



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 163 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, December 1, 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

Tuesday, December 1, 1998

The House met at 10 a.m.

[English]

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1005)

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, copies of One Year Later: The Ottawa Convention is Making a Difference.

* * *

[Translation]

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.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 19th report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts regarding Chapter 18 of the September 1998 auditor general's report.

[English]

The report deals with the financial information strategy of government basically moving to a full accrual system and asks that the government move quickly in that area and keep parliament informed.

[Translation]

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests the government to table a comprehensive response to this report.

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 47th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the associate membership of some standing committees of the House.

If the House gives its consent, I should like to move concurrence at this time.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

* * *

PETITIONS

GRANDPARENTS' RIGHTS

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by many of my constituents.

The petitioners are calling on parliament to amend the Divorce Act to include a provision, as supported in Bill C-340, regarding the right of grandparents to have access to or custody of their grandchildren.

TAXATION

Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to present the following petition signed by 32 concerned Canadians.

The petitioners call upon parliament to encourage the government to consider increasing its level of support for a "Tobin tax" by promoting the concept among other G-7 countries.

The goal of this global currency transaction tax would be to prevent currency speculation.

EUTHANASIA

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from members of my constituency, from the communities of Vulcan and Champion, calling on the government to not go down the road of euthanasia. I agree with the petition.

Routine Proceedings

The Deputy Speaker: I hate to think that I heard the hon. member express agreement or disagreement with the petition because he knows that is against the rules and I am sure he would not have done it.

PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present.

The first one is signed by 25 people from my riding of Red Deer. These constituents request parliament to support Bill C-304 which would strengthen the protection of property rights in the Canadian bill of rights.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): The second petition, Mr. Speaker, signed by 85 people, asks that parliament review and change relevant provisions of the Criminal Code to ensure that men take responsibility for their violent behaviour toward women.

• (1010)

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present this petition signed by a number of Canadians, including Canadians from my riding of Mississauga South.

The petitioners would like to bring to the attention of the House that human rights violations continue in many countries around the world, including countries such as Indonesia. They also point out that Canada continues to be internationally respected for its defence of international human rights.

The petitioners on this 50th anniversary of the UN declaration on universal human rights call on parliament to continue its efforts to speak out against countries which tolerate violations of human rights and to do whatever is possible to bring to justice those who are responsible for such abuse.

MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present concerning the multilateral agreement on investment. As we know, talks on the agreement collapsed in Paris this fall.

Nevertheless, these petitioners, who were opposed to the MAI, call upon parliament to recognize the fact that Canadians reject the MAI approach to globalization and they instruct the government to seek an entirely different kind of agreement by which the world might achieve a rules based global economy which protects workers, the environment and the ability of governments to act in the public interest.

MERCHANT NAVY VETERANS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by over 100 people in the Peterborough region.

The petitioners point out that merchant navy veterans did not receive post-war veterans benefits, that all of them served under full military command, that many of them served under the most anxious circumstances, and that casualties in the merchant navy were often worse than in other theatres of war.

They call upon parliament to act now to compensate merchant navy veterans for their service and hardship after serving on Canadian and allied ships during World War II and in the Korean war.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition from people concerned about the threat of nuclear war.

The petitioners point out that there are over 30,000 nuclear weapons in existence. They pray and request that parliament support the goal of the abolition of nuclear weapons on our earth, that Canada advocate the immediate de-alerting of all nuclear devices, that Canada join the nations of the New Agenda Coalition, that Canada advocate within NATO that nuclear weapons have no militarily useful role, and that additional financial support be allocated to Russia to ensure safe and secure disarmament of its nuclear arsenal.

[Translation]

DIVORCE ACT

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.): I wish to present four petitions calling on parliament to amend the Divorce Act and to support Bill C-343, so that parents and grandparents may have access to their children and grandchildren.

[English]

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House to return to motions.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the House give unanimous consent to revert to motions in Routine Proceedings?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the 47th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the parliamentary secretary have the unanimous consent of the House on this occasion to present this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Question No. 150 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 150—**Mr. Mark Muise:**

Did the Minister of Canadian Heritage, or anyone in the Ministry of Canadian Heritage, hold consultations with the National Association of Japanese Canadians prior to deciding to make the changes to the mandate and reporting structure of the Canadian Race Relations Foundation that are proposed in Bill C-44, The Administrative Tribunals (Remedial and Disciplinary Measures) Act, and if so, what were the results of those consultations?

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (parliamentary secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): The Department of Canadian Heritage did not hold consultations with the National Association of Japanese Canadians prior to deciding to make the changes to the mandate and reporting structure of the Canadian Race Relations Foundation proposed in Bill C-44, the Administrative Tribunals (Remedial and Disciplinary Measures) Act. However, when the amendments to the Canadian Race Relations Foundation Act were first introduced in June 1996 in Bill C-49, the Administrative Tribunals (Remedial and Disciplinary Measures) Act, now Bill C-44, the honourable Hedy Fry, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women), informed stakeholders, including the National Association of Japanese Canadians, NAJC, that the government intends to maintain a lead role in race relations policy and programming and that amendments are necessary to avoid overlap and duplication of efforts.

The amendments to the Canadian Race Relations Foundation Act are in keeping with the government's commitment to streamline federal boards, agencies and corporations and to make them more accountable to the Canadian public. The amendments will also clarify the mandate of the foundation to ensure that it will be able to achieve its objectives and that it will efficiently and effectively complement the activities of the Government of Canada.

In addition, the changes to the Canadian Race Relations Foundation Act will make it easier for the Canadian Race Relations Foundation to be a significant factor in the resolution of race relations issues in Canada. The proposed amendments do not alter our vision of the key role the foundation will play. It will be a centre of excellence, a national resource to serve the information

Supply

and research needs of governments, public and private institutions, researchers, communities and the general public.

[English]

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1015)

[English]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—SOCIAL PROGRAMS

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.) moved:

That this House urge the government to conclude an agreement with the provinces and territories, prior to December 31, 1998, and based on the unanimous resolution of the provinces as agreed to last August 7th at Saskatoon, to strengthen the partnership between the federal, provincial and territorial governments in order to secure Canada's social programs for the future.

The Deputy Speaker: Since today is the final allotted day for the supply period ending December 10, 1998, the House will go through the usual procedures to consider and dispose of the supply bill.

In view of recent practices, do hon. members agree that the bill be distributed now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During the course of today's debate members of the Reform Party will be dividing their time.

Mr. Preston Manning: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the supply day motion before the House.

This motion, as members will note, calls for the government to conclude an agreement with the provinces and territories prior to the end of the year and to establish a stronger partnership for the provision of essential social services such as health care, education and social assistance. It calls for that agreement to be based on the unanimous resolution of the provinces as agreed at Saskatoon last August 7.

In other words, the motion calls for a positive, timely, proactive response by the federal parliament to the demands of all provinces

Supply

for a better and stronger social union. I do not need to tell the House that such a response to the social union proposals from the premiers is long overdue and even more urgent in light of the provincial election results in Quebec last night.

As a democrat who accepts and respects the results of elections, I want to extend congratulations to all those members of the Quebec Assembly who were elected yesterday.

[Translation]

I wish to congratulate Mr. Bouchard's government on its re-election. Congratulations as well to Mr. Dumont and Action démocratique du Québec, which offered Quebecers a third option between sovereigntists and traditional federalists.

[English]

I also want to congratulate Mr. Charest for fighting a valiant campaign with one hand tied behind his back, a hand tied by the actions or more correctly by the inactions of the Prime Minister and the federal government.

I believe it is imperative that the federal government and parliament send a clear message to all the provinces including Quebec that the reform of the federation is essential and a national priority.

However, over the past 12 months the federal government has had at least three opportunities to send that message and has failed to do so. On November 25, 1997 the official opposition put forward a motion endorsing the efforts of the premiers to initiate reform of the federation through the Calgary declaration, including the seventh point of that declaration which pertained to the reform of the social union.

That motion specifically called for the federal government to communicate the Calgary declaration to the people of Quebec and to consult them on its contents. The government supported the motion but failed to act on it, missing a golden opportunity to communicate to Quebecers the demand for reform of the federation in other parts of the country.

Then on August 7 of this year, after intense negotiation among the provinces themselves in which Premier Bouchard also took part, the 10 premiers and 2 territorial leaders endorsed resolutions calling for a new partnership between the two orders of government for the provision of social services including the refinancing of health care.

However, the Prime Minister reacted negatively in the press to these proposals and his officials have resisted action on several of the main points. Thus there was still no concrete, tangible progress to report on reform of the federation when the Quebec election was called on October 28. Yet another missed opportunity.

At the outset of the Quebec election there was the Prime Minister's infamous interview with *La Presse* in which he implied

again that fundamental reform of the federation, in particular relations between federal and provincial governments, was not an option or a priority. In other words, the tired old song that federalism is good enough as it is, precisely the wrong message to send to Quebec at the beginning of a provincial election.

• (1020)

Three golden opportunities over a 12 month period to send a clear message to all provinces including Quebec that reform of the federation is a viable option and national priority were all missed by the government.

Yet the sun still shines on Canada. Here we find ourselves on the day after the Quebec election with yet another opportunity to send a message to the people of all the provinces that parliament is prepared to respond positively today to the demand for reform of the way this federation delivers and finances social services.

I remind all hon. members that in the final analysis this social union is not a constitutional measure. Nor is it merely some subject for academic debate about federal-provincial relations or the administration of government programs. The social union is about health, education and support for people in need.

At this point in time when federal transfers to the provinces have been cut by \$7 billion, when hospitals are closing, when 1,400 doctors have left the country in the last two years, when nurses are striking in British Columbia, and when almost 200,000 people are on waiting lists, the social union is particularly about health care.

When the premiers call for joint action between themselves and the federal government to repair the health care system, when the electors of Quebec support joint action to repair the health care system, and when our motion today calls for joint action to repair the health care system, we are asking the federal government to respond to the health care needs of real people—somebody's mother, somebody's father, somebody's child, somebody's friend—waiting for the government to act.

The motion is asking the federal government to conclude an agreement with the provinces this month that will make a difference as to how health care is provided and financed in the country next year and in the years ahead.

We know from the representations of all the premiers and the polls that there is demand in every province for social services reform, even if there is still some disagreement about the details. I urge NDP members of the House to support the efforts of Premier Romanow and Premier Clark on this issue, to support the motion in principle and then argue for their particular perspective on the details of the social union at a later time. I also urge PC members of the House to support the efforts of Premiers Klein, Filmon, Harris and Binns on this issue to do likewise.

We also know from the Angus Reid poll of November 24, conducted for Radio Canada in Quebec, that 73% of respondents said that if Premier Bouchard were re-elected his priority should be to attempt to improve the position of Quebec within Confederation, while only 24% said he should commence to gather winning conditions for a referendum on sovereignty.

[*Translation*]

I sincerely hope that Bloc Quebecois members will see in this motion the major features of the social union motions they themselves introduced on October 5 and November 19. I sincerely hope, as well, that Bloc Quebecois members will support this motion, because it reflects the wish expressed by Quebec voters for immediate priority to be given to social service reforms.

[*English*]

Finally, I appeal to government members, indeed to all members of the House, not to miss yet another opportunity to provide some positive leadership on the issue of social union.

[*Translation*]

This parliament's job in the coming months will be to create winning conditions for all Canadians as we enter the 21st century.

[*English*]

As we enter the 21st century there should be winning conditions for taxpayers, winning conditions for jobs, winning conditions for health care, winning conditions for all our people regardless of their language, culture, ethnicity, station in life or where they live in the country.

I urge all members to support the motion as a positive step toward creating winning conditions for the new Canada of the 21st century.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. leader of the Reform Party. It concerns the deadline of December 31, 1998. I wonder why this particular deadline.

• (1025)

It seems that it has made the motion much more problematic than it needed to be. My understanding is that the premiers would not be happy with a motion passed by the House which required that they and the federal government arrive at an agreement by the end of this month, given what month it is. It seems hard to believe the motion was put forward with any kind of realistic expectation that this could happen, or put forward for that matter constructively, knowing how difficult it would be to meet such a deadline.

Those of us who approach this issue constructively are somewhat mystified at why this deadline would be put in the motion. It is not just in respect of the difficulty of meeting the deadline but

Supply

also because of the difficulty of having any due process between now and then.

I remember the hon. member and his party castigating the rest of us for lack of public consultation when it comes to these kinds of things. Does the member really think that between now and December 31, 1998 there could be some meaningful public consultation, or has he converted to executive federalism?

Mr. Preston Manning: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I will respond in two ways. First, there is a reason for the deadline. Our understanding is that the premiers want this concluded by the end of the year. The premiers have referred to the end of December as a deadline that must be met.

They are asking for the federal government to respond conclusively to the resolutions they passed in August. They are not saying that the legislation, if there is a requirement for legislation, has to be in place. They want a definitive response from the federal government by the end of the year to proposals which have been on the table for months and months and months. That is the reason for the December 31 deadline.

On the member's second point, of course we see a place for public process but there has to be public process with respect to some agreement that is in place. Until we know the federal government's response to the premiers' resolutions, what would we discuss with the public in a public discussion at this stage? It would be the various options the federal government may pursue. We see all sorts of room for process after there has been some definitive agreement between the federal and provincial governments. In fact we would insist on that.

I urge hon. members not to let the time factor be a restraint from voting against the motion. The House has to put some pressure on the government, which has been dragging its heels for years on this subject, to come to some kind of conclusion now on matters that have been before it for months.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member talked about how important it is to invest in our health care system for the benefit of all. The member doth protest too much.

This is the member whose party supports a two tier health care system, one for the rich and the leftovers for the rest of Canadians. He is also the leader of the party that wants to scrap the Canada Health Act which provides the foundation for the quality of health care in Canada.

Will the member reverse his position on two tiered health care and on eliminating the Canada Health Act?

Mr. Preston Manning: Mr. Speaker, the member shows a gross and I would suggest a deliberate misunderstanding and misrepresentation of the position of the official opposition. Our position has

Supply

always been that health care should be available to all Canadians regardless of ability to pay and we do not support an American style of health care. We never have and never will.

We are open to amendments to the Canada Health Act. Coming out of the social union discussion we may require amendments to the health act. If the member is concerned about the health care act, he should be concerned about the violations of it today. One of the five criteria of the Canada Health Act which the government swears is its number one priority is accessibility to the system.

Accessibility means being able to get health care when one needs it. With 188,000 people on waiting lists, that one criterion of the Canada Health Act is being violated tens of thousands of times per day. It is violated not by anything the official opposition has done but by the inaction of the federal government.

• (1030)

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to speak to the motion of the Leader of the Opposition about the social union.

I want to reiterate some of the comments that he made regarding the need for the federal government to show leadership and to acknowledge to Canadians that there is room for reform in the federation.

I would like to take a moment to explain what the social union is. As the premiers stated in Saskatoon in August, “it is about governments working together within their constitutional responsibilities to ensure strong and sustainable health, education and social services for all Canadians. It is not about more power for one order of government or another”.

