Williams—79

Obhrai
Ramsay
Riis
Robinson
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
Stoffer
Thompson (Charlotte)
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumont
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brien
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Canuel
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Cullen	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepolo
Dromisky	Drouin
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fournier	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne
Lee	Lefebvre
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	Loubier
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	

Government Orders

O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pratt	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert—178

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collenette
Dalphond-Guiral	Finestone
Galloway	Guimond
Lebel	McKay (Scarborough East)
Perron	Proud

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 16 defeated.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following items: Motions Nos. 42, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 56, 65, 66, 70 and 107.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 164]

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 42, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 56, 65, 66, 70, 74, 75 and 107 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 67.

[Translation]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[English]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, this is a good motion. The Reform Party will vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, my opinion is different, and we will be voting nay.

[English]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, members of my party will be voting nay.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, this motion allows the provinces to opt out, take the cash and run and I would vote no to the motion.

• (1905)

(The House divided on Motion No. 67, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 165)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Bailey	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Cummins	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Gilmour	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Harris
Hart	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lunn	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Obhrai	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vellacott	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams —45	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brien
Brison	Brown
Bryden	

Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Copp
Cullen
de Savoye
Desjarlais
De Villers
Dion
Dockrill
Drouin
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fournier
Gagliano
Gauthier
Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)
Graham
Grose
Guay
Hardy
Harvey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keys
Knutson
Laliberte
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lefebvre
Lill
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marchand
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Matthews
McDonough
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Ménard
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Plamondon
Proctor
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Rocheleau
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solomon
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien

Byrne
Calder
Canuel
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvard
Herron
Ianno
Jackson
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lalonde
Laurin
Lee
Leung
Lincoln
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marceau
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé
McCormick
McGuire
McWhinney
Mercier
Milliken
Minna
Muise
Myers
Normand
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Paradis
Peric
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
Stoffer

Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Venne
Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan

Telegdi
Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Valeri
Vautour
Wappel
Wayne
Wilfert —212

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie
Bennett
Dalphond-Guiral
Galloway
Lebel
Perron

Asselin
Collette
Finestone
Guimond
McKay (Scarborough East)
Proud

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 67 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 68.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 71 as well.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 165*]

The Speaker: I therefore declare Motion No. 71 defeated.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The results of that would also defeat Motion No. 68.

The Speaker: Motion No. 68 will be voted upon separately.

The question then will be on Motion No. 68.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that the members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present are voting nay unless they indicate otherwise.

Mr. Keith Martin: Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting Motion No. 68.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote yea on this motion.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote yea to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents I would vote yes to this worthy motion from the hon. member for Kamloops.

(The House divided on Motion No. 68, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 166)

YEAS

Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Borotsik
Brien	Brison
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Duceppe
Dumas	Earle
Fournier	Gagnon
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay	Hardy
Harvey	Herron
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Laliberté	Lalonde
Laurin	Lefebvre
Lill	Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Matthews	McDonough
Ménard	Mercier
Muise	Nunziata
Nyström	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Proctor
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Solomon	St-Hilaire
Stoffer	Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vautour
Venne	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne —72	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Anders
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew

Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casson	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cummins
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goldring
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harris
Hart	Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	Lunn
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Mark	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Mayfield	McCormick
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Miffin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
Ohrai	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Provenzano
Ramsay	Redman
Reed	Reynolds
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Scott (Skeena)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Solberg
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	St-Julien
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vellacott
Wappel	Whelan
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Wilfert
Williams —185	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collenette
Dalphond-Guiral	Finestone
Galloway	Guimond
Lebel	McKay (Scarborough East)
Perron	Proud

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 68 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 69. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 73 and 76.

• (1910)

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, on Motion No. 69 I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois agree with this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote yea to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I would vote in favour of this motion.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I note that the Deputy Prime Minister has left and should not be recorded as having voted on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 69, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 167)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Borotsik	Brien
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Brison	Casson
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chatters	Cummins
Crête	de Savoye
Davies	Desjarlais
Debien	
Desrochers	

Government Orders

Dockrill	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Hardy
Harris	Hart
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lefebvre	Lill
Loubier	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
Mayfield	McDonough
Ménard	Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nunziata
Nystrom	Obhrai
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Proctor	Ramsay
Reynolds	Riis
Ritz	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Solomon
St-Hilaire	Stinson
Stoffer	Strahl
Thompson (Charlotte)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vautour
Vellacott	Venne
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams —116

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélar
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copp
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri

Government Orders

Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert —140

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collenette
Dalphond-Guiral	Finestone
Galloway	Guimond
Lebel	McKay (Scarborough East)
Perron	Proud

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 69 defeated. I also declare Motions Nos. 73 and 76 defeated.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following items: Motions Nos. 78, 84, 85, 86, 91, 92, 94 and 95.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 167]

The Speaker: Therefore I declare Motions Nos. 78, 79, 84, 85, 86, 91, 92, 94 and 95 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 72.

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

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois disagree to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members vote in favour of this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote nay to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I would vote in favour of this motion.