To put it quite simply, the social union would mean better health care for all Canadians by ensuring that the funding arrangements between the federal government and the provinces is reformed on the basis of transparency, consistency and sufficiency.

It was at Saskatoon that the premiers unanimously endorsed the social union. That does not mean that there was not some heated debate. There were concerns expressed by all the provinces. Some provinces may have more difficulty with some areas than others, but they compromised and they agreed to set a parameter of an agreement.

The social union has the support of four Progressive Conservative premiers. It has the support of three Liberal premiers. It has the support of two New Democratic Party premiers. And it has the support of the Parti Québécois premier. It crosses all party lines.

When the social union was debated in October, it had the support of all the opposition parties. The federal Liberals stand alone in their opposition to the social union. One has to question why that is.

As Premier Romanow of Saskatchewan put it, “the Canadian social union has been challenged in recent years by the unilateral actions of the federal government”. It is time for the federal Liberals to accept the evolving relationship between Ottawa and the provinces.

The re-election of the Parti Québécois yesterday has assured Canadians that the social union issue will not go away. We are faced with the paradox of the position of Premier Bouchard who on the one hand is talking about strengthening the social union while on the other hand he is intent on creating the winning conditions for a referendum to take Quebec out of the federation.

[*Translation*]

It is clear that Quebecers have decided to re-elect the Parti Québécois because they believe it to be the party that is best able to govern and represent their interests.

It is also quite clear from the polls that what the large majority of Quebecers want is reform within the Canadian federation, with increased control of their personal affairs. This is what the Reform Party offers, not only to the Province of Quebec, but also to all Canadians from all the provinces and territories. Together, we must work to meet the winning conditions for the creation of a new Canada.

[*English*]

While this motion should not be seen as a response to yesterday's election, it is clear that the federal government has allowed Premier Bouchard to gain the momentum.

With this motion, federalists can once again reclaim the initiative that was started by the premiers. It is with this opportunity of supporting this motion that the federalist forces in this country can reclaim the position of leading toward a new direction in the federation.

We can show all Canadians that by strengthening the partnership between the two orders of government, by strengthening the social union we can improve the federation.

• (1035)

The premiers' agreement was not outrageous. It can in no way be construed as an attack on the federal government or federal powers.

For example, the premiers asked for collaborative arrangements on federal spending in areas of provincial-territorial jurisdiction. This means that before the federal government starts spending money in an area of provincial jurisdiction, the federal government should collaborate with the provinces. How can this be construed as an attack on the federation?

I asked my constituents about this in my latest householder. The question was: Do you agree that the federal government should be prevented from spending money in provincial jurisdictions with-

out the approval of the majority of the provinces? With over 1,800 responses to date, over 80% of these respondents said yes. The federal government should be prevented from spending money in areas of provincial jurisdiction without the agreement of the provinces.

The premiers also asked for a new dispute resolution mechanism that would prevent disputes and resolve them fairly when they arose. How does this challenge federal powers?

The provinces also asked for an opt out provision that would allow provinces to opt out of any new or modified Canada-wide program with full compensation provided that the province carries on a program that addresses the priority areas of the Canada-wide program.

The premiers claim that this is an essential dimension of the provincial-territorial consensus negotiating position. The premiers are being realistic with this position. Because our country is so diverse, one cannot always impose a one size fits all solution.

The social union has the unanimous support of the provinces. Polls just prior to the Quebec election indicated that 73% of Quebecers did not want separation but rather a renewed Canadian federation. With this motion, the Reform Party is offering that renewed Canadian federation, an opportunity to create the winning conditions for a new and stronger Canada.

However, I do wish to put forth the following amendment. I move:

That the motion be amended by inserting after the word "House" the word "strongly".

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who just spoke has been very involved on behalf of the official opposition in endeavouring to ascertain the positions of the various provincial governments with respect to the social union.

She is also a representative from the province of British Columbia. Would she care to comment on the importance of the social union proposals to that great province? That province will be the second largest province in Canada some time in the 21st century. Would she care to share a bit of her knowledge and experience on that subject?

Ms. Val Meredith: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

The province of British Columbia, probably more than many, feels very disconnected from the federation, from the central government in Ottawa. Often we find ourselves on the other side of a situation.

• (1040)

It is very important for the federal government to recognize that British Columbia is a growing province and is most likely to be the

Supply

second largest province in the next century. The federal government must recognize that all the provinces have grown up.

It is time for this federal government to recognize that in 1867 the jurisdictions of health, education and social services were given to the provinces. The provinces are ready to assume responsibility. The provinces are asking the federal government to acknowledge that they are capable of assuming that responsibility and agreeing to the social union. It clearly establishes some rules for this new partnership, with the recognition from the federal government of the provinces' ability to deliver services, and this new partnership will be confirmed with the agreement of the social union. Because there is a set process and regulations to be followed, this will enable the provinces to do what they can do best, which is to deliver services to their people who would receive the best services because they are done by the government closest to them.

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask the member, is what we are really talking about here not just a warmed over Charlottetown accord which is going to give more power to the provinces, weaken the federal government and play directly into the hands of separatist Premier Lucien Bouchard? Is that not what they are proposing on the other side?

Ms. Val Meredith: Mr. Speaker, absolutely not. There is no reason that the federal government would be less strong. All we are talking about is an open relationship between the federal government and the provinces recognizing the vision the founding fathers had of confederation in 1867. There is no way this would weaken the federal government any more than it already is by telling Canadians that they are not prepared to look at the country evolving from 1867, that they are not prepared to look at change, that they are not prepared to work with the provinces to provide better health care, education, and social services to the people of Canada.

There is no way that this agreement can be considered the same as the Charlottetown accord. I would suggest that with this debate and the debate we had on the supply day motion a week ago, we are trying to get this government to open up the debate so Canadians will have an understanding of what it is we are talking about. This House is a good place to start the debate. It is important for all of us to continue this debate out in the public and include Canadians in the decision making.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there seems to be one essential question that must be asked first of all: Why do we have a federation?

My suggestion, the suggestion of the Government of Canada, is that we have a federation in order to ensure that we are able to pursue common objectives within our diversity of experiences. Unitary countries can set common objectives, but cannot draw

Supply

upon the wealth of diversity of experience as a federation can. Ten self-centred republics to the north of the United States could have the diversity of experience, but not the same capacity to set common objectives and benefit from each other's support.

I say this because it is natural for provincial governments to be concerned primarily by the diversity of experiences, or in other words their own autonomy, while still keeping in mind the necessity for common objectives. It is equally natural for the federal government to be concerned primarily with common objectives, while still keeping in mind the diversity of the country. This is exactly what is happening with the negotiations for social union, an issue of extreme importance for all Canadians.

At the invitation of the Prime Minister of Canada, primarily, as well as the Premier of Saskatchewan, the Prime Minister and the premiers, along with the territorial leaders, reached agreement on December 12 to try to improve the Canadian social union.

• (1045)

The provinces set out to work together, coming up with a common approach only on June 18. I cannot blame them for taking six months; this is a complicated matter.

The Government of Canada took a month, until July 16, to react. The Quebec premier really joined the discussion only on August 7, and without the leadership of a government in Quebec with a belief in Canada, things became more complicated and progress slower. Since then, we have been discussing these two propositions together: one from the provinces and one from the federal government. Both are under examination.

The aim is not to reach an awkward compromise between the two; the aim is to draw out of the two the best possible social policy, the best possible framework for a decision so Canadians may have the social policies they are entitled to.

This is no easy achievement, because it is an important issue. It involves health and the social safety of people in Canada and because, what is more, we already have a good social union and it is always hard to improve on something good. I hope that the opposition parties will not try to diminish Canada's achievements for political gain.

Canada has achieved something good in its social union, without a doubt, as it has in the Canadian federation in general. It is a success, when you look at what is going on elsewhere in the world. It is not a work in progress. And so it is difficult, and it is not just the Government of Canada saying this.

[*English*]

A study released by the national bureau of economic research of Harvard University about the quality of governments compared

150 governments according to their capacities to deliver good services to citizens while respecting their freedom.

Canada ranked 5th of 150 governments. It is not so bad. We have to improve something that already is good. We need to work together, especially at this time following a lot of cuts and difficulties. Governments have been able to put their fiscal houses in order. Now together we have to choose good policies. It may take time but it is necessary in order to succeed.

[*Translation*]

Now I would like to link this debate and the unity of our country, Canadian unity. There is, in our opinion, a bad way to pose the problem and a good way.

The bad way to pose it is to react as if in a panic under the pressure of a separatist threat and as if we were trying to appease them with a policy that could be a poor one, but simply to placate them—this is what may be called loot politics. Separation blackmail and loot politics have no hold on the Government of Canada and never will, so long as the government is Liberal.

[*English*]

Another way to badly describe it is to call it a power grab. The federal and provincial governments both explain that is not what is under negotiation.

Our difficulty arises when the Prime Minister is misquoted, especially by the Leader of the Opposition. The Prime Minister never said he does not want to improve the federation, to put forward concrete changes. He said that constitutional change now is not the best way to achieve it. The Leader of the Opposition has said the same thing.

Why invent difficulties where there are none? I would understand the Leader of the Opposition putting pressure on us the way he is if the provinces were complaining that the federal government is not negotiating completely in good faith.

I quote what Premier Romanow, chairman of the premiers conference, said yesterday: "The first order of business is the social union, negotiating it as quickly as we can, not under artificial deadlines or timetables, doing it with dispatch, doing it with determination".

The Prime Minister wants to do it. His ministers want to do it. The premiers want to do it. Premier Bouchard signed on in Saskatoon in August.

The bargaining position of the provinces and the territorial governments is what the premiers did. They set out several positions we would like to see implemented in the social union. It is a bargaining position. It is a give and take. There is compromise, flexibility and no artificial deadlines. I could not agree more. I have other quotes from premiers saying the same thing.

Supply

• (1050)

I will now explain why the motion of the Leader of the Opposition is unacceptable to the government and I will suggest a motion that I hope will be acceptable to all parties.

The motion is that this House strongly urge the government to conclude an agreement with the provinces and territories prior to December 31, artificial deadline. We do not need to rush. We need to work cautiously and seriously, based on the unanimous resolution of the provinces as agreed at Saskatoon August 7. I am not sure what that means. Does that mean that if the Leader of the Opposition were the Prime Minister of Canada he would sign exactly what the provinces are suggesting?

If that is the case he and his party should say that very clearly to Canadians. If it is to negotiate in good faith to see if we can improve both federal and provincial proposals we would agree, but this is too vague too support.

To strengthen the partnership between the federal, provincial and territorial governments in order to secure Canada's social programs for the future, why do we only want to secure social programs? Do we not want to also improve our social programs?

Therefore I would move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "conclude" and substituting the following therefor:

"The best possible agreement with the provinces and territories and based on the commitment of first ministers in December 1997 and affirmed by the provinces at Saskatoon last August 7, to strengthen the partnership between the federal, provincial and territorial governments in order to secure and improve Canada's social programs for the future".

[Translation]

I seek the unanimous consent of the House to move this amendment.

The Deputy Speaker: Since there already is an amendment before the House, I think it is clear that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs cannot move another amendment right now.

Is there unanimous consent to allow the minister to move this amendment now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: There is no unanimous consent. The amendment is therefore not in order.

[English]

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I cannot express strongly enough my disappointment in the minister's speech.

It was just a litany of reasons for delay. It reminds me of Lincoln's comment on people in his day who said they were in favour of the abolition of slavery but could not do it on this day, not on that day, not by this way and not by that way. At the end of the day, of course, they really were opposed to the change that was being recommended.

I would like to ask the minister a practical question. What is it in the proposals put forward by the premiers that is the great obstacle to bringing this to a successful conclusion? Is it the opt out clause, is it the dispute settling mechanism? What are the practical things that the federal government simply cannot solve in its relations with the provinces that prevent this social union agreement from moving ahead?

• (1055)

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Mr. Speaker, I find the comparison irresponsible. It does not make sense. We will forget it.

We are speaking about something very important. It is not time to suggest bad purposes to others. We are working to improve health care, social policies for the people.

It is something important but it seems like the Leader of the Opposition considers that a power grab from one government to another.

What I know is we need to improve our capacity to work together, the provincial and federal governments. We are looking at it very responsibly. The provinces ask us to do the same. No one speaks now about the deadline of December 31. This is not responsible.

We will go ahead to have a good federation. We will improve both the capacity to work together to our shared objectives and the capacity for the provinces to experiment in the diversity of their own solutions. It will be a win-win solution for federal and provincial governments and above all for all Canadians.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the minister a question again, and I will do it very slowly, because what I heard from him were a couple of notes jotted down on a sheet. There was no forethought, there was no organization in that. I suggest he read *Hansard* tomorrow to see how little sense that speech actually made.

The member for Calgary Southwest asked him in good faith what is the problem, what is the hang-up with the federal government, and again more blather.

The minister knows how serious this issue is. The government can talk about the fact that everything is great in Quebec and in every other province. But the government did precious little to help the federalist side in the election last night and then the minister stands up today as if everything is terrific. It is not. We have a separatist government again in Quebec.

Supply

I would like him to stand up and say exactly what it is with his government that is the hang-up to seeing through this social union that every premier in the country wants.

We do not need a lecture on unity this morning. We need the minister to stand up and say what he will do to make sure the social union goes through with every premier in the country and what his hang-up is. Name it, please.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Mr. Speaker, the central answer to the question is we want something even better than what the provinces have suggested for all Canadians. The provinces agree that their current proposal is for negotiation. It is not something they want us to sign as it is. They want to look at it with us as we may improve it.

So where is the problem to try to improve something so important? As the hon. member was starting to say in the question, if we have a social union why do we have so much poverty and unemployment and so on? It is true we have a lot of things to improve in the federation and we will not succeed if we do not invent good solutions for Canadians.

I will tell the House what we need for that. We need imagination and faith in this country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first off, I would like to congratulate Lucien Bouchard and the Parti Québécois, in whom the people of Quebec put their trust yesterday. They will form the next government in Quebec.

• (1100)

I also want to congratulate Jean Charest and the Liberal Party, Mario Dumont and the Parti de l'action démocratique, and all those who participated in this election, whether or not they got elected, illustrating what democracy is all about and how much courage is required to take on this task.

I should point out that the government Quebecers elected yesterday is a good government. This was not a referendum. We sovereignists never said it would be. The federalists in Quebec were the ones who held it would be a referendum election. They will have to live with that now.

We never made any such assertion. We are asserting, however, that it is indeed a sovereignist government that the people of Quebec elected yesterday, confirming the decision they had made in the 1994 provincial election and in federal elections, first in 1993 and again in 1997, with more than 60% of the members from Quebec in this House being sovereignists.

That said, today, we must realize that, from across Canada and also from Quebec yesterday everywhere, a clear message has been

sent to Ottawa. It concerns social union. This has been a traditional demand of Quebec's for over 50 years. That is why I was somewhat amazed to hear the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs state that the motion before us was a panic reaction. This is an issue that has been debated for 50 years, and we are told this morning that it is a panic reaction.