• (1915)

(The House divided on Motion No. 72, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 168)

YEAS

Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Davies
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Earle	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hardy	Laliberte
Lill	Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
Nunziata	Nystrom
Proctor	Riis
Robinson	Solomon
Stoffer	Vautour
Wasylycia-Leis—21	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Anders
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare

Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Cadman
Cannis
Caplan
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Cohen
Copp
Cullen
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Drouin
Duhamel
Duncan
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Fournier
Gagliano
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale
Graham
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hart
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Iftody
Jaffer
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Keys
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lefebvre
Lincoln
Loubier
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marceau
Marchi
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Ménard
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
Obhrai
O'Reilly
Paradis

Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Calder
Canuel
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
Cummins
Debien
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
Epp
Folco
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godfrey
Goldring
Gouk
Grewal
Grose
Guay
Harris
Harvard
Herron
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jackson
Jennings
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Laurin
Lee
Leung
Longfield
Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Marchand
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
Mayfield
McGuire
McWhinney
Mercier
Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Muise
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Patry

Peric
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pratt
Ramsay
Reed
Richardson
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Valeri
Vellacott
Wappel
Whelan
Wilfert

Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Plamondon
Provenzano
Redman
Reynolds
Ritz
Rocheleau
Saada
Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)
Serré
Solberg
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (Charlotte)
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Venne
Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—235

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie
Bennett
Dalphond-Guiral
Galloway
Lebel
Perron

Asselin
Collenette
Finestone
Guimond
McKay (Scarborough East)
Proud

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 72 defeated. The next question is on Motions Nos. 80 and 81.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent in the House to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following: Motions Nos. 80 and 81.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 168*]

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 80 and 81 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 82.

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

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are in favour of this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote no.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote nay to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, this motion would delete the word Canada from the name of the Canada child tax benefit act and I would vote no.

(The House divided Motion No. 82, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 169)

YEAS

Members

Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Brien	Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
de Savoye	Debien
Desrochers	Duceppe
Dumas	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay	Lalonde
Laurin	Lefebvre
Loubier	Marceau
Marchand	Ménard
Mercier	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Venne —37

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Anders
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters

Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Cummins	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Duncan
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Epp
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Gilmour	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Golding
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Hardy	Harris
Hart	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Johnston	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Labiberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Linn
Longfield	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
MacAulay	Malhi
Mahoney	Mancini
Maloney	Marchi
Manley	Marleau
Mark	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martín
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Massé
Matthews	Mayfield
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nunziata
Nystrom	Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proctor	Provenzano
Ramsay	Redman
Reed	Reynolds
Richardson	Riis
Ritz	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Scott (Skeena)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Solberg
Solomon	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
St-Julien	Stoffer
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (Charlotte)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Torsney	Ur

Valeri
Vautour
Wappel
Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—219

Vanclief
Vellacott
Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie
Bennett
Dalphond-Guiral
Galloway
Lebel
Perron

Asselin
Collenette
Finestone
Guimond
McKay (Scarborough East)
Proud

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 82 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 83.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 83.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 169.*]

The Speaker: I therefore declare Motion No. 83 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 87.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent that the members who voted on the previous motion be deemed to have voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois vote yea to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote nay to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of York South—Weston I would vote no to this motion.

Government Orders

(The House divided on Motion No. 87, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 170*)

YEAS

Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bergeron
Bigras	Brien
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Duceppe
Dumas	Earle
Fournier	Gagnon
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay	Hardy
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	Lefebvre
Lill	Loubier
Mancini	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough	Ménard
Mercier	Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Proctor	Riis
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Solomon
St-Hilaire	Stoffer
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vautour
Venne	Wasylycia-Leis—57

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Anders
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casson	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cummins
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Gilmour

Government Orders

Godfrey	Goldring
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Lunn	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Massé	Matthews
Mayfield	McCormick
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nunziata
Obhrai	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Provenzano
Ramsay	Redman
Reed	Reynolds
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Scott (Skeena)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Solberg
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	St-Julien
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (Charlotte)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Vellacott	Wappel
Wayne	Whelan
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Wilfert
Williams —199	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collenette
Dalphond-Guiral	Finestone
Galloway	Guimond
Lebel	McKay (Scarborough East)
Perron	Proud

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 87 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 89.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting nay.

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

• (1920)

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are against this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote yes to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of York South—Weston, I would vote in favour of this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 89, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 171*)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bailey
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Cummins	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Gilmour	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Harris
Hart	Harvey
Herron	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews	Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nunziata
Obhrai	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Vellacott
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—59	

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bellemare
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Boudria
Brien
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Canuel
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Grose
Guay
Hardy
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Knutson
Laliberte
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lefebvre
Lill
Longfield
MacAulay
Malhi
Mancini
Marceau
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé
McDonough
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Ménard
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Plamondon
Proctor
Redman

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Copp
Cullen
de Savoye
Desjarlais
DeVilliers
Dion
Dockrill
Drouin
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fournier
Gagliano
Gauthier
Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)
Graham
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lalonde
Laurin
Lee
Leung
Lincoln
Loubier
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marchand
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McGuire
McWhinney
Mercier
Milliken
Minna
Murray
Nault
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Paradis
Peric
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pratt
Provenzano

Government Orders

Reed
Riis
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Venne
Wasylcyia-Leis
Wilfert—197

Richardson
Robillard
Rocheleau
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solomon
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Valeri
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie
Bennett
Dalphond-Guiral
Galloway
Lebel
Perron

Asselin
Collenette
Finestone
Guimond
McKay (Scarborough East)
Proud

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 89 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 93.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I would propose that you seek consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 93.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 171*]

The Speaker: I therefore declare Motion No. 93 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 96.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I would propose that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberals voting no.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, New Democratic Party members present vote yes to this motion.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote yea to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of York South—Weston, I would support this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 96, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 172)

YEAS

Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Borotsik
Brien	Brisson
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Duceppe
Dumas	Earle
Fournier	Gagnon
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay	Hardy
Harvey	Herron
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	Lefebvre
Lill	Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
McDonough	Ménard
Mercier	Muise
Nunziata	Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Proctor	Riis
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Solomon
St-Hilaire	Stoffer
Thompson (Charlotte)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Vautour	Venne
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne —71

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Anders
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Béclair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne

Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casson	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cummins
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goldring
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Lunn	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Mark
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Mayfield	McCormick
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Miffin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
Obhrai	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Provenzano
Ramsay	Kedman
Reed	Reynolds
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Scott (Skeena)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Solberg
St. Denis	Steele
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	St-Julien
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vellacott
Wappel	Whelan
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Wilfert
Williams —185	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collenette
Dalphond-Guiral	Finestone
Galloway	Guimond
Lebel	McKay (Scarborough East)
Perron	Proud

Government Orders

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 96 defeated.

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent that the members who voted on the previous motion be deemed to have voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we do not think the budget is that good and this is the 41st time for time allocation. We are very disappointed. We are going to have to vote no on both accounts.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are against this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members feel compelled to vote no as well.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote nay to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, as you know, this budget does not delete the GST but as far as Liberal budgets are concerned, it is not bad and I will vote in favour.

• (1925)

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

(*Division No. 173*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bonin

Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Goodale
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
O'Reilly
Paradis
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pratt
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert —141

Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Clouthier
Cohen
Copp
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison
Canuel

Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bigras
Brien
Cadman

Government Orders

Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Cummins	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Hardy
Harris	Hart
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lefebvre	Lill
Loubier	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
Mayfield	McDonough
Ménard	Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nystrom
Obhrai	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Riis	Ritz
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Solomon	St-Hilaire
Stinson	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Vautour	Vellacott
Venne	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—115	

consequential amendments to other acts, be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: The next deferred recorded division is on the motion at the third reading stage of Bill C-19.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree I would propose that you seek consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting yea.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are against this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, NDP members vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote nay to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, this left wing piece of legislation deserves to be defeated and I will vote no.

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

(*Division No. 174*)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collenette
Dalphond-Guiral	Finestone
Galloway	Guimond
Lebel	McKay (Scarborough East)
Perron	Proud

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House resumed from May 15 consideration of the motion that Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dockrill	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fontana

Fry
 Godfrey
 Goodale
 Grose
 Harb
 Harvard
 Ianno
 Jackson
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Kraft Sloan
 Lastewka
 Lee
 Lill
 Longfield
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Manley
 Marleau
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 McCormick
 McGuire
 McWhinney
 Milliken
 Minna
 Murray
 Nault
 Nystrom
 O'Reilly
 Paradis
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Kent—Essex)
 Pratt
 Provenzano
 Reed
 Riis
 Robinson
 Saada
 Sekora
 Shepherd
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Brant)
 St-Julien
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Wappel
 Whelan

Gagliano
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
 Graham
 Guarnieri
 Hardy
 Hubbard
 Itody
 Jennings
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keyes
 Knutson
 Laliberte
 Lavigne
 Leung
 Lincoln
 MacAulay
 Malhi
 Mancini
 Marchi
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 Massé
 McDonough
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 Mifflin
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Mitchell
 Myers
 Normand
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Pagtakhan
 Patry
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Proctor
 Redman
 Richardson
 Robillard
 Rock
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Serré
 Solomon
 Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Stoffer
 Telegdi
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Vautour
 Wasylycia-Leis
 Wilfert—160

Herron
 Hoepfner
 Johnston
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Kerpan
 Lalonde
 Lefebvre
 Lunn
 Marceau
 Mark
 Matthews
 Ménard
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Muise
 Obhrai
 Plamondon
 Reynolds
 Rocheleau
 Schmidt
 Solberg
 Stinson
 Thompson (Charlotte)
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
 Turp
 Venne
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Jaffer
 Jones
 Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
 Konrad
 Laurin
 Loubier
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Marchand
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Mayfield
 Mercier
 Morrison
 Nunziata
 Picard (Drummond)
 Ramsay
 Ritz
 Sauvageau
 Scott (Skeena)
 St-Hilaire
 Strahl
 Thompson (Wild Rose)
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
 Vellacott
 Wayne
 Williams—96

Private Members' Business

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie
 Bennett
 Dalphond-Guiral
 Gallaway
 Lebel
 Perron

Asselin
 Collette
 Finestone
 Guimond
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 Proud

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

MACKENZIE-PAPINEAU BATTALION

The House resumed from May 12 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 12, 1998, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. M-75 under Private Members' Business.