I am also a little surprised to hear him tell us that this was an artificial deadline. It is strange that this government insisted so much on Quebec taking part in these negotiations, considering that, since 1994, the PQ government was present at the negotiation table 89% of the time, while from 1990 to 1994, the provincial Liberals were present only 23% of the time. This is the reality.

The federal government kept telling the PQ government to take part in the negotiations, because it was important to settle the issue. That was before the election. Now, less than 24 hours after the results came in, this government says "This is not urgent. Why all the fuss?"

I did hear Roy Romanow yesterday and I am very disappointed by the attitude of the NDP today, because there are NDP governments—I can think of Mr. Clark and Mr. Romanow—that insisted on Quebec taking part in these negotiations, and that saw how important it was to settle this issue.

The issue goes back a long time. I said 50 years, which includes not only Maurice Duplessis, but also Jean Lesage, René Lévesque and Robert Bourassa. These people were from various backgrounds and represented different parties. However, they all shared the same view on this issue.

I would like to quote Jean Lesage who, in 1960, said the following and certainly not because he was panic-stricken:

This full financial compensation with the right to opt out should take the form of additional taxation rights, specifically reserved for the provincial governments, and of corresponding equalization payments. Each province would be free to dispose of these revenues as it pleases, within its own jurisdictions.

Daniel Johnson senior added the following in 1966:

Quebec hopes that it will be understood once and for all that, for socio-cultural reasons, it insists wholly and absolutely on its constitutional areas of jurisdiction being respected and accepts no federal interference in those areas, whether direct or indirect.

In 1970, Robert Bourassa, who can most certainly not be suspected of any sovereignist leanings, said:

Quebec continues to believe that this federal spending power in areas that come under exclusive provincial jurisdiction ought quite simply not to exist, and the federal government would do well to quite simply renounce it totally.

This was not panic speaking, it was a clear judgement by Robert Bourassa. In 1978, René Lévesque added:

Quebec believes that federal spending powers ought to be restricted only to those areas listed as exclusive or joint federal responsibilities.

This is what Quebec has been saying clearly for 50 years. Today in Quebec this is a view that is held not only by the Parti Québécois, which will form the next government as a result of yesterday's election, but is also shared by Mr. Charest of the Liberal Party and Mr. Dumont.

• (1105)

This strategy of the sovereignists, along with that of the federalists, and indeed of all leaders of political parties in Quebec, all those who are politically active in Quebec, with the exception of the federal Liberal Party and the members of that party from Quebec who sit in this House, such as the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, shows that we have the interests of Quebec at heart. What is being practiced here is not the politics of the worst case scenario, which is the worst kind of politics. We are acting in defence of Quebecers' rights.

Nor are we engaged in a kind of blackmail, as the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said earlier. Good heavens, sovereignist policy has never had anything to do with holding a knife to anyone's throat. It was first expressed by Léon Dion, the father of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, and in pretty clear terms. Today, they are trying to convince us that it was the sovereignists who did so. We must get back a bit closer to the truth.

I believe the minister does not appreciate being confronted with reality, but that is what was said, and history will prove it. The sovereignists have never applied this policy. We were clear. We are here to defend our interests.

Yes, we believe in sovereignty, and it is our right to do so, just as others have the right to believe in federalism. That is not what we are debating today because, for once, federalists and sovereignists are in agreement, the parties here—I hope that the NDP will rethink its position—because Mr. Clark is a New Democrat, Mr. Romanow is a New Democrat, Mr. Harris, Mr. Klein and Mr. Filmon are Progressive Conservatives, the Reform Party, the Progressive Conservative Party here, Jean Charest, Mario Dumont, Lucien Bouchard, almost everyone except, once again, the Liberals.

Who but this government is preventing the provinces and the federal government from changing for the benefit of all Quebecers and Canadians? It sings the same old song at every referendum, makes up all sorts of stories before a federal election, and then, the morning after, tells us there is no rush to resolve the situation.

For months, we heard quite the opposite. Now they tell us no action is necessary. We say something has to be done and done fast. As the Leader of the Opposition quite rightly pointed out, we are not talking about a constitutional amendment. We are talking about an administrative agreement.

Why is this urgent? Because there is a budget in the offing. Because there are surpluses: \$10.4 billion that the government has

Supply

built up over the first six months by dipping into the pockets of the unemployed, by helping itself to money that should go to the provinces for post-secondary education, welfare and health, particularly health.

When the budget is brought down and if we do not reach an agreement making it possible to opt out with full compensation, we will see this government again launch into a spiral of reckless spending that will saddle us with new deficits, again interfering in provincial jurisdiction, having slashed health care funding throughout Canada with dangerous results, and swooping in to rescue us at the last minute, with assurances that Ottawa knows best.

We have had it. We are fed up. That is the long and the short of it. And that was the message sent by Quebecers yesterday. And it is the message being sent by the 10 premiers. And I hope it is the message of all opposition parties worthy of the name in this House.

[*English*]

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I gather from the remarks of the Bloc Québécois leader that he welcomes the motion of the Reform Party. I presume it fits perfectly into the sovereignist agenda of the Bloc Québécois. Is that not so?

Is the Bloc Québécois not supporting the motion because the Bloc Québécois is on the same wavelength as the Reform Party and the Reform Party is on the same wavelength as the Bloc Québécois? It is sovereignty and it is separation that the Reform Party is supporting here. We can see this clearly.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, I support the motion for one main reason. It is because almost everybody in Canada is supporting the motion and also in Quebec. All provinces are supporting the motion. The only people in Canada who are not supporting the motion are sitting on that side of the House, and they are on a one-way to a dead end.

• (1110)

That is why they are not supporting us. That is why they are acting like father knows best, like Ottawa knows best. That is the problem we have been facing for many years with the Liberals.

They are denying reality not only in Canada but mainly in Quebec and are telling stories and tales to the people. That is why Canadians do not understand what has gone on in Quebec. They had a lesson another time and that is why not only Quebec but all the provinces are supporting the motion of the Reform Party today.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I did not mean my rising to cause a mass exodus on the part of the

Supply

Bloc, but while the member who asked the last question is still in the House I want to begin by saying that it is a profound mistake to caricature this debate as one between separatists and federalists, or between those who somehow support the agenda of the Bloc and those who do not. There is a degree of support within a variety of federalists in the country for the whole notion of a social union.

It would be profoundly cheap in the political sense or intellectually vacant to try to caricature the debate as somehow having to do with who supports the separatists and who does not. There may be a convergence of views among the Reform, the Bloc and others, but I do not think this is the appropriate way to portray the debate on this matter.

We have a convergence of a number of things. We have the convergence of the view of the Reform Party which has always been for a more decentralized Canada, a Canada in which the federal spending power is much more restricted than it has traditionally been, and the view of the Bloc which is a traditional Quebec position whether or not one is a separatist.

The reality is that the Liberal government, far from the provinces being the ones who have destroyed or are destroying the power of the strong central government, has systematically weakened and destroyed the power of the federal government in the federation by acting unilaterally and unfairly, by withdrawing from various programs and by acting in a way to weaken its power.

It does not make any sense to demonize the provinces. It is the federal government that has been destroying its own status and its own power in the country by way of withdrawing from the partnerships it established, particularly with respect to medicare and in a variety of other ways.

We have a convergence of what I would say is the Bloc and Reform views of a more decentralized federation and a weakened federal government, with the reality being that the federal government is systematically weakening itself and converging with the reality that the provinces have to deal with the federal withdrawal from medicare, et cetera.

Provinces are saying they need some other way of dealing with this matter. They cannot continue to imagine that they are in some kind of idealistic partnership when in fact they are in no partnership at all. They are constantly subject to the unilateral actions of a federal government which does not collaborate with them. It does not co-operate with them. It does not endeavour to set up ways of dealing with these problems. They want a less conflictual federation, the kind of conflict we see all the time.

The minister thrives on this kind of conflict. I do not think he is particularly helpful in the way he deals with it. He could have

answered the questions asked of him in a much more helpful way than giving us the usual Liberal diatribe.

The social union, as I understand it, comes out of two things. It comes out of the anxiety of the premiers after the referendum of 1995 that there was no federal leadership. They needed to do at least what they could do to provide a context in which Quebecers who want to make the country work could see that others in the country wanted to make the country work.

The anxiety about lack of federal leadership continues to this day.

• (1115)

There is still a paucity of federal leadership when it comes to this file. On top of that is the fact that the federal government in its budget of 1995 virtually withdrew from the partnership it had established over the years with the provinces.

So we have these two factors which I think put the premiers on the road to Saskatoon last August. I think there is great merit in their proposals and great merit in trying to build a less conflictual confederation.

I do not think the federal government has the authority any more to unilaterally set standards in health care if it is not going to pay the tune. If the federal government is only paying 6 cents or 15 cents on the dollar, or whatever it is, depending on whose figures we believe, it just does not have it any more.

I wish the government would put the money back in, speak with authority and go back to the old system. But if the government is not going to put the money back in it cannot do it. It means that it has to sit down with the provinces and work something out instead of belabouring this with all of its tired, old rhetoric.

We have some concerns about the social union and about the motion. We still think the December 31, 1998 deadline is not helpful and not something which the chairman of the premiers supports. But we also have concerns with the Saskatoon agreement itself and I want to put those on the record. They are not insurmountable things. They are things that could disappear in the course of the negotiations between the provinces and the federal government. I hope they would.

Our particular concern is with respect to the language of opting out, with compensation, out of new or modified Canada-wide programs. There is nothing new about new. "New programs" was in Meech. "New programs" was in Charlottetown. But modified Canada-wide programs would open up the door to a situation in which at some point there could be changes to the Canada Health Act or changes to something else with respect to medicare that could allow some provinces to argue that medicare was now a modified program and, therefore, they had the right to opt out of it.

I can say, in spite of our desire to be agreeable and constructive and to see the merits of the social union and the merits of the

provincial arguments on this score, that the federal NDP will never agree to a social union which opens the door to opting out of medicare by provinces.

On the other hand, it is important to get the social union so that we do not have a situation in which provinces might decide to opt out anyway. Because at some point, if it is only 6 cents or 15 cents on the dollar, why would some provinces which feel they could afford it not say that they might as well go it alone? Then they would not have to put up with all of the rules from these guys.

This is the danger, this is the precipice that this Liberal government has led us to with respect to medicare and other programs. By so weakening the federal presence in the existing social union we now have these proposals before us which, in many ways, we would not have if we had significant, real and inspired leadership from the federal government on the unity file and in respect of maintaining a decent federal presence in these social programs. But we do not have that and so we have the situation which is before us.

Another concern that we have has to do with the status of aboriginal people in respect of the social union. There is a concern on the part of the aboriginal leadership that the fiduciary responsibility which the federal government has for aboriginal people is not dealt with in any of the social union documents that have come forward so far.

It certainly seems to me that this is something which has to be addressed in some way or another if we are to conclude an agreement at some time. At the moment the provinces and the federal government do not take this into account at all.

I asked the leader of the Reform Party why he wanted an agreement by December 31, 1998 and he said that he wanted a federal response. The motion does not say "Let us have a federal response by December 31, 1998", it says "conclude an agreement". That is not just a federal response, it is an agreement between the federal government and the provincial governments. That is why that continues to be such an unrealistic proposal.

• (1120)

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I share many of the points of view that have been expressed by the hon. member, except for the usual debate we have about the role of the Liberal government. He knows what we will answer to his critiques. We will say, as is the case, that if we take into account the tax points, the federal government cut much more from its own programs than it did in transfers to the provinces. If we had not done that, our social union would be in pretty bad shape today. We would have a huge deficit, no economic growth and so on. But I do not think this is the matter of debate today.

Supply

Today's debate is on how to improve the federation in terms of aspects that are so important to Canadians, social policies and health. As the member has said, the answer is to invent ways for governments to work together, in partnership, in a more efficient way. This needs imagination and faith. We must stop demonizing the provinces and the federal government, as well as the games of the separatists and so on. We must stop unilateral action and we must work together as much as possible. That is why we invented the CHST and that is why we have said that we will not unilaterally decide on new programs like home care or pharmacare.

My question for the hon. member is the same as the question I asked the Leader of Opposition, who did not answer it. Would he sign the proposal of the provinces as it is, or would he consider it, as the provinces are asking us to do, as a base for negotiation in order to improve the social union?

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, maybe the minister was speaking to his parliamentary secretary while I was speaking. I made it quite clear that the NDP would not sign the Saskatoon agreement as it now stands. I went into great detail about how we objected to the language of new or modified Canada-wide social programs. The first dumb question of the day. I just explained why we would not sign the Saskatoon agreement.

The minister said that they brought in the CHST in order to solve these problems. I am saying that the CHST is a form of the very unilateralism that the social union, in its best intention, is designed to overcome. We have had one unilateral action after the other, going back to the MacEachen budget of 1982, which was the first time the EPF transfers were cut unilaterally by a Liberal government. The Tories said that they would never do such a thing. Then they were elected in 1984 and the first thing Jake Epp did was unilaterally cut the—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am sorry, but I am going to unilaterally cut the member off because we have two minutes for questions and comments.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his talk. I would ask him not to get too hung up on the deadline, mainly in light of the minister's response.

The hon. member sees the resistance on the part of the government to moving forward on this at all. Our reason for putting the deadline was to try to create pressure.

The member suggested that maybe we should ask for a federal response. I know what the member is getting at, but he has seen the federal response. It is pure mush. It does not drive to a conclusion. I would ask the member to reconsider that.

Supply

The premiers added a modifying clause to the opt out clause. They added: “provided that the province or territory carries on a program or initiative that addresses the priority areas of the Canada-wide program”. The member is aware of that proviso. Did that help him at all in his objection?

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I was not saying that the motion would be better if it asked for a federal response. I was saying that when I asked the member a question about the deadline, he talked about a federal response instead of talking about the language that is actually in the motion, which is to conclude an agreement. I was not asking for a federal response; it was the member himself in responding to my question.

The modified opt out clause is not good enough for us when it comes to medicare. We entertain no notion by which it would be possible for provinces to opt out of medicare. We can see the possibility for new programs, et cetera, but we consider medicare to be beyond reproach and beyond the reach of any new arrangements with respect to the social union.

• (1125)

We would like to see the federal government do what we think it should do, which is to re-establish its credibility and its moral authority in this area by putting back at least \$2.5 billion into the federal transfers and not the piddling \$1 billion that may be called for by the finance committee. This is something that the government should do if it wants to bargain in good faith and show Canadians that it really means it when it talks about—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am sorry, but the time for questions and comments has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Mr. Speaker, once again the opposition parties are the ones raising the issue of social union in this House. It is very difficult to advance this issue federally.

Members will probably recall that the Bloc Québécois introduced a similar but more detailed motion whose intent was the same: to spur the federal government to action. Between the Bloc Québécois motion and today’s Reform motion, a meeting chaired by the Minister of Justice was held in Edmonton, if I am not mistaken, with the intergovernmental affairs ministers of all the provinces. It seems to have helped provide both sides with a clearer understanding but nothing has come of it. That is unfortunate.

This morning, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs alluded to a federal government proposal. Which proposal? I would like the minister to give us an example or two. I would like to know the status of the federal government’s proposal.

An hon. member: He should table it.

Mr. André Bachand: I cannot force him to table it; he has not put it on the record yet. If he agrees to do so, then House rules will apply and the minister will introduce his proposal in the House.

I wish the minister and the government would provide more details. There is no substance; this is an empty proposal. There are numerous concerns and the government does not seem to understand how important social union is.

It is a two-way street. Our NDP colleague who just spoke was quite reticent. He does not really understand what a social union is either.

During the Quebec election campaign, we saw that the Premier of Quebec also perhaps interpreted what he signed in his own way. He quoted only one or two paragraphs of the agreement.

I would like to hear about the famous right to opt out and have the minister read the federal proposal on opting out. What Quebec, with Premier Bouchard, understands is that opting out includes full compensation, but not obligation. The Saskatoon agreement does not say that, however. There is no automatic, universal and unquestioned right to opt out. Absolutely not.

The rules are set when a new program is created or an old one modified, and the government says to the provinces—I said this in October on the subject of the Bloc motion, and I say it again—there is the right to opt out of the administration of a program, but there is an obligation to change or establish a program in line with what was negotiated.

A system of national standards is set up, in the end. Some in Quebec will react angrily to that, naturally, but this is what is to be found in the document on social union. We can agree with that or not. However, could we have the minister’s position and a quote from his document on opting out—an important element in the respect of jurisdictions and the administrative capabilities of the provinces and regions? Could we have a bit of information?

The other element is the matter of the veto, which is not a veto. That is in the document as well, and it requires consent. If there is no consent, a veto applies. After the veto comes the right to compensation. But what is that? Could we hear from the government on that? Could we make progress on the matter of the social union?

Could we not involve the parliamentarians in this House? Would the government not agree to strike a committee comprising all parties? We could agree, first, to explain what is meant by social union and see whether we agree on the definitions. We could quickly set up an all party committee. Perhaps we have some good ideas on both sides of the House to move things forward a bit.

Supply

• (1130)

The minister could surely propose good ideas and be open to the good ideas of the opposition, and we would know what is going on.

People in every riding ask us “What is this social union?” We try to get into the specifics. We tell them “It is a document that was prepared by the provinces”. This morning, the minister told us that there is also a federal document, a federal proposal. Does such a document actually exist? Is this just rhetoric or is there really a written document? If there is such a document, could it be distributed among parliamentarians? That would be important.

As for the wording of the Reform motion, it goes without saying that we cannot disagree with the notion of social union. The Conservative Party has been discussing this issue for two years, but our approach is much more comprehensive. We talk about a social and economic union, about what we call the Canada pact.

Again, we have been discussing this issue for a long time. It was an integral part of the Conservative Party’s platform during the 1997 election campaign. We would like things to move forward a little. They do at the provincial level and they should at the federal level.

The Reform Party’s motion stems from yesterday’s election in Quebec. Yesterday, the Reform Party was preparing for action. It sent an opposition motion and then changed it. The Reform Party changed its mind. It prepared another motion on a different issue. All this is not very serious. It lacks credibility. Social union is so important. This is part of the everyday lives of Quebecers and of Canadians. Credibility and seriousness are required.

As for the December 31 deadline, unfortunately, I have my Christmas shopping to do, and I am not alone in that. It is December now. A government has just been elected in Quebec. Some outcomes will be contested, which will not change much, but still. Before a new cabinet is sworn in at Quebec City, weeks will go by. Is it not a bit irresponsible on the part of the Reform Party to propose this?

But I understand the idea. Mr. Bouchard spoke about a December 31 deadline. I understand the other provinces, but would we in this House have any credibility—at least on this side—if we said “We will put in the dates that work best”? I feel this is important.

December 31 is all very fine. The Leader of the Official Opposition told my NDP colleague “there is no point getting all caught up in dates”. Even without getting all caught up in dates, it is still important. When legislation comes into effect, like Bill C-68 on firearms, it is important. A date is a date.

I have problems with the matter of a date. I have a lot of problems as well with what possessed the Reform Party to bring into this House a less detailed proposal than that made by our Bloc Québécois colleagues in October. Being more detailed, ours forced

the government to address matters in greater detail, as we are trying to do again this morning, and to get some answers, to find out what is going on: Is the general store open or closed? Can customers enter or not? What is going on?

We do not really know what is happening with social union. What we hear from the government is “We shall see, there is no hurry, negotiations are under way”.

Today’s motion by the Reform Party is like the feel-good Barney song “I love you, you love me”. But we cannot get any details on it. I feel we could have pushed a bit harder on this.

I have great difficulty with the December 31 date. It is not credible. It could have been signed in September or perhaps in October. There was nothing from the federal government, but now it is right before the holidays, a new government has just been elected in Quebec. Give it some time. Will Mr. Facal still be Quebec’s minister of intergovernmental affairs? I think he will. Mr. Facal himself said he had had a good meeting in Edmonton. Could the government not demonstrate a bit more credibility?

I seek the unanimous consent of the House to move an amendment. It will perhaps not be along the lines of what the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs suggested this morning, but it will reflect the New Democrats’ concerns.

• (1135)

I think the Reform Party is prepared to accept this amendment. Again, it is a question of credibility, because the Parliament of Canada should not be telling the provinces to work everything out before December 31.

I seek unanimous consent to move the following amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Madawaska—Restigouche. I move:

That the words “prior to December 31, 1998” be deleted and replaced with “prior to the next federal budget”.

This is important. The provinces are worried about the next federal budget and the next throne speech. I am asking that, prior to the next federal budget, prior to the next throne speech and prior to the next cabinet shuffle, the federal government, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and the Prime Minister reach an agreement with the provinces that would then be reflected in the federal budget.

It is a minor amendment and takes nothing away from social union, the Reform Party or any other party, or the government. What we are saying is that, with the prospect of a budget of over \$140 billion that refers to transfer payments and federal-provincial relations, and a throne speech in which new programs will be announced, would it be possible to have an agreement prior to the next federal budget and throne speech? What we are proposing is

Supply

some credibility, some responsibility and some action, and we are seeking the unanimous consent of the House.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member rightly pointed out that the December 31 deadline was totally unrealistic.

Indeed, it must be remembered that it was on December 12, 1997 that the Prime Minister and the Premier of Saskatchewan convinced their counterparts to go ahead with improving the social union. The provinces came up with their own proposals in mid-June. The federal government replied in mid-July. The Premier of Quebec only got on board in early August. Without the leadership of the Premier of Quebec, things are much more complicated. Since then, an election was called in Quebec, and that also slowed things down.

We are negotiating rather intensely. I remind the hon. member that his party was in office for eight or nine years and never proposed such measures. They tried the Meech Lake accord, but I would remind him that in the throne speech of February 1996, the federal government agreed to make a move and to improve the use of its spending power more significantly than under the Meech Lake accord. We are already in the post-Meech era.

As for getting parliament involved, I quite agree, but again this is a matter of stages. Right now, negotiations are taking place between governments. There is not a single provincial government that would agree to discuss these negotiations in committee in its own legislature. Again, this is simply a matter of going step by step.

I must also point out that the provinces' proposal was not made public by the provinces, but was leaked to the media, which is very different.

Finally, I have a question for the hon. member. It is the same question I put, in vain, to the leader of the official opposition, who did not answer, and the same one I put to the NDP member, who did reply. If they were in office today, would the Progressive Conservative leader, Mr. Clark, and his party sign the provinces' proposal as it stands?

Mr. André Bachand: Mr. Speaker, I would invite the minister to reread the Progressive Conservative Party's 1997 election platform. It is very clear. In our opinion, the proposal on social union

must go much further. We are also thinking about the economic union. If the federal government were open, we could talk of social union and resolve it and talk of economic union as well.

Matters go even further. The social union under consideration also requires a number of federal departments to move. I remind you that the ministers of finance of all the provinces asked the federal government in May and June in the negotiations on social union for money and a five-year commitment.

What we are saying is that we agree with the social union as proposed. However, it must include a financial commitment from the Minister of Finance, as proposed at the time of the agreement in May and June, and must, in our opinion, also deal with the matter of economic union.

• (1140)

At the moment, Mr. Clark and the Progressive Conservative Party have no problem with social union. It is a document that warrants being translated into law, into regulations, but it suits us fine.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member of the Conservative Party to clarify the time frame contemplated with respect to social union.

The motion clearly states an agreement must be reached prior to December 31, 1998, and its purpose is to ensure that the next federal budget will not contain, as last year's budget did, initiatives like the millennium scholarships, which are not in keeping with the Saskatoon declaration.

This is the time of year when the federal budget is being prepared. The longer the time frame is, the more likely the government is to hide behind the fact that the budget is prepared ahead of time.

I would like to understand the member's position with respect to the time frame, while at the same time hoping that an agreement can be reached by the end of December. I would also like to know whether he wants the next federal budget to be in keeping with the spirit of the Saskatoon declaration, so the government does not pull another stunt like the millennium scholarships, but this time around with new initiatives in health care or in other fields.

I would like to determine whether he is making it clear to the government that it better not make another mistake like the millennium scholarships in other provincial jurisdictions.

Mr. André Bachand: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his question.

We are indeed going further. Far from being closed, the matter of the millennium scholarships is in fact on the table, as part of the negotiations on social union. In our opinion, the millennium scholarships are not in keeping with the agreement signed by Pearson and Lesage in the 1960s.

Supply

Everyone should keep the issue of social union in mind and remember that the millennium scholarships will have to be reconsidered in light of the agreement with Quebec.

Regarding the December 31 deadline, to suggest such a date before the next budget has been described as a cynical move. If an agreement is reached before the next budget, I think including it will not be a problem. If the government is committed to reaching an agreement before the next budget, it will have a potential agreement in mind while preparing its budget, as we will see in the throne speech. The throne speech may very well do a great deal of damage.

Notwithstanding all this, I agree with my colleague that the next budget must respect, if not the letter, at least the spirit of social union, the spirit of the Canadian pact.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for the opposition motion before us. I will read the motion, to make sure it is well understood:

That this House urge the government to conclude an agreement with the provinces and territories, prior to December 31, 1998, and based on the unanimous resolution of the provinces as agreed to last August 7th at Saskatoon, to strengthen the partnership between the federal, provincial and territorial governments in order to secure Canada's social programs for the future.

On November 25, 1997, the official opposition moved a motion supporting the efforts made by the provincial premiers to reform the federation with the Calgary declaration, including the seventh point of that declaration, dealing with a reform of the social union.

That motion specifically asked the federal government to promote public awareness of the Calgary declaration in Quebec and to hold consultations on this issue. I personally questioned the Prime Minister on several occasions regarding his plans to consult Quebecers, but he did not reply and he did not take any measures to that effect.

The government supported the motion, but did not take the necessary measures, thus missing a golden opportunity to make Quebecers aware of the fact that other Canadians want to reform our federation.

Then, on August 7, after intense negotiations between the provinces, in which Lucien Bouchard took part, the ten premiers and the two territorial leaders supported the resolutions for a new partnership between the two levels of government regarding the delivery of social services, including the refinancing of health care services.

• (1145)

The Prime Minister did, however, react negatively to these proposals, and his colleagues refused to act on a number of the most important points. There was not yet any concrete and tangible

progress toward reform of the federation when the Quebec election was called on October 28.

In an Angus Reid poll on November 24, conducted in Quebec for Radio-Canada, 73% of respondents said that if Premier Bouchard were re-elected, his priority should be to attempt to improve the position of Quebec within Confederation, while only 24% said he should commence to gather "winning conditions" for a referendum on sovereignty.

[*English*]

I would like to remind the government and all members of the House that we have a great opportunity to put partisan politics aside and to put Canada first.

Our motion outlines exactly what we would like the government to do, to give a response to the premiers of all the provinces that want a response before the end of the year as to whether or not the conditions outlined in the Saskatoon agreement are in line with what the government believes should be reformed in the federation for the future. It is a simple request on behalf of the official opposition. I believe that all members of the House see the value of this simple request.

In effect, when we see what happened last night in the province of Quebec, when we see the feelings that exist right across the country with regard to the way the federation functions in its current state, especially with regard to the relationship between the provincial governments and the federal government, there is a real need and desire for positive change.

The premiers have done this on two occasions, first with the Calgary declaration and now with their meeting in Saskatoon. They are urging the federal government as are we in the official opposition to either concur or give some sort of response whether or not the federal government agrees with this initiative.

We in the official opposition have said that we believe this is a positive start. These are exactly the ideas that need to be talked about when it comes to the balance of power in the country and the way relationships exist between the federal government and the provincial governments. It is obvious that sort of sentiment exists right across the country, not just in Quebec where again we see people are not happy with the status quo as we saw last night with the election results.

[*Translation*]

Finally, I would appeal to the government members, indeed all members, not to miss yet another opportunity to provide some positive leadership on the issue of the social union.

The task of this Parliament in the months ahead is to create winning conditions for all Canadians as we enter the 21st century, winning conditions for taxpayers, winning conditions for jobs,

Supply

winning conditions for health care, winning conditions for all our people regardless of their language, culture, ethnicity, station in life, or where they live in the country.

I urge all hon. members to see support of this motion as a positive step toward creating winning conditions for the new Canada of the 21st century.

[English]

Mr. Speaker, as you will hear from all my hon. colleagues, we are happy to put forward the motion. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, despite the timeline that we put within the motion and which has also been outlined by the premiers, we feel that it is very important that the government finally take some leadership on the issue. It must put forward a response to give some encouragement to the premiers for the hard work they have done in trying to reform the federation to help us take it into the 21st century.

• (1150)

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, given what the member has said, does he agree that the federal government and the provinces should certainly negotiate and try to come up with a more effective social union, but would he not agree that it should not be at the price of weakening the federal government's influence in the lives of Canadians? We have to keep the federal government strong. Would he not agree with that?

Mr. Rahim Jaffer: Mr. Speaker, I would like to entertain the hon. member's question, but because the federal government has remained so strong and many people feel that it has neglected especially the regional issues and concerns in this country, the answer is not to continue strengthening only the federal government. As the official opposition and the premiers are putting forward, it is time to look at rebalancing the powers that exist between the federal government and the provincial governments.

This might mean that we would not only just strengthen the areas of provincial jurisdiction, but at the same time strengthen the areas of jurisdiction which are solely federal. It is not just unilaterally looking at the federal government and saying we should have a strong federal government and neglect the provinces as this government has done, but looking at the way to strengthen the balance of power that exists between the provincial governments and the federal government.

We have outlined that in our new Canada act. The premiers have outlined how to do that in their deliberations. I would encourage the hon. member not just to look at it as unilaterally strengthening the federal government, but to look at how to balance that relationship as the whole country is calling out for.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member and other members in his party use health care as an example of one of the areas in which they want to balance the federation.

I have to ask again whether the member supports his party in its position that there should be the option to have a two tier health care system where the rich could pay for the health services that they want and whatever is left over, the residuals, would be left for the rest of Canadians.