As is the practice, the division will be taken row by row starting with the mover and then proceeding with those in favour of the motion sitting on the same side of the House as the mover. Then those in favour of the motion sitting on the other side of the House will be called. Those opposed to the motion will be called in the same order.

The question is on the motion.

● (1935)

Before the Clerk announced the result of the vote:

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
 Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
 Bailey
 Bergeron
 Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
 Bigras
 Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead)
 Brien
 Cadman
 Casson
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
 Cummins
 Debien
 Duceppe
 Duncan
 Forseth
 Gagnon
 Gilmour
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 Gouk
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Harris
 Harvey

Anders
 Bachand (Saint-Jean)
 Bellehumeur
 Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
 Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Borotsik
 Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
 Brison
 Canuel
 Chatters
 Crête
 de Savoye
 Desrochers
 Dumas
 Epp
 Fournier
 Gauthier
 Girard-Bujold
 Goldring
 Grewal
 Guay
 Hart

Private Members' Business

Mr. Clifford Lincoln: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my name to those supporting the motion.

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

*(Division No. 175)***YEAS**

Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Brien
Bigras	Canuel
Caccia	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Charbonneau	Davies
Crête	Debien
de Savoye	Desrochers
Desjarlais	Duceppe
Dockrill	Duncan
Dumas	Folco
Earle	Gagnon
Fournier	Girard-Bujold
Gauthier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Hardy
Guay	Laliberte
Jennings	Laurin
Lalonde	Lefebvre
Lavigne	Lincoln
Lill	Mancini
Loubier	Marchand
Marceau	McDonough
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mercier
Ménard	Nystrom
Nunziata	Plamondon
Picard (Drummond)	Riis
Proctor	Rocheleau
Robinson	Solomon
Sauvageau	Stinson
St-Hilaire	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Stoffer	Turp
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Venne
Vautour	
Wasylcia-Leis—66	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Anders
Anderson	Assadourian
Augustine	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Cadman	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Casson	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chatters	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cummins
DeVillers	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finlay

Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goldring	Gouk
Graham	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Hubbard
Jackson	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Keys
Knutsen	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lee	Leung
Longfield	Lunn
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Massé
Matthews	Mayfield
McCormick	McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McWhinney
Mifflin	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
Obhrai	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Patry
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Provenzano
Ramsay	Redman
Reed	Reynolds
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Rock
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Scott (Skeena)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Solberg	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (Charlotte)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Vellacott	Wappel
Wayne	Whelan
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Wilfert
Williams—171	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collenette
Dalphond-Guiral	Finestone
Galloway	Guimond
Lebel	McKay (Scarborough East)
Perron	Proud

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from May 14 consideration of the motion that Bill C-247, an act to amend the Criminal Code (genetic manipulation), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 12, 1998, the next deferred recorded division is on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-247 under Private Members' Business.

We will follow the same voting pattern as we did the last time.

● (1945)

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

(Division No. 176)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Assadourian	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brison
Bryden	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Canuel	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Dockrill
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Earle
Epp	Forseth
Fournier	Gagnon
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guarnieri
Guay	Hardy
Harris	Hart
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Knutson
Konrad	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lavigne	Lee
Lefebvre	Lill
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
Mayfield	McDonough
Ménard	Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nunziata
Nystrom	Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Proctor	Provenzano
Ramsay	Reynolds
Riis	Ritz
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	

Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Solomon
Steckle	St-Hilaire
Stinson	St-Julien
Stoffer	Strahl
Telegdi	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Vautour	Vellacott
Venne	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—134

Private Members' Business

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bulte
Byrne	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Chouther
Coderre	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Godfrey	Graham
Grose	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keyes	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Leung
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Marleau	Massé
McCormick	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
Pagtakhan	Patry
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Shepherd	St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Whelan
Wilfert—101	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collenette
Dalphon-DuGuil	Finestone
Galloway	Guimond
Lebel	McKay (Scarborough East)
Perron	Proud

Private Members' Business

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Health.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

* * *

• (1950)

NATIONAL HEAD START PROGRAM

The House resumed consideration of the motion and the amendment.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made earlier today, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions on Motion No. 261.

The vote is on the amendment.

• (2000)

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

(Division No. 177)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brisson	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Casson	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cummins
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Duncan
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Epp
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring	Graham
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Hardy
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hoepfner
Hubbard	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Johnston	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keddy (South Shore)
Keys	Knutson

Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lill
Lincoln	Longfield
Lunn	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
Nunziata	Nystrom
Obhrai	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proctor
Provenzano	Ramsay
Redman	Richardson
Riis	Ritz
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Solberg	Solomon
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (Charlotte)	Torsney
Ur	Vanclief
Vautour	Vellacott
Wappel	Wasylcyia-Leis
Wilfert	Williams—170

NAYS

Members

Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Brien
Bigras	Chatters
Canuel	Crête
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Debien
de Savoye	Duceppe
Desrochers	Fournier
Dumas	Gauthier
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Guay
Godin (Châteauguay)	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Laurin
Kerpan	Loubier
Lefebvre	Marchand
Marceau	Mercier
Ménard	Picard (Drummond)
Morrison	Reynolds
Plamondon	Sauvageau
Rocheleau	St-Hilaire
Scott (Skeena)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Stinson	Turp
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	
Venne —44	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Asselin
Bennett	Collenette
Dalphon-Duval	Finestone
Galloway	Guimond

Private Members' Business

Lebel
Perron

McKay (Scarborough East)
Proud

McDonough
McWhinney
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Muise
Myers
Obhrai
O'Reilly
Paradis
Phinney
Pratt
Provenzano
Redman
Richardson
Ritz
Robinson
Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)
Serré
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (Charlotte)
Torsney
Vanclief
Vellacott
Wasylcia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—186

McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault Nunziata
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Proctor
Ramsay
Reynolds
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora
Shepherd
Solomon
Steckle
Stinson
Stoffer
Szabo
Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Ur
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan
Wilfert

The Speaker: I declare the amendment carried.

The next question is on the motion as amended.

• (2005)

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

*(Division No. 178)***YEAS**

Members

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anderson
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brisson
Bryden
Byrne
Cadman
Caplan
Casson
Cauchon
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Copp
Cummins
Desjarlais
Dion
Dockrill
Drouin
Duncan
Easter
Epp
Folco
Forsyth
Gagliano
Godfrey
Goldring
Grewal
Grose
Harb
Harris
Harvard
Herron
Hoepfner
Jackson
Jennings
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Keyes
Konrad
Laliberte
Lavigne
Leung
Lincoln
Lunn
Mahoney
Maloney
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield

Adams
Anders
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Barnes
Bélangier
Bertrand
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Calder
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chatters
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Davies
DeVillers
Discepola
Dromisky
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri
Hardy
Hart
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Jaffer
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kerpan
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Longfield
MacAulay
Malhi
Mancini
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
McCormick

NAYS

Members

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Canuel
Crête
Debien
Duceppe
Fournier
Gauthier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Mercier
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp

Bergeron
Brien
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dumas
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Lefebvre
Marceau
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne —35

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie
Bennett
Dalphond-Guiral
Galloway
Lebel
Perron

Asselin
Collenette
Finestone
Guimond
McKay (Scarborough East)
Proud

The Speaker: I declare the motion, as amended, carried.

*Adjournment Debate***ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

• (2010)

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Greg Thompson (Charlotte, PC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased that I will have a little time tonight to continue my crusade on the hepatitis C story. I do not have to remind the House that it is a very heart wrenching story. Many thousands of Canadians are waiting to find out whether they are going to be compensated. The only compensation package the federal government has agreed to is for the innocent victims between the years 1986 and 1990.

We on this side of the House and some of the members from the Liberal caucus believe that all victims of hepatitis C should be compensated. A group of people who through no fault of their own were infected by tainted blood prior to 1986. They will receive no compensation. There are also victims on the other side of that date. We often talk about the pre-1986 victims but there are also victims who were infected through no fault of their own after 1990. A constituent of mine has been reminding me of that. We often talk in this House of the pre-1986 victims but there are many victims who were infected after 1990.

We are talking about fairness in the compensation package. Canada has been selected by the United Nations as the number one country in the world. I think Canada is more generous than that in terms of what the government is offering. We have the capacity and the financial wherewithal to compensate all victims of hepatitis C. I remind the government that we have to do something for those victims.

When we look at what we have been reading lately in the newspapers, many of us are still pretty distressed by what we are hearing from the government. I was pleased today when I asked that question of the health minister. He is not going to tie assistance and research monies into other areas of legitimate health concern in this country as was reported by one of our national television networks over the weekend. It reported that the government might withhold funding for breast cancer research and funding for the AIDS strategy. That is not the case at all. The health minister told me today there will be no change in the funding of those two areas and other areas.

We are looking for more generosity on the part of the Minister of Health. We have gone after him pretty rigorously in the House and we have to continue to keep the heat on the minister. We know there has been some progress on behalf of some of the provinces.

We are looking for a compensation package for all those victims outside the prescribed area of 1986 to 1990. We want victims before and after compensated.

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, when the ministers of health made the announcement on March 27 on how the various governments of Canada would be approaching the issue of hepatitis C, they did so together sitting at the same table with one another and with people who are affected by the virus. They did so knowing that some people would not be happy. They sat across from these people, faced them and answered their questions.

• (2015)

The public wants governments to listen to what peoples' thoughts are on these issues and has asked that we take responsibility for the blood system problems of the past. We have done so. It wants governments to work together and we did so. The Canadian public prefers that any assistance provided by governments be distributed according to need. This is what we proposed this past March 27.

On May 14 health ministers met with representatives from the Hepatitis C Society of Canada. They met and listened to the Canadian Hemophilia Society. Health Canada officials have been speaking directly to affected members of the public who have called into Health Canada to tell us about their daily lives, the problems they face and what they want governments to do.

The federal government has consistently shown that it wants to work with all involved but that not everybody involved wants to work toward a real solution. We continue to do so.

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REFORM

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Bloc Québécois has launched a large scale offensive to bring the federal government to review the Employment Insurance Act. We have known for a while that only 41 per cent of the unemployed receive benefits.