Is this what he calls rebalancing the federation, by allowing the dismantling of the Canada Health Act and allowing a two tier health system, or does he have some other explanation of how he is going to balance that?

Mr. Rahim Jaffer: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the hon. Leader of the Opposition attempted to answer this question earlier in the debate and I am happy to do so once again.

It is clear that we currently have a problem in our health care system. The only ones in the House who do not want to face up to that fact are the members opposite. They have cut billions of dollars out of the transfers in health care. The only thing the official opposition has ever said with regard to health care, and I know the Leader of the Opposition reiterated it, is that we want to have access to health care for everyone within our Canadian system. We want to strengthen that. It might mean that we have to allow some flexibility under the current system.

It is just not acceptable when 1,400 doctors are going south and there are over 188,000 people on waiting lists. Obviously there is a problem. The government has neglected its commitment on transfers to health care and it is leaving no other options for the provinces to deal with that situation.

Our commitment is to a national health care system. There is no doubt about it. We should look at that system and see how we can provide health care much more effectively. If that means flexibility to some extent with the Canada Health Act, then so be it. But we need to be able to provide the same standards to everyone across the country.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if I understand the Reform Party in this motion, it is that the House of Commons of Canada should accept, without question and without any attempt to negotiate, the position of all the provinces. Is that truly the position it is putting forward?

Mr. Rahim Jaffer: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would read the motion as it stands, it says that we urge the government to conclude an agreement with the provinces and territories prior to

December 31, 1998. That does not mean to accept it in its current form. Even we as the official opposition have some concerns with the current agreement but we feel it is a positive initiative. We feel it should be entertained in this House.

• (1155)

As the premiers have asked, we should be giving the response to them by the deadline they have outlined. The government has known about this agreement for a number of months now. We cannot continue to wait. We have to act. That is what the official opposition motion deals with.

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to speak on a topic that is important to all of us, national unity. National unity takes on a special significance today given the results of yesterday's election in which a party dedicated to the break-up of our country was re-elected in the province of Quebec.

Although the Government of Quebec will attempt to say that it has been given a mandate to hold a referendum and begin the departure from Canada, I beg to differ. I believe Quebecers have made a choice of good governance and not separation. Poll after poll indicates that Quebecers do not want another referendum.

The premier of Quebec is looking for what he calls the winning conditions for separation. We must ensure that the only winning condition which exists is that of Canada. It is time that we all rise to this challenge and create the climate for winning conditions for Canada. All Canadians must work together to ensure that there is not another referendum.

The solution is a political one and parliament has a very important role to play. We must give all Quebecers and all Canadians a reason to believe in our country. We must show them that Canada can work. This is a wake-up call for the Government of Canada. It is time for it to be proactive. A Liberal government cannot take the stance it took in the last referendum.

Today in Canada there are options and ideas on the table. The official opposition has already presented the new Canada act. Today's motion contains a framework for Canada as we enter into the 21st century.

The official opposition is committed to ensure that every attempt is made to avoid the break-up of the country that we love so much. Canadians from coast to coast share the same view. We have seen the Calgary declaration garner support from almost all provinces. We have also seen the provinces make tremendous progress on the issue of the social union.

We have a rare opportunity for co-operation between provinces. We must seize this golden opportunity for a new era of federal-provincial co-operation that will benefit all Canadians.

Supply

I also feel that the Calgary declaration and the social union will give Quebecers a reason to believe in this country. The time for rhetoric and feel good statements is over. It is time for this government to act.

Let us consider what we are discussing today. The social union negotiations which are currently taking place between the federal government and its provincial counterparts are a tremendous step. First, we have seen a unanimous provincial consent on the issue of the social union. This is significant given the ideological and partisan differences which exist among our provinces. Second, the social union will afford the provinces the right to create programs tailored to their individual needs.

When we talk of social union, what exactly are we referring to? We are referring to a new system where the provinces would have greater freedom to design social programs to fit their individual character. There needs to be more federal-provincial consultation in the design of social programs and a collaborative approach to the use of federal spending powers.

Provinces should be given the ability to opt out of programs and receive compensation as long as they implement a program which addresses the specific needs. It is clear that in certain areas national standards are needed, but national standards do not necessarily mean federal standards. They need to be developed jointly with the provinces.

When disagreements do occur, a dispute settlement process is needed which is not dominated by one side. Perhaps more important, a social union is needed so that the federal government cannot unilaterally dictate standards, cut funding, and then expect the provinces to maintain these standards.

• (1200)

The provinces need to know that sufficient funds will be made available by the federal government so that programs can be effectively implemented. The social union is essential because our country is large and diverse. A central parliament cannot hope to effectively address the needs of diverse regions.

My one and a half years as an MP have reinforced my view that decentralization in key areas is the best method of dealing with our diversity. It is time that the federal government realize this and stop playing with the future of our country. The federal government has done an effective job of convincing Canadians that any sharing of powers is detrimental the well-being of our nation. We have reached a point when we must re-evaluate the manner in which we approach our deteriorating social net.

Let me draw the attention of members to what is happening in my home province of Alberta. In Alberta today we receive \$578 million less than we did in 1994 for health care. At the same time, Alberta's health care spending has risen by \$400 million largely due to an aging and increasing population and high costs of medical technology and drugs. Overall Alberta has gone from a 50:50 cost

Supply

sharing arrangement with the federal government to a situation where the federal government now funds approximately 14% and the province of Alberta spends about 86% for health, education and social assistance.

Lacking predictable funding, provinces like Alberta have been scrambling to address the long term issues that have risen in our social assistance program. Provinces now share all future risks due to rising costs, aging population and lifelong learning.

As the government assumes a lesser role in the area of social care, this void is being filled by families, individuals and communities. There are over 700 community organizations and literally thousands of dedicated volunteers delivering social services in the city of Calgary. However, despite the best efforts of these fine people there are simply not enough resources set aside for social programs.

In my home town of Calgary there is an estimated 1,000 homeless people requiring shelter. A recent attempt to provide shelter for 150 of Calgary's downtown homeless population failed largely due to costs and red tape. Many people find themselves on the outside looking in. This is not acceptable. Hence we see the desire of the provinces to create programs for their specific needs.

Again, the federal government is taking its usual slow time to respond. Therefore our motion is calling for a deadline. The Leader of the Opposition has asked the government what is the hold up. The government is not answering.

[*Translation*]

Ladies and gentlemen, it is high time we took this responsibility seriously.

[*English*]

Therefore I call on all members of the House to cast aside partisan politics and help create the winning conditions for federalism.

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker I will be sharing my time with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice.

We are given an opportunity for debating today a concept-social union. It is important to note that it is not tabula rasa. It is not a new concept. It was first used in continental Europe in the 1970s. Members can find it applied in a practical sense in countries like West Germany. One should draw a lesson from that that the attainment of a social union, which is a pragmatic term, requires institutional changes and adjustments in many levels of government. In the European case it involved bringing in three levels of government, federal, provincial and municipal, and some conse-

quential constitutional changes. It is not something that can be legislated overnight by a wave of a magic wand.

• (1205)

In Canada we have had some experience, not all of it necessarily successful, with varying conceptions of the locations of social policy making, sometimes helped by court decisions and sometimes hindered.

What I am saying is that the issue is complex and cannot be resolved in a quick snap debate and knee-jerk reaction to events in other places.

The motion before us is an official opposition motion and a very specific motion. It sets an artificial deadline of December 31, 1998. Why? It urges the conclusion of an agreement with provinces, to legislate in other words. It is also predicated on what is stated to be a unanimous resolution of provinces, although we have already had suggestions from the member for Winnipeg—Transcona intervening in this debate that while there was a consensus there was not an identity of views on all subjects.

The motion strikes one as perhaps something that was put forward in good faith by people who stayed up too late watching television and television events but could have benefited perhaps by more examination of the problem area. What we are dealing with is a process of ongoing negotiations between heads of government. It is not for strangers in the process to intervene without carefully considering what is already there.

In fact, constitutions change, federal systems can change by constitutional amendments and by great acts of legislation. But the experience is of course that those are rare events and rarely come to successful fruition unless in periods of national euphoria, the experience of other countries after a great revolution or military victory or something similar.

What worries me in this motion is that it ignores the fact that there is an ongoing process involving heads of government talking to each other in good faith and basing themselves on a reality that since the 1982 Constitution Act it is very difficult to change our Constitution by a formal amendment. To make legislation or an amendment or an agreement which presumably would have to be legislated, the be all and end all, one puts aside the very effective and pragmatic opportunities and processes for changing a federal Constitution.

What we are seeing in action is executive diplomacy being exercised between heads of government.

If one listened to the debate this morning one would see that while everybody approaches with enthusiasm the general notion of doing something new in social policy, there are wide divergencies in what should be done and how it could be done.

One heard from the leader of the third party a very strong call for constitutional changes involving the federal spending power. We heard from the member for Winnipeg—Transcona who was, I think, reflecting the views of his provincial government, not as a spokesman but simply because he is aware of them, a strong opposition by his province to opting out.

These are the crucial details, the crucial elements of a new agreement on a social union that would have to be worked out and before any formal agreement could be made. They are being worked out. There is a give and take in executive diplomacy and that is what it is all about.

That is why I come back to the basic issue that we have an ongoing process. If there is consensus at the end it can lend itself to administrative structural changes in the system of government without the need for a constitutional amendment. With a constitutional amendment if an agreement can be reached but without it with the elements of flexibility built in to accommodate different provincial positions.

We have models for that in the Pepin-Robarts report which I think the leader of the third party commented on and which was helped considerably by the intervention of Léon Dion.

• (1210)

Those particular agreements build in the possibility of a pluralistic federalism that allows different arrangements for different provinces. Would this be the conclusion of the process of discussion and negotiation on the social union now taking place? I cannot foresee that result until the negotiations come to an end.

To put it into an a priori agreement now, here are the blueprints, how are they outlined, I think would fetter and confine a process of adjustment, a process of give and take that is the lifeblood of any dynamic federal system.

My statement to this motion would be that it is premature, it interrupts an ongoing process and may hurt or delay its successful completion. I think in particular the deadline is something that puts an unnecessary time limit on it.

What I would urge this House to do is accept the spirit of the motion that we are committed in Canada, as we have been ever since 1867, to a concept of a constitution as a living tree, the words of Lord Sankey uttered much later, that a constitution is continually evolving, that executive diplomacy, the give and take of negotiations between heads of government is part of that. It introduces a degree of flexibility and an ability to meet special conditions in one province or region rather than another that formal constitutional amendments do not do.

Supply

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the points of debate raised by my colleague opposite.

In the social policy renewal initiative began in August 1995 by the premiers. There is a long series of initiatives and steps of progress that has been made in the process of social policy renewal by the provinces and territories since that time. I will not go through that. Given the hon. member's erudition he is well familiar with these.

From August 1995 to December 1998 the premiers have been beavering away in sensible, logical, well thought out steps on social policy renewal. I would like to ask the hon. member what the federal government has done to assist and to influence this process and how long the hon. member believes would be reasonable before the federal government actually comes to some conclusion in this whole process which has now been going on since at least August 1995.

Mr. Ted McWhinney: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for a very thoughtful question. It should be remembered that the federal government is only one player in this process and in the spirit of pluralistic federalism we do not seek to impose our will on the other players. We seek consensus.

One of the realities we face when we look at the provinces is personnel change. Provincial elections change, governments change their own attitudes. On this issue we could say we will adopt the Pepin-Robarts report. We will apply this sort of formula.

We would like, however, the provinces to help us on this issue. For example opting out, is this something that all provinces would accept? If it is not, why not? Is it something that some would accept and not others?

As federal players we are not seeking to impose our will. We are part of a process and we recognize that the delays, which we would regret as much as anybody, occur from the necessary democratic point of obtaining a consensus.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that answer but it does puzzle me. First of all, the member says the federal government is only one player. I remind the member again that the provinces, the other players, have been playing. They have been playing vigorously. They have been kicking the ball toward the goal post for over three years. What has the federal government been doing? What has it been doing to play in the game? Yes, it is only one player, but as far as I have seen it has not been doing much to play.

• (1215)

The member says that the provincial players keep changing. If that is a reason for not getting an agreement, we will never have an

Supply

agreement because the players keep changing in any government. Surely the people of the country deserve the players that are on the field at the time to move toward a goal.

Given whoever is playing at a particular time, what is a reasonable timeframe for social policy renewal to reach some kind of conclusion?

Mr. Ted McWhinney: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the supplementary question. It is not simply that provincial players change. It is that attitudes within provinces change.

At this time, for example, we are getting strong representations from the third level of government on issues of this sort and they are obviously part of the general negotiation. If what is involved may eventually be a constitutional amendment, it is part of the process of incorporating those views, seeing whether they are accepted or rejected.

As I say again, the federal government could develop an ideal type of what we think should be the social union, but we want to be sure the consensus is there. This debate has made very clear that as between even the parties in opposition there is no consensus as to what they mean by the social union. I will not say it is a chameleon word, but it is a word, as Dewey said, whose truth is determined operationally. When they finally get together and say we agree on this, this is the give and take. Then we can move.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party is urging the government to conclude an agreement on social union with the provinces and territories before December 31.

I am glad that the Reform Party is taking such an active interest in our social union, but I cannot support the motion. Such an important issue takes time to address. Imposing arbitrary time lines serves no one's best interest.

The government is committed to a few simple principles. We want to continue to build a stronger, more compassionate and prosperous Canada. We want to improve the quality of life for all Canadians. Also we as parliamentarians want to leave a legacy for our children and our youth.

There is no magic formula to accomplish this. There are no simple solutions. Anyone who says that there are is either naive in my opinion or trying to pull a fast one.

Positive change requires concerted effort on a wide variety of fronts. It demands the good will and co-operation of all levels of government as well as the citizens of the country. Perhaps most of all it requires the right attitude. We need to focus on what we can accomplish together. We need to be willing to share our strengths and help each other to overcome our weaknesses.

That is the kind of attitude the government brings to policy making. That is the kind of attitude that will help launch Canada confidently into the 21st century.

The Government of Canada has worked very hard over the last five years to renew federalism. It will continue to do so in the months and years to come, because no healthy system is ever static. We have a vibrant democracy and robust institutions. It is only natural that they would grow and develop over time.

The Reform Party's motion raises some issues that are dear to Canadians. In many respects our social programs reflect the heart of the country. They speak to what we stand for as Canadians. As Canada changes, they need to evolve, but this evolution must follow a reasoned and positive direction. We are talking about programs and institutions that are crucial to the citizens of the country and crucial to our children and grandchildren.

I do not know why the Reform Party seems to be so anxious to rush forward. Negotiations are still under way. While the government is confident that a good framework will be developed, we recognize that these things take time. If we were to support the motion, I believe the House would not be acting responsibly and in the best interest of Canadians.

These negotiations give a good indication of the type of activity we are seeing throughout the government these days. There is a great deal of positive work being done to reform the federation and build a better Canada. I relish the opportunity to discuss this issue.