Today, the Bloc Québécois released a black book on the employment insurance reform. This book, based on Statistics Canada's figures, confirms that only 26 per cent of unemployed young people receive benefits. This is totally unacceptable. The government must do something about this.

This black book on employment insurance also shows that, in 1996, out of \$6 billion in cuts, \$4.3 billion was due to restrictions in the program, while the remaining \$1.7 billion was attributable to labour market activity. The \$4.3 billion was due to restraints in eligibility, the duration of benefits and the amounts paid.

Adjournment Debate

How did we get there? The problem is that, in their latest attempt to overhaul the EI system, the Liberals were obsessed with fighting the deficit. All the government wanted to do was find ways to accumulate as much money as possible at the expense of society's most disadvantaged, the people who struggle to make ends meet.

The government must go back and abolish the intensity rule, which penalizes seasonal workers. It must reduce the number of hours required in a first job. We must ensure that we have all the information needed to correct this reform, which creates social iniquity and also has the unfortunate effect of lagging behind society and the labour market.

The government has not yet decided what to do about independent workers. It does not know exactly how to adapt to the new conditions of precarious employment. It is forcing everyone to pay contributions from the first hour, but the end result is that many people, 74% of young people, are contributing, but not getting the benefits.

When will the federal government finally decide to review the Employment Insurance Act and give it back its true purpose of ensuring a decent income between jobs for people who are unemployed?

[*English*]

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the employment insurance system is about supporting individuals who have an attachment to the labour force and who need temporary assistance before getting back into the workforce.

Despite the member's claims that he has made in the past and again tonight, the fact is that we do not want individuals moving from EI to social assistance. We want them to move from EI into the workforce.

Let us set the record straight. Since March 1997 social assistance case loads have declined in all provinces. In the member's province of Quebec the most recent figures show 436,200 households were on social assistance, the lowest number of cases since January 1993.

The fact is that a portion of social assistance recipients has always been persons who either did not qualify or who exhausted their EI benefits. Contrary to the hon. member's statement, our last EI reform was precisely about trying to help these unemployed individuals back into the workforce.

• (2020)

The employment insurance reform brought forth by the government included a number of bold new measures to modernize the system and to ensure it could better help Canadians face the challenges of our changing economy and help them find and keep jobs.

Rather than making Canadians dependent on passive income support for as long as possible as the member and his party would like, we choose to invest EI dollars in new measures to help Canadians return to work as quickly as possible.

What is so innovative is that we have broadened eligibility for these employment measures so that all Canadians who received EI or UI in the last three years can benefit from them as can people who collected maternity or parental benefits during the last five years.

To further build on this innovation, the Government of Canada has negotiated labour market development agreements with nearly all provincial and territorial governments for the delivery of these active measures.

The Government of Quebec will receive \$2.7 billion over five years—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I am sorry to interrupt the parliamentary secretary.

[*Translation*]

The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 8.20 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, May 25, 1998

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

National Head Start Program

Motion	7091
Mr. Adams	7091
Motion	7091
(Motion agreed to)	7091
Mr. Grewal	7091
Mr. Brison	7092
Ms. Phinney	7094
Mr. Loubier	7095
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	7096
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	7097
Mr. Knutson	7097
Mr. Casson	7098
Mr. Stoffer	7099
Amendment	7099
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	7099
Divisions deemed demanded and deferred	7100

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 1998

Bill C-36—Time Allocation Motion	
Mr. Boudria	7100
Motion agreed to	7101
Mr. Duceppe	7101
Report stage	
Bill C-36	7101
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	7101
Mr. Lunn	7102
Mrs. Debien	7103
Mr. Stoffer	7104
Mr. Bonwick	7106
Mr. Brison	7107
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	7107
Mr. Bonwick	7108
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	7108
Mrs. Lalonde	7109
Mr. Dumas	7110

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Algonguin Secondary School in North Bay

Mr. Bélanger	7110
--------------------	------

Oliver, B.C.

Mr. Gouk	7111
----------------	------

Dr. Russell McDonald

Mr. Finlay	7111
------------------	------

APEC

Ms. Leung	7111
-----------------	------

Notemakers

Mr. Easter	7111
------------------	------

Ireland

Mr. Kenney	7111
------------------	------

Ecumenical Patriarch

Mr. Cannis	7112
------------------	------

Missing Children Day

Mrs. Jennings	7112
---------------------	------

Head Start Program

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	7112
---	------

David Levine

Mr. Plamondon	7112
---------------------	------

Ireland

Mr. O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	7113
-------------------------------------	------

Missing Children

Mrs. Dockrill	7113
---------------------	------

Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Mr. Discepola	7113
---------------------	------

Quebec Flag

Mrs. Tremblay	7113
---------------------	------

Yarmouth Ferry Service

Mr. Muisse	7113
------------------	------

FOREX Plant

Mr. Bertrand	7114
--------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Hepatitis C

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	7114
Mr. Gray	7114
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	7114
Mr. Rock	7114
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	7114
Mr. Gray	7114
Miss Grey	7114
Mr. Rock	7115
Miss Grey	7115
Mr. Rock	7115

Employment Insurance

Mr. Duceppe	7115
Mr. Pettigrew	7115
Mr. Duceppe	7115
Mr. Pettigrew	7115
Mrs. Gagnon	7115
Mr. Pettigrew	7115
Mrs. Gagnon	7116
Mr. Pettigrew	7116
Mrs. Gagnon	7116
Mr. Pettigrew	7116

Health

Ms. McDonough	7116
Mr. Rock	7116
Ms. McDonough	7116
Mr. Rock	7116

Somalia Inquiry

Mr. MacKay	7116
Ms. McLellan	7116
Mr. MacKay	7116
Ms. McLellan	7117

National Defence

Mrs. Ablonczy	7117
---------------------	------

Mr. Eggleton	7117	Hepatitis C	
Mrs. Ablonczy	7117	Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	7122
Mr. Eggleton	7117	Mr. Rock	7122
Employment Insurance		The Economy	
Mr. Crête	7117	Mrs. Redman	7122
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	7117	Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	7122
Mr. Crête	7117	Fisheries	
Mr. Pettigrew	7117	Mr. Lunn	7122
National Defence		Mr. Anderson	7123
Mr. Goldring	7118	Canadian Armed Forces	
Mr. Eggleton	7118	Ms. St-Hilaire	7123
Mr. Goldring	7118	Mr. Eggleton	7123
Mr. Eggleton	7118	Presence in Gallery	
David Levine		The Speaker	7123
Mr. Gauthier	7118	Points of Order	
Mr. Dion	7118	Comments During Question Period	
Mr. Gauthier	7118	Mr. Gray	7123
Mr. Gray	7118	Mrs. Jennings	7123
National Defence			
Mr. Hart	7118		
Ms. McLellan	7119		
Mr. Hart	7119		
Mr. Eggleton	7119		
Millennium Scholarships			
Mr. Tremblay	7119		
Mr. Pettigrew	7119		
Aboriginal Affairs			
Mrs. Karetak-Lindell	7119		
Ms. Blondin-Andrew	7119		
Trade			
Mr. Strahl	7120		
Mr. Gray	7120		
Mr. Strahl	7120		
Mr. Gray	7120		
Canadian Armed Forces			
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	7120		
Mr. Eggleton	7120		
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	7120		
Mr. Eggleton	7120		
Health			
Mr. Thompson (Charlotte)	7120		
Mr. Rock	7121		
Mr. Thompson (Charlotte)	7121		
Mr. Rock	7121		
Science, Research and Development			
Mr. Alcock	7121		
Mr. Duhamel	7121		
Transitional Jobs Fund			
Mr. Anders	7121		
Mr. Pettigrew	7121		
Canadian Armed Forces			
Mrs. Venne	7121		
Mr. Eggleton	7121		
Fisheries			
Mr. Robinson	7122		
Mr. Anderson	7122		
		ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
		Order in Council Appointments	
		Mr. Adams	7123
		Government Response to Petitions	
		Mr. Adams	7123
		Committees of the House	
		Environment and Sustainable Development	
		Mr. Caccia	7124
		Bank Act	
		Bill C-407. Introduction and first reading	7124
		Mr. Nystrom	7124
		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	7124
		Criminal Code	
		Bill C-408. Introduction and first reading	7124
		Mr. Dromisky	7124
		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	7124
		Petitions	
		Marriage	
		Mr. Jackson	7124
		Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	7124
		Justice	
		Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	7124
		Hepatitis C	
		Mr. Perić	7124
		Fisheries	
		Mr. MacKay	7124
		Kosovo	
		Mrs. Redman	7125
		Emergency Personnel	
		Mr. Szabo	7125
		Taxation	
		Mr. Szabo	7125
		Gasoline Prices	
		Mr. Steckle	7125
		Marriage	
		Mrs. Ur	7125
		Taxation	
		Mr. Riis	7125

Pensions	
Mr. Riis	7125
Multilateral Agreement on Investment	
Mr. Riis	7125
Mr. Adams	7125
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Adams	7126
Mr. MacKay	7130

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 1998	
Bill C-36. Report stage	7130
Mr. Dumas	7130
Business of the House	
Ms. Catterall	7131
Motion	7131
(Motion agreed to)	7131
Mrs. Gagnon	7131
Mrs. Gagnon	7132
Budget Implementation Act, 1998	
Bill C-36. Report stage	7132
Ms. Bulte	7132
Mr. Mayfield	7133
Ms. Girard-Bujold	7135
Mr. Mahoney	7136
Mr. Mahoney	7137
Mr. Strahl	7137
Mr. Marchand	7139
Mr. Williams	7140
Mrs. Guay	7141
Mr. Kenney	7143
Mr. Lefebvre	7144
Mrs. Ablonczy	7145
Mr. Fournier	7147
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	7148
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	7149
Mr. de Savoye	7149
Mr. Stinson	7151
Mrs. Jennings	7152
Mr. Tremblay	7153
Mr. Solberg	7155
Motion	7155
(Motion agreed to)	7155
Motions Nos. 68 and 69	7155
Mr. Riis	7155
Motions Nos. 70 and 71	7155
Mr. Solberg	7155
Motions Nos. 72 and 73	7155
Mr. Riis	7155
Motions Nos. 74 and 75	7155
Mr. Solberg	7155
Motions Nos. 76 and 78 to 81 inclusive	7156
Mr. Riis	7156
Motions Nos. 82, 83 and 84	7156
Mrs. Gagnon	7156
Motion No. 85	7156
Mr. Riis	7156
Motions Nos. 86, 87 and 88	7156
Mrs. Gagnon	7156
Motion No. 89	7157
Mr. Brison	7157