• (1220)

[*Translation*]

There is a multitude of reasons why the Canadian federation works. I could list the federal programs and initiatives that have served Quebec, Alberta, British Columbia as well other parts of the country. Every federal government department would be on the list, and the lives of all Canadians and Quebecers like me would be affected by the activities listed.

Substantial progress has been made on a number of issues. We are withdrawing from mining, logging and tourism. We have launched measures to stimulate job creation through the Canada infrastructure works program. And work will continue as part of the national children's agenda.

There are members of this House who will no doubt continue to maintain that Canada does not work. They claim that the Canadian federation lacks flexibility and that the true aspirations of the provinces can never be achieved in such a restrictive system. If a framework agreement on social union is not signed within a month, they will say it is further proof of the fact that Canada does not work.

I do not share that opinion. I think that the majority of Canadians do not share it either. Therefore, I cannot support this motion. I find it rather ironic that the Reform Party and the Bloc Quebecois stand on the same side of this issue with respect to this motion.

[*English*]

Certainly the rest of the world is trying to figure out the secret of our prosperity. Other countries are looking at Canada and asking themselves how they can achieve that level of success.

I will spend some time talking about that reaction. There is a great deal we take for granted in the country. We sometimes forget just what we have accomplished together. That is not despite our differences but rather because of our differences. They have forced us to become creative and conciliatory. Our willingness to embrace both French and English, to celebrate our aboriginal heritage and to welcome cultures from around the world have made Canada the success story it is today.

I should like to talk a little about the government's agenda. We hear about the need for change. There has been change, something that the opposition neglects, and a lot of it. Perhaps it is time Canadians knew about it.

My colleagues have already addressed the economic successes we have seen recently. I will not delve too deeply into that area. Suffice to say we have a budget surplus of \$3.5 billion, the first surplus in more than a generation. That is a remarkable \$45.5 billion swing in just four years from the \$42 billion deficit we inherited from our predecessors in 1993.

The finance minister's balanced fiscal and economic plan has created a Canadian economic foundation that is among the most fundamentally strong and dynamic in the world.

I will now turn to the social policy side of the government's accomplishments. What has the government done in the last five years, Canadians may ask themselves.

[*Translation*]

Our social safety net is a source of great pride in Canada. It is the essence of the values we share. Guaranteeing the continuance of our health and social programs is the priority of Canadians and of their governments. Our health care system and other elements of our social safety net are the envy of the world. They point very simply to the principles of mutual help and common interest underlying our federation and our social union. They testify to Canadians' commitment to a shared sense of responsibility for each other and toward the common good.

There are voices saying it is perhaps time to begin dismantling the system or, better yet, to privatize everything. I think that the federal government and its provincial partners must continue to work together on this and find new ways to meet the needs of Canadians.

Supply

[*English*]

There have been several initiatives recently which illustrate what I am talking about. The national child benefit was introduced to reduce and prevent child poverty and to assist parents of low income families in either moving from welfare to work or staying employed.

• (1225)

There is also the community action program for children which recognizes that communities are best positioned to address the needs of young Canadians. It builds on community strength by funding neighbourhood groups that deliver services to children at risk.

There are nearly 400 CAPC projects in over 300 urban, rural and remote communities across Canada. Every week almost 29,000 children and 27,000 parents and caregivers visit these projects. I would like to think those are 29,000 children whose lives are just a little better.

A variety of health related activities have been developed over the past few years. Health Canada, for example, provides funding for five centres of excellence for women's health in Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver. These centres are dedicated to improving the health of Canadian women by enhancing the health system's understanding of and responsiveness to women's health issues. In a similar vein the government is funding a variety of research initiatives. In June the federal government announced its renewed support for breast cancer research.

The government is confident that we will negotiate a framework agreement that is good for all Canadians. Such an agreement would promote equality of opportunity for all Canadians wherever they live or move in the country. It would also strengthen the partnership among governments in order to serve Canadians better. Is this not the legacy we want to leave our children and our youth?

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government seems to be hedging on the fact that it supports this agreement in principle or that it supports the concept of social union. When does the government see itself as coming to some conclusion with respect to the talks with the premiers?

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos: Mr. Speaker, unlike the opposition member we will not set an artificial deadline for negotiations. Negotiations are ongoing. We have shown flexibility and openness.

We intend to work in collaboration with the provinces to arrive at a social union that is the best social union in the world, as we have worked toward assuring Canada is the best country in the world. We will not put an artificial deadline on such important negotiations.

Supply

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the hon. member. The member said in her response that Canada was a great country. She said the usual Liberal things: feel happy, feel good and everything is going great.

A United Nations committee came here and blasted us on child poverty. In my speech I said that there are over 1,000 homeless people in Calgary. StatsCan said today that taxes were so high the disposable income of Canadians is getting lower and lower. How can she talk about a feel good approach with everything that is going on? Does she not read all these things? What would be her response to that?

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos: Mr. Speaker, I would welcome the occasion to repeat what I said in my speech about the different initiatives undertaken by the government, but I will not repeat it because I am sure most Canadians listened to what I said.

In terms of the United Nations index, the member may not know that for five years in a row Canada has been chosen as the best country in the world. No one is saying that we have no poverty. No one is saying that there are not problems. However, the difference between this side of the House and the other side of the House is that we look for solutions to problems. We do not criticize; we look for solutions. We have proven that we have given solutions to Canadians. We have proven that we have solutions to address most of the problems of the world.

The United Nations human development index indicated that the Australians, the Americans and the French regard Canada as the country they would most like to live in. I am very proud of the government's record and I see a legacy for our children. We look for solutions that are in collaboration and in consultation with our provincial and territorial partners.

• (1230)

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to address today's motion.

[*Translation*]

This motion calls for a social union with co-operation between the Government of Canada and the provinces. There is unanimity in this area—with the provinces, with the territories, with medical groups, with nurses' groups and with the opposition. Unanimity is not easily achieved in a country like Canada. It is hard to find unanimity.

In matters of health care, unanimity is necessary and possible.

[*English*]

I would like to approach the motion in as positive and constructive fashion as I can. The social union the provinces have called for relates strictly to the reason I came to the House of Commons, and

that is for a health care system that is better than the one we had when I left my practice.

I would like to summarize why the provinces are so vociferous on this issue. This is not being done in a critical sense but in a factual sense.

In 1993 the federal government spent \$18.7 billion on social transfers directed to the provinces. For reasons that most Canadians understand, it decided to drop those transfer payments to \$11.1 billion, a drop of \$7.6 billion. The government did it unilaterally. There was no consultation, no agreement. That action on the most important social program in Canada precipitated a series of events which has led us to the point where the provinces from every political stripe are all united in calling for a social union that will never allow that to happen again.

There could never be a unilateral action of that kind if a social union were entered into. I have listened over and over again to my Liberal colleagues say that there is in fact a very important program, health care, and they are bound and determined to support it. This would be a mechanism where they could do more than just talk.

There is another thing that has made the provinces so unanimous on this issue. I will give an example that does not relate to health care but is about welfare in British Columbia. B.C. set up some residency requirements after the cuts for social assistance took place. The federal response was to fine the B.C. government. It took away transfer payments, even more for social assistance. There was no dispute mechanism, no interchange of information. The federal fist was slammed down and that was the end of the discussion.

That is the reason today there is unanimous provincial agreement for a social union. It is hard to imagine how the provinces could be more unanimous. Who else is unanimous on these issues? Medical colleagues throughout the country are unanimous. Why? Some of our best nurses are leaving their profession. They are not just leaving the country but they are leaving the profession because they cannot stand the workload they now have. The cuts have gone through the system so deeply that they cannot stand the workload they have.

An hon. member: You asked for it.

Mr. Grant Hill: I hear from across the way that is a provincial responsibility. It is selective vision.

There is outdated equipment. We have 1.1 MRI per 100,000 people in Canada. Germany has 3.4 MRI per 100,000 people. Why should two countries that are so similar in terms of economic capabilities have such a difference? There is outdated equipment due to those cutbacks.

• (1235)

[*Translation*]

There has been a drop in the level of confidence in Canada. In 1993, 55% of Canadians considered the health care system excellent or very good. Today, in 1998, only 29% of Canadians find the system excellent or very good. Why? Waiting lists are an obvious problem for doctors, for patients and for nurses. What a shame.

According to a study done for the CMA by the Angus Reid group for the past three years, Canadians feel access to certain health care services has become more restricted.

[*English*]

Why would the federal government care about that? Why would the Liberal members care about that? It is because they themselves will get ill. They themselves will find themselves on waiting lists. They themselves will have grandparents or children left in the cold.

The provinces are asking for something that is fairly straightforward and fairly simple. They are asking for the federal government to never ever take funds from health care unilaterally. If there is a disagreement on the Canada Health Act, if there is a disagreement in the way the Canada Health Act is being implemented, they are asking that there be a dispute settlement mechanism, that there be a tribunal that would sit down and say "Here is one perspective. Here is another. What is good for the patient?"

I always try to put comments about health care in a personal vein and I will do that today. A patient wrote a letter to me not so long ago, a woman from Ontario who was diagnosed with breast cancer. She was told that she needed to have a procedure very quickly and then chemotherapy to follow. She was sent to the specialist. He did a biopsy and sure enough the cancer was worse than it was originally thought. The procedure needed to be done quickly. She was booked for surgery in two weeks and that was considered to be quite reasonable and normal. When the date came the surgery had to be put off. There were not enough nurses for the surgery. It was put off for another two weeks. When that day came, the surgery was done. Then her chemotherapy, which should have been started almost immediately, had to be put off for three months.

The fear, the concern, the worry. That is what the provinces are asking for. It is not for some political juggling match. It is simply to provide the care for that most important social program to that woman with breast cancer who had needs that were not met here in Canada.

I hear the comment about having the Reform Party admit that it wants two tier medicine. The Reform Party does not want two tier medicine. What we want is care for patients that is timely, that is available, that is modern and which keeps people healthy.

Supply

All throughout the world people are grappling with these problems. Most countries seem to put health care as the highest priority, not just in terms of hyperbole, not just in terms of rhetoric, but in terms of practicality.

The social union is moving positively toward that end. Does it have to happen in 30 days? I have listened to my colleagues say that is too quick. Then I say, set a Liberal date. Do not listen to a Reform date. Set a Liberal date. We will be happy to be able to say there is progress being made. But as of now the provinces are asking where the progress is. We will push hard for that progress to be made for one reason, for health care for Canadians, for the patients.

• (1240)

Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Brampton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a short question for the hon. member from the Reform Party.

The member says the deadline is December 31. Let us assume that everybody agrees on the deadline and we pass the motion. What happens if we do not meet the deadline? Are we going to come back on January 1 and ask for a deadline of January 31 and so on and so forth for the next year? These deadlines are artificial. We do our best and they do their best to make sure the country works. A deadline does not work. If it is not complied with or the agreement is not reached by the deadline, then a second deadline is necessary and there could be no end in sight.

Commitments should be made and we have to work together to improve the federation. That is the commitment we should make rather than to stick to a deadline which is not realistic.

Mr. Grant Hill: Mr. Speaker, I understand why the member might be hesitant to face a deadline and that is a valid point. Our question is what is the Liberal timeframe? We have seen very little progress on this issue.

The perfect time to have entered into a social union surely would have been prior to the Quebec election. What a powerful tool. What a baseball bat to have driven separatist thoughts lower on the agenda. There may be good reasons for not meeting that deadline. I am perfectly willing to listen to a Liberal timetable. This is trying to drive the agenda toward completion. If December 31 is too quick, I am listening and would like to know, when?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are relatively favourable to today's Reform Party motion. It is similar, if not identical, in purpose to the motion we moved in October, urging the federal government to speed up negotiations on social union, given that the premiers had come out with a statement in August in this regard.

What we get out of the Reform Party motion is that more haste is required. As our leader reiterated this morning, this is an issue that

Supply

has been around for a long time. Reformers have rarely mentioned it. For 50 years now, Quebec has been calling on the federal government to respect the areas of provincial jurisdiction set out in the Constitution, such as health and the social sector, but to no avail. The federal government has used its spending authority to interfere in provincial jurisdictions and, in recent years, in order to eliminate its own deficit, it has slashed transfer payments to the provinces, with the results mentioned by the member.

Would the Reform Party member agree with Quebec's demand that there should be a right to opt out of new programs in this sector with full financial compensation?

Mr. Grant Hill: Mr. Speaker, for me it is not a partisan issue but an issue that concerns all Canadians.

I want unanimity for social programs in Canada and, in the case of health care, an agreement is necessary for all Canadians. Personally, I do not like the Bloc Quebecois proposals, but the social union is not a political issue, it is an issue that concerns all Canadians. This is why I am presenting my position in the House today.

[*English*]

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to the Reform supply day motion. It has an essential role to articulate to the people of Quebec and the rest of Canada what we plan on doing to strengthen this country, to strengthen social programs for all Canadians. I compliment the member for South Surrey—White Rock—Langley for her leadership on this issue.

• (1245)

[*Translation*]

The Canadian federation is not only based on constitutional principles. Indeed, our country primarily strives to help those who are less fortunate and to provide them with the necessary support.

The federal government definitely has the financial resources to ease the plight of the poor. We all remember how Canadians got together to help their Quebec friends when they had to deal with floods, in the past.

This definitely shows that, when some real disaster occurs, we Canadians help each other. Canadians are once again displaying their fundamental qualities to promote the social union.

[*English*]

The social union is integral for the future of Canada and for the future of Canadians. As my colleague for Macleod just mentioned, it speaks to a stronger partnership which Canadians hold dear to their hearts and which is critically important for the health and

welfare of Canadians. It speaks to the saving of our social programs, in particular health care, education and welfare.

The Government of Canada has a fiduciary responsibility to work with the provinces in these areas, and yet what we have seen is the destruction of these programs. These programs have been gutted from within. As a result, people who work in these areas are hanging on by their fingernails. Indeed, the Canadians who are supposed to benefit from these programs, particularly health care and education, are suffering. As we all know, health care and education are being destroyed.

If the government wants to hide behind the Canada Health Act and say that Canadians are receiving health care when they need it, it is either not telling the truth or it has its head stuck far into the sand. The cold hard reality is that Canadians are not getting health care when they need it. The Canada Health Act is being violated in four of its five principles. As a result, Canadians needing treatment for cancer, or urgent medical care for heart operations, down to the most mundane operations, are waiting. While they wait they suffer and their families suffer.

For the last few years the government has been content to sit on its hands and say that the status quo is acceptable. It acknowledges that there is a problem, but it has not put forth any constructive solution. Instead it has pointed its finger at us in a derogatory way, saying that we want to destroy these ideals. If we wanted to do that we would not have put forth this motion to save our social programs: health care, education and the supplemental income required by people who lose their jobs through no fault of their own.

Reform wants to save these social programs and put them on sound fiscal footing within the resources we have available to us. We have to speak practically about this. We are willing to introduce in this House a solution that involves asking the federal government and the provinces to work together to ensure that the feds do what the feds do best and the provinces do what the provinces do best. Is there agreement on this? Indeed there is.

The vast majority of premiers have asked, have pleaded, have begged the federal government to engage in a discussion with them so that in the 21st century we will have social programs that will benefit all Canadians, that will be there for all Canadians in their time of need and will be on sound fiscal footing. That is the essence of this motion.

• (1250)

We also do it from the point of cost. Having the provinces and the federal government doing the same thing is patently idiotic. It is duplication. The left hand does know what the right hand is doing and it is a waste of taxpayers' money. Why do we not let the feds do what the feds do best and let the provinces do what the provinces do best?

Supply

It would also benefit national unity because we would then see a willingness on the part of the Government of Canada to work with all of the provinces, from British Columbia to Newfoundland, and the territories to ensure that these social programs are sustainable.

Let us look at Quebec the day after the election. The Quebec people have clearly said that at this point in time they do not want a referendum. They want strong social programs, a strong economy, lower taxes and a better future for themselves and their children. That is what Canadians from coast to coast want.

Despite the best efforts of everybody inside and outside this House, the federalist message does not get to the people of Quebec outside of those in Montreal. Les gens du Québec outside Montreal, in Chibougamau and other cities, do not hear the federalist message because the issue of national unity has taken place between the political and intellectual elites of this country. This message does not penetrate the barriers that exist within the francophone, separatist-leaning media in Quebec and does not get to the French-speaking people of Quebec.

One only has to travel outside Montreal to see that the people live in an information vacuum when it comes to federalist solutions. They live in a bubble into which the rhetoric of separatist politicians is continually introduced.

The truth of what the federalists are proposing, the love that Canadians have for Quebec under the umbrella of equality for all, does not get through. Because that message does not get through the people of Quebec are left with a biased and warped view of what happens outside Canada. I would also argue that what happens within Quebec is not as well known as it should be outside its borders.

If we are going to keep this country together we have to engage in communication between the people of Quebec and the rest of Canada, between the rank and file people in the trenches, on the ground and in their homes, people to people, not between politicians or intellectuals in university.

While the message in yesterday's election says that Quebecers do not want a referendum at this point in time, it clearly did not say they do not want a referendum at all. I would argue that what is going to happen is that the people of Quebec are going to wait until their health and welfare is improved through the Government of Quebec and when they are on stable footing then they will look for a referendum.

We have a narrow window of opportunity. The federal government must meet with the people of Quebec in the trenches, eyeball to eyeball.

There was a large meeting in Montreal of Canadians from coast to coast asking the people of Quebec to vote no in the last

referendum. Why did the French-speaking separatist politicians hate that so much? Because it bypassed their power and their control. It got a strong federalist message directly to the people.

Some may argue that is what tipped the balance in favour of the no vote. That is possible. Therein lies a lesson. With back and forth communication between people we will have a chance to keep this country together. If we fail to do that we will certainly be looking at another referendum, again putting Canada at the precipice of a breakup.

• (1255)

Ms. Louise Hardy (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, traditionally the people in the territories, who are the poorest and most vulnerable in this country, have depended on a strong federal presence to equalize their standard of living and their place in the country.

I am really concerned about the member's motion because it has excluded the first nations people of this country from participating in a social union. I would like to know why the member did that because, as far as being vulnerable goes, these people are the most vulnerable. The first nations people are the poorest, they have the highest health risks and the poorest housing conditions. I would like the member to explain that exclusion.

Mr. Keith Martin: Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. This motion explicitly asks for Canadians from coast to coast to be involved. The last time I checked, the aboriginal people of Canada are Canadians.

I draw the attention of the hon. member to the work of the members for Skeena, Wild Rose and others in the Reform Party who have been asking for input from aboriginal people. In fact, these members have held meetings with aboriginal people, asking them what we can do to help. Over 100 aboriginal people have attended each of these meetings.

For the first time, many of these grassroots aboriginals—not the chiefs, not their political leaders, but grassroots aboriginals—are saying thank you to the Reform Party for helping them to get their message out in the House of Commons.

The grassroots aboriginal people have not been heard on this issue. As the member acknowledged, and I know she has worked very hard on this issue, they suffer the worst possible socio-economic conditions in this country. Members of my party have been working very hard to ensure that their message is heard loud and clear.

Over \$8 billion is put into aboriginal affairs. However, it has been argued that only \$1 out of every \$20 gets to the people on the ground. That is appalling. There have been accusations by aboriginal people of the misappropriation of funds by aboriginal leaders. However, when they ask questions, they get the cold shoulder. The

Supply

first nations are abused, not only by the system which non-aboriginals created, but also by their own people.

I would argue that what the government needs to do and what the minister of Indian affairs needs to do is listen to the grassroots aboriginal people.

The minister came to my riding. Aboriginal people from the Pacheenaht reserve, Becher Bay and elsewhere have been asking the minister for years for answers on where the moneys are going and expressing their concerns about abuses on the reserve. The minister met with the political leaders, but did not speak to the people putting forth the accusations, one of whom was the hereditary chief of a band. It was embarrassing.

I plead with the minister to listen to these aboriginal people and not to wave off what they are saying because of what she has heard from their leaders. The minister should work with the aboriginals to solve their appalling conditions. The first nations should be given the tools they need to provide for themselves.

The aboriginal people do not want separation. The grassroots people do not want the political nirvana of separate statehood or nationhood, but they do want health care, jobs, education and a safer future for themselves and their children.

Hon. David Kilgour (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is a doctor and a member of parliament. I think it is correct that about \$80 billion is being spent on health care from various sources across the country and about \$250 million is being spent on medical research.

How much stress would the hon. member put on increasing assistance to medical research to help the health care system generally?

Mr. Keith Martin: Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. secretary of state has done a tremendous amount of work in providing constructive solutions to the health care field. He has written some very eloquent articles on this issue which many of us have read with great admiration.

I think that we have to proportion our resources in research on the basis of mortality, morbidity and the effect on the patient and their families. I compliment the government for putting more money into research in the last budget. It is something that is long overdue and the government needs to be commended for that.

However, I think there are some novel ways in which we can get more money into the research areas. Perhaps one way of doing that is to ensure tax exemptions and tax cuts for people who wish to invest in research facilities. They can use that as a tax write-off. But also moneys can be used within the system to do more research into prevention. What we tend to focus on is dealing with the problems. I draw the attention of the House to the head start motion

that was passed in the House in May 1998, my private member's motion, that dealt with prevention in crime and with the basics of children in the first eight years. If we adopted that motion and dealt with those solutions we could save a lot of people's lives and a lot of money across the country.

• (1300)

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Waterloo—Wellington.

I am pleased to rise on this very important issue but puzzled as to how we have arrived at this moment in our history where we are debating a motion that would arbitrarily and artificially impose a deadline on negotiations that are currently going on across the country.

I listened to the previous speaker and I have listened to him on many occasions and heard thoughtful comments in this place from that member of the Reform Party. I see the member for Calgary East who I know does not always agree with his party's positions, particularly some of the more extreme ones. I heard the member for Macleod, the health critic, talk in terms of his party's not wanting two tier health care and various other things he was denouncing.

It has occurred to me as I listen to this debate that this whole thing is about double standards. I want to share with the House a couple of comments, and this is a direct quote, which would seem to run in the face of the comments by the member for Macleod when he said the Reform Party is not advocating a two tier health system. This relates very clearly to the social union negotiations that were going on.

The leader of the Reform Party to the Saskatoon Business Association on April 2, 1995 said: "We want to amend those sections of the act", the Canada Health Act, "that deny the provinces the flexibility to require some Canadians to pay at least a portion of their own health care costs".

How would members interpret that in any way other than two tier health care? I find it a complete contradiction in terms, a denial of his own leader's recorded statements, when the health critic for the Reform Party stands here urging the government to move ahead unilaterally on an issue that would clearly impact the delivery of health care and he is denying his leader actually said this by claiming that the Reform Party is not in support of dismantling the Canada Health Act and establishing a two tier health system.

On February 23, 1998 the member for Vancouver North said: "I had to go into a hospital in Florida. It really put a shame to what happens in my riding in North Vancouver with socialist medicine. I do not think there is any harm in having some competition".

Once again it is a matter quite clearly of the words not matching the music, of saying one thing and believing another. I see that the

health critic is here and I want him to know that I believe he cares about Canadians' health. He is a medical doctor. I believe he has serious concerns. But I do not understand how he reconciles the difference between the statements made.

How he reconciles these double standards is a problem that the Reform Party in my view must wrestle with in its caucus meetings. It must be fascinating to be a fly on the wall to listen to "on the one hand we want to do it this way, but on the other hand we think we can sell it better if we announce it another way".

• (1305)

Frankly, that is what we are seeing here with the issue of putting some kind of arbitrary deadline. All members in this place want to see a deal done on behalf of all Canadians that makes Canada work.

I believe even members of the Reform Party believe that all members who were sent here as federal politicians, anyone who comes here with a federal interest in making this federation work, want to see some kind of a deal structure. There may be exceptions with Bloc Quebecois members obviously who were sent here more as regional or provincial politicians.

I recall very clearly that I was unable to go to Montreal when the big rally took place at the last minute during the referendum. My wife, a member of council, and a number of her colleagues went on a bus and a number of people from my riding went.

They told me what an incredibly moving experience that was. Yet the Reform Party, instead of joining hands with Canadians in Montreal, worked against not only us but against this entire nation. It ran a deficit in its own budget. It went over its own budget. It spent money it did not have which again points out a double standard to try to destroy the Charlottetown accord. I think it succeeded in doing that.

During one of the parliamentary recesses, when we are getting messages from around the world about the financial stability of this country, we saw the leader of the Reform Party at a speech somewhere in Asia totally tearing down the social and economic fabric of Canada. This is someone who would purport to be a prime minister. This is outrageous.

I want to share with members a couple of quotes that came about as a result of the events last evening in the province of Quebec. We all know what we saw in the province of Quebec last night was a clear message. It was a message from the people of Quebec to the separatists that they do not want a referendum.

I say that to my colleagues in the Bloc. It is a clear message. They do not want a referendum. I did not see anybody strutting around. I watched the news. I did not see great yelling and cheering at the supposed victory parties.

Supply

In fact, what I saw was puzzlement from the separatists who said "We thought Quebecers really wanted a referendum and they really wanted to separate. Maybe the don't". What they really want is government to get on with the job. In a vast majority, if someone looks at the numbers, 55% of the people in the province of Quebec last evening voted against the PQ. That is a pretty clear message.

I want to share a couple of quotes. The first one I want to share is a quote from the provincial premier who happens to be the chair of the provincial premiers as they meet this year. It is interesting that next year's chair will be newly elected, re-elected Premier Bouchard.

This year's chair, Premier Roy Romanow, said in talking about the election:

I think what it means is that the task ahead of us is to, if I may use a little bit of play on Premier Bouchard's campaign slogan, winning conditions for referendum, for me the focus now is winning conditions for Canada. And the first order of business is the social union, negotiating it as quickly as we can. Not under any artificial deadlines or timetables. Doing it with dispatch, doing it with determination. The Prime Minister wants to do it, his ministers want to do it. The premiers want to do it. Premier Bouchard signed on, here in Saskatoon in August, to the bargaining position. I underline those words, the bargaining position of the provinces and the territorial governments.

Premier Tobin stated:

What we've had here is the people of the province of Quebec engage in election and elect their government for the next four years. We haven't had tonight, based on this result, in my mind, something more than that. On the question of social union, and the negotiation that's ongoing, I think that's something that we'll get back to early in the new year without artificial deadlines.

• (1310)

Why would we wind up today in the House of Commons with a resolution? The opposition is continually hammering the government for, in its words, being heavy handed. Should we ignore the negotiations that are going on very well at the table as we speak and impose some artificial deadline whether it is a Reform one or, as the member for Macleod says, a Liberal one? That is absolute nonsense and it is not the way to negotiate a social union contract for the betterment of the country.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my Liberal colleague if there is a commitment by his government to actually bring this discussion, this initiative by the premiers, to some conclusion. It has been ongoing for a year. There has been no real indication from the federal government that it will reach a conclusion.

Is there a commitment from the Liberal government to actually sign a document at some time down the road?

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question and a responsible position to take. I would hope there is a commitment that our government is negotiating. I know the Prime Minister is interested in seeing a deal done. The House has heard the quotes I shared from Premier Romanow and from Premier

Supply

Tobin. I know there is a serious desire to see a social union contract put in place which protects medicare, which ensures that proper transfer payments flow and at the same time protects a strong position for the federal government to have a role in leading policy.

We will not be neutered the way the Reform Party would see us neutered. We will stand strong as nationally elected politicians in this place and for all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's compilation of yesterday's election results is a rather odd one.

In discussing social union, he referred to the Meech Lake Accord. As a Quebecker, I remember that the present Prime Minister, then leader of the Liberal Party but without a seat in the House, played a very specific role in the failure of Meech, with the complicity of then Newfoundland Premier Clyde Wells. Today he gets all worked up about those who were responsible for the failure of Meech. He ought to look back at that.

Returning to social union, these are demands that go back 50 years, in Quebec and in the other provinces as well. It is also in part the outcome of the federal government's cuts to transfer payments to the provinces, of its brutal cuts to health care. They are what has triggered this discussion, since the other provinces were forced to make cuts to health care, to the hospitals. That is what they have been pushed to.

I hope the federal government understands the urgency for remedying the situation by restoring transfer payments as promptly as possible, in the next budget, for health care in particular, but also for education and social assistance.

I would like to know my hon. colleague's opinion on this matter, that is on the money the federal government has cut from the provinces in these areas.

[*English*]

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I on behalf of my constituents in Mississauga West, a primarily anglophone community but officially bilingual and we try our best even though I am not quite there yet, I want to say to the people of Quebec thank you for sending a clear message to the separatists both in this place and in Quebec City. I thank the people for giving the clear strong message that we want to get on with the next four years of governing.

• (1315)

Yes, we want to negotiate a social union contract. Yes, we need to deal with transfer payments that impact on health care in the province of Quebec, in the province of Ontario and right across the

land. Yes, the government has a clear responsibility to ensure that we redistribute the income and wealth in Canada so the provinces which have traditionally been called have not provinces will not suffer.

With the economic strength in provinces like Quebec, Ontario, Alberta and B.C. we can help our brothers and sisters everywhere else in Canada which also has its own individual economic strengths and benefits.

It is all about building a team, a team called Canada. I believe we can do it. After last night I believe we can do it with Quebec as part of Canada.

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the current negotiations on the social union. This is a very important issue. These negotiations give us the opportunity to improve Canada's social and health policies.

Discussions are presently being undertaken at all levels of government in Canada in the hopes of making improvements to the social union for our country. These governments are attempting to find the best way for governments to help and serve Canadians.

While there are elements of the motion that are difficult to understand and certainly impossible to support, the motion provides us with a valuable opportunity to debate important new initiatives started by our government to strengthen federalism and to make the country work more efficiently for the benefit of all Canadians.

These negotiations are an important opportunity for Canada to improve the social and health policies that mean so much to all Canadians wherever they may live. All governments in Canada are currently involved in negotiations on how to improve Canada's social union. They are trying to design the best approach for helping governments to help Canadians.