Motion No. 90	7157
Mrs. Gagnon	7157
Motions Nos. 91 and 92	7157
Mr. Riis	7157
Motion No. 93	7157
Mr. Solberg	7157
Motions Nos. 94 to 96 inclusive	7157
Mr. Brison	7157
Motions Nos. 97 to 102 inclusive	7157
Mr. Riis	7157
Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	7157
Motion No. 103	7157
Motions Nos. 104 to 106 inclusive	7158
Mr. Riis	7158
Motion No. 107	7158
Mr. Solberg	7158
Motion No. 1 negatived	7158
Ms. Catterall	7159
Mr. Strahl	7159
Ms. Catterall	7159
Mr. Strahl	7159
Mr. Bergeron	7159
Mr. Solomon	7160
Mr. Harvey	7160
Mr. Nunziata	7160
Motion No. 2 negatived	7160
Ms. Catterall	7161
Mr. Solomon	7161
Ms. Catterall	7161
Mr. Strahl	7161
Mr. Bergeron	7161
Mr. Solomon	7161
Mr. Harvey	7161
Mr. Nunziata	7161
Motion No. 7 negatived	7161
Ms. Catterall	7162
Mr. Strahl	7162
Mr. Bergeron	7162
Mr. Solomon	7162
Mr. Harvey	7162
Mr. Nunziata	7162
Motion No. 11 negatived	7162
Ms. Catterall	7163
Mr. Nunziata	7163
Motion No. 57 negatived	7164
Ms. Catterall	7165
Mr. Strahl	7165
Mr. Bergeron	7165
Mr. Solomon	7165
Mr. Harvey	7165
Mr. Nunziata	7165
Motion No. 16 negatived	7165
Ms. Catterall	7166
Motions Nos. 42, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 56, 65, 66, 70, 107, 74 and 75 negatived	7166
Ms. Catterall	7166
Mr. Strahl	7166
Mr. Bergeron	7166
Mr. Solomon	7166
Mr. Harvey	7166
Mr. Nunziata	7166
Motion No. 67 negatived	7166
Ms. Catterall	7167
Mr. Nunziata	7167

Ms. Catterall	7167
Mr. Strahl	7167
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	7167
Mr. Bergeron	7167
Mr. Solomon	7168
Mr. Harvey	7168
Mr. Nunziata	7168
Motion No. 68 negatived	7168
Ms. Catterall	7169
Mr. Strahl	7169
Mr. Bergeron	7169
Mr. Solomon	7169
Mr. Harvey	7169
Mr. Nunziata	7169
Ms. Catterall	7169
Motion No. 69 negatived	7169
Ms. Catterall	7170
Mr. Strahl	7170
Mr. Bergeron	7170
Mr. Solomon	7170
Mr. Harvey	7170
Mr. Nunziata	7170
Motion No. 72 negatived	7170
Ms. Catterall	7171
Mr. Strahl	7171
Mr. Bergeron	7172
Mr. Solomon	7172
Mr. Harvey	7172
Mr. Nunziata	7172
Motion No. 82 negatived	7172
Ms. Catterall	7173
Mr. Strahl	7173
Mr. Bergeron	7173
Mr. Solomon	7173
Mr. Harvey	7173
Mr. Nunziata	7173
Motion No. 87 negatived	7173
Ms. Catterall	7174
Mr. Strahl	7174
Mr. Bergeron	7174
Mr. Solomon	7174
Mr. Harvey	7174
Mr. Nunziata	7174
Motion No. 89 negatived	7174
Ms. Catterall	7175
Mr. Strahl	7175

Mr. Bergeron	7175
Mr. Solomon	7175
Mr. Harvey	7176
Mr. Nunziata	7176
Motion No. 96 negatived	7176
Motion for concurrence	7177
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	7177
Ms. Catterall	7177
Mr. Strahl	7177
Mr. Bergeron	7177
Mr. Solomon	7177
Mr. Harvey	7177
Mr. Nunziata	7177
Motion agreed to	7178

Canada Labour Code

Bill C-19. Third reading	7178
Ms. Catterall	7178
Mr. Strahl	7178
Mr. Bergeron	7178
Mr. Solomon	7178
Mr. Harvey	7178
Mr. Nunziata	7178
(Bill read the third time and passed)	7179

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion

Mr. Lincoln	7180
Motion negatived	7180

Criminal Code

Bill C-247. Second reading	7181
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ...	7182

National Head Start Program

Motion	7182
Amendment agreed to	7182
Motion as amended agreed to	7183

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Hepatitis C	
Mr. Thompson (Charlotte)	7184
Mr. Nault	7184
Employment Insurance Reform	
Mr. Crête	7184
Mr. Nault	7185

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :

<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada – Édition, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9.