What we call the social union most Canadians know through their direct experiences in their communities. Over the years we have learned to take for granted that wherever we live in Canada quality health care is available when we get sick. Young people can count on first rate education. Those who have lost their jobs or who have been hit by bad times are able to get the help they need. Pensions and benefits are available to secure quality of life in old age. These programs and services are the social union.

[*Translation*]

The concept of social union focuses on the Canada-wide nature of these programs and services, as well as the importance of providing all Canadians regardless of where they live in the country, or where they travel to, an equal opportunity to benefit from the programs that meet their fundamental needs.

Supply

[English]

Perhaps more important, the concept of social union captures our commitment to one another, our understanding that we are stronger together and that as Canadians we help each other wherever the need may be. We are always willing to help.

The current negotiations are tackling some difficult issues, but it is important to keep in mind that we already have one of the best social systems in the world. It is to ensure we can improve this quality of life that all governments are committed to succeeding in the negotiations.

The negotiations were launched by the Prime Minister and Canada's premiers at the first ministers' meeting on December 11 and December 12, 1997. At that time first ministers agreed that each jurisdiction would appoint a minister to negotiate a new social partnership to help improve decision making and delivery of social and health policies. While this may seem like a long process these issues are important for Canada and for all Canadians. We must take the time necessary to get it right and the time necessary to succeed.

We have tried not to allow the process to become political. That is why all governments have agreed not to negotiate through the media where too often positions become rigid and exaggerated and the focus is on power and conflict. These negotiations are and must be focused on what is right for Canadians.

I will provide the House with a sense of our current social union, with a sense of why the government believes we must improve it, and with a sense of what we are trying to achieve through those negotiations.

Most of us take for granted the advantages we receive from the social programs put in place throughout the country. The network of social benefits that permits us to have our high level of living is relatively new. It was established only after the second world war when the depression was still fresh in our collective minds.

• (1320)

Old age pension plans, employment insurance, student loans and health insurance were all founded within the last 50 years with the collaboration of all levels of government in Canada through debate, dialogue, disagreement and ultimately compromise.

The history of the social union is a remarkable story of creativity and mutual respect. It is a story of the commitment of generations of Canadians to caring for one another and to accommodating our differences as we pursue our common purpose. Most impressive has been our ability simultaneously to achieve Canada-wide initiatives while enhancing the freedom of provinces to act for their residents.

The commitment to improve is particularly important now because Canada like all countries in the world faces tremendous challenges. As the baby boomers begin to enter the retirement years our aging population will put real strains on our pension, health care and social systems. Within 20 years the number of Canadians over 65 will increase by 50%. With no change in the system in almost 30 years fully one-third of the federal budget will be needed to be spent on seniors pensions.

Federal and provincial governments after consultations with Canadians have already taken steps to ensure the Canada pension plan. With globalization and the emerging information economy we will need more than ever a literate technologically skilled and mobile labour force. Our social programs must adapt to the changing labour market and new directions in the nature and organization of work. Our youth are entering a labour market that is very difficult and different from the one we knew. We must equip them with skills and information they require and need, and the freedom to pursue opportunities wherever they arise.

We must ensure for all Canadians access to learning and unfettered mobility. We have more to do for Canadian children to ensure that they are ready to learn and have the fair start necessary to participate fully in Canada's economic and social opportunities. Each Canadian must have access to the opportunities afforded them by all for all of Canada.

All governments have had to take tough measures to balance their budgets and thereby increase our flexibility for the future and our resiliency in the face of global forces. This has put a premium on efficiency and on making sure that governments do not duplicate one another. We share risks and resources and we learn from one another. We can and we must work together and make it better for Canadians.

Given the value we attach to our social and health programs, given our contribution to our quality of life and given the challenges before us, governments are working together to set out the basis for an even stronger partnership, a new social union framework. The negotiations on the new framework provide an opportunity to strengthen our co-operation for the benefit of all Canadians. To do this we must be consistent with the core values and principles of our Canadian federation.

The first we must note is that the Constitution must be respected. Respect of the Constitution and constitutional power and competencies is essential to maintain the effectiveness of public policy and the mutual respect that is a basis of this partnership. The foundations of this social union must respect the Constitution.

Second, we must show greater co-operation to meet the needs of Canadians. Governments are now co-ordinating their work on behalf of children, youth and persons with disabilities through recent initiatives. That should carry on.

Supply

Third, the ability of governments to act must be preserved. Greater co-operation should not and cannot mean that governments cannot do anything without asking permission of each other. We can strengthen our partnership without hindering our capacity to act. We can avoid what the Europeans call the joint decision trap. The framework must preserve the capacity to act and to adapt to change as required and as needed.

The fourth idea I present is the principle that the federation must be flexible. We are learning how to reconcile joint action with enhanced flexibility for the provinces. We have seen this in the recent labour market agreements which allowed provinces to choose the approach most suited to their labour market. We have seen this in the national child benefit in which provinces were able to invest as appropriate to the challenges they faced. A new framework must ensure that flexibility.

The fifth notion is that the federation must be fair. Canada has led the G-7 in bringing down its deficit and gaining fiscal control. It has achieved this with relatively less conflict and friction than what might rightfully be expected but not without consequences. Canadians are worried about the adequacy of funding for core programs. With the prospect of a fiscal dividend the federal government is conscious of the challenges facing the provinces, and we need to act accordingly.

• (1325)

We must keep each other informed. That too is important and fundamental to the framework. We must also enhance accountability for Canadians and to Canadians. That too is part and parcel of this union. It is very important that we have the opportunity to establish this new partnership and a new balance to manage the interdependence of services for all Canadians. It will prevent the elimination of the doubling of cost and it will lead to a much better federation.

The test of our efforts is simple. Are Canadians better served? Are governments more transparent and accountable to Canadians? Are we in a better position to improve our health and social policies and to promote the well-being of Canadians in all parts of Canada? Have we improved mobility for Canadians? Above all, have we achieved greater equality for opportunity in Canada?

The answer is that we will do that in the best interest of all Canadians. While the motion before us appears reasonable enough on the surface, it cannot and shall not be supported. We need to carry on in a way that is in keeping with the values, institutions and the symbols that define us as a people and unite us as a nation.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of my colleague across the way. He outlined five points and because of the shortage of time I would like to ask him questions on two of them.

The first issue was that the Constitution must be respected in all cases. How is it that the Constitution can be respected when the federal government is interloping on provincial jurisdictions as given to them in the 1867 Constitution?

The second question deals with his fifth point. He said that the federation must be fair and that the federal government must be allowed to do the job it feels it is there to do. Is it fair when the federal government goes into a medicare program with a promise of 50% funding and years later is only providing 11% funding?

Mr. Lynn Myers: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member opposite for the questions.

Certainly we on the government side need always to be cognizant, as do all Canadians, of the importance of respecting the Constitution in all these matters. That is fundamental not only to all Canadians but to all of us in this place. To present the Constitution in a fair manner is important. It is also important to provide a social union framework and context which enable us as Canadians to promote and preserve those things that we hold dear and which need protection and promotion in a fair and equitable fashion.

It is very important that we on the government side continue to do that. We have traditionally and historically been a party and a government of nation building. We intend not to tear down but rather to build in a manner consistent with the kinds of values and ideals all Canadians want us to use. It is important to continue on that vein and do so in the best interest of all Canadians.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to speak to the motion. The Reform Party believes very strongly it is time that Canada endorsed the social union put forward by the provinces and territories. We are urging the government to do exactly that.

I have listened to some of the pabulum coming from across the way. My colleague from Surrey asked a very straightforward question of the hon. member about the government's commitment to health care. When the Canada Health Act first came into place the federal government made a commitment to fund health care to the tune of 50%.

• (1330)

What did the government do? Now it funds it at 11%. She asked a very straight question of the member and we got back this pabulum about the government believes in fairness, that it wants to build up and not tear down. That does not mean anything. That is not a commitment. It is just rhetoric from the government.

Mr. Speaker, excuse me if I accuse the members of the government of being disingenuous with respect to the answers I have

heard from them today regarding their commitment to signing and enacting the social union. We think it is extraordinarily important to do this. It is important for the well-being of Canadians who depend on these social programs, but it is just as important for the unity of the country.

Every time we raise specific questions we get empty answers. It is unbelievable that in the House of Commons when we are debating something that is incredibly important to Canadians, that is all we get from the government.

The member for Mississauga West said that the government believes in the social union. That is great. Then why does the government not sign it? This has been before governments for a long time. Many of these proposals have been before Liberal governments for a long, long time.

I think the answer is that the government does not want to give up its powers. It does not believe in national standards. It believes in federal standards. It believes in standards that it alone sets even though all these areas that we are talking about fall under provincial jurisdiction in the Constitution. The gentleman who just spoke said that we must respect the Constitution. The very fact that the federal government is using its spending power to intrude in areas of provincial jurisdiction shows that its commitment to the Constitution is at best tenuous.

The provinces and the official opposition recognize that the federal government can and should have a role to play in some of these services, but let us enter into them on a co-operative basis. Unfortunately, the government often is not prepared to do that.

We have a situation where the provinces and the territories, many of which are represented by Liberal premiers, are calling on the government to take this initiative seriously. The government has had a chance to regard it since August and it has still done absolutely nothing. We say that the real test of whether or not a government is committed to these things is not whether it says it believes in the principles of them in some debate, but it is whether it is prepared to sign onto them.

There was an election in Quebec yesterday. We know that people in Quebec do want Canada to work. They made that very clear in the way they voted yesterday. We know that the premier of Quebec has signed onto this social union. He wants to make this work.

My question is which party is it that is standing in the way of Canadian unity? It is the federal government that is standing in the way. The Prime Minister indicated before the election how much he was going to stand in the way of this by saying that we are not going to have the flexibility that is necessary to make Canada work as a confederation, as a co-operative movement, a movement that recognizes that not all the ideas have to come from the federal government. Some of them can come from provincial governments or from the private sector.

Supply

In Canada most of the time the good things that we do are done through co-operative means. Every day in the private sector people get together co-operatively and exchange goods and services, money and all kinds of things. They do it on a co-operative basis. It creates all kinds of good. It creates prosperity, wealth and a lot of good will.

We also know in this case that the provinces and the territories got together and said "We are going to work co-operatively. We are going to try to get together because this is in the best interests of all of our respective constituents". That is what they did. They got together and brought forward this social union.

We recently saw securities regulators across the country get together and co-operatively work out a new system whereby they would establish standards that would apply across the country. I point out that the finance minister tried to do this awhile ago and completely and utterly failed. We know that a previous Conservative government tried to do the same thing and completely and utterly failed.

• (1335)

We now know that the securities regulators, driven by the interests of private individuals who need to have economic organization in order to make it easier to invest across the country, got together and said that they could do it co-operatively. In other words, they established national standards without being bound by federal standards.

That seems to be the whole problem here. We have a government that is so stubborn, which is really characterized by the Prime Minister, that it simply refuses to sign onto anything that it did not create even though it is operating in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

It is time for the government to set aside that pride, that vanity and to come to the realization that good ideas which benefit all Canadians do come from lower levels of government. That is exactly what we are talking about here.

I do not know anybody who thinks that the social union is a bad idea, except for the federal government. If it does not think it is a bad idea—and I know it will protest when I say that—then why does it not sign onto it? The government has had months and months to do it. There was the prospect of a Quebec election in front of it and the government still did nothing. In fact, in the face of it, it seemed as if the Prime Minister was trying to derail the whole thing.

Instead of suggesting that somehow this motion is not helpful when obviously it is and is bringing before the House of Commons one of the most important initiatives in the country today, why do members across the way not start thinking about ways to endorse it? Why not look for ways to get behind this instead of fighting it at

Supply

every step? Unfortunately that is not the way the government operates.

One thing strikes me when we talk about issues like health care. The hon. member who spoke just a minute ago talked about how the government wants to build. That is very laudable and those are nice words. However, I want to review what has happened in the last five years in Canada with respect to health care. I think this really does put the lie to some of the words we have heard from across the way where the government was saying that it believed that we need to work together.

Health care is an area of provincial jurisdiction. Did the provinces have the benefit of being consulted by the federal government when the federal government decided to essentially eviscerate health care in Canada, when it cut \$7 billion from health care, when it drove 188,000 people onto waiting lists in Canada? Is that the government's co-operative approach? I do not think so. That is not co-operative.

Here is an area of provincial jurisdiction and what did the government do? It marched in and said it was not going to cut the size of government or pare down its own departments. It was going to cut health care by 35%. I would argue that is much of the reason the provinces finally said they had to get together, irrespective of their own differences, to fight the federal government because it was standing in the way of giving Canadians proper health care.

The government goes ahead and guts health care because it thinks it is more important to find savings gutting health care than to gut for instance subsidies to big business.

Although the words we have heard from the other side sound very nice and warm, they are completely insincere. We do not buy it for a minute. We think the real test of the government's commitment to a social union is action, not more warm words, not more discussions.

We urge members across the way to join with the Reform Party and with other opposition parties today and to vote in favour of what is being proposed so that we can truly unite Canada.

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the member across the way.

The word co-operation came up an awful lot. It really is hard to sit in my seat and listen to this when I think back to the 1997 election campaign where the Reform Party made signs that said it did not want to have a premier or a prime minister from Quebec. Now I ask, does that sound like the Reform Party wants co-operation with Quebec?

• (1340)

It really is hollow when we listen to words like those from the opposition. The Reform Party would have been very happy to have had a crisis in Quebec. The vote last night was very solid. It does say that Quebecers indeed do want to be a part of Canada. Thank goodness that the people of Quebec have not listened to the Reform Party. The Reform Party's rhetoric, its meanness of spirit, its not wanting to have Quebecers as a part of Canada is awful.

Could the hon. member across the way explain to me how he and his party could make this statement, that they would never want a prime minister from Quebec?

Mr. Monte Solberg: Mr. Speaker, I think what we really meant to say was that we do not want this Prime Minister who happens to be from Quebec. The real answer is that the Reform Party did not say those things.

The Reform Party wants to see the aspirations of all regions of the country represented when it comes to constitutional discussions. That is one of the reasons this social union is very supportable by the Reform Party. It does represent the aspirations of all the provinces. That is why we are very supportive of it.

I wish the government across the way would be equally supportive. The government turns around and guts health care in Canada. It cut \$7 billion in expenditures to the provinces for health care. Then the government stands in this place and says that it believes very strongly in working with the provinces so that we can have national standards for health care.

The government's actions speak louder than its words. I am not surprised that given the government's past actions, it cannot support this motion today.

Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on the question.

With respect to that ad, the member explained what the ad was about but there is one point I would like to make. I had a lot of constituents say to me that Jean Charest was incensed that we would label him as nothing but a Quebec politician, but the fact that he jumped and tried to become the premier of Quebec proves that portion of what we were saying about Jean Charest.

Has the hon. member for Medicine Hat heard similar things?

Mr. Monte Solberg: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that Canadians want to see their views represented from all across the country. The very fact that the Reform Party has brought forward a list of ways that we can accommodate not only Quebec but all the provinces through the new Canada act demonstrates that our commitment to this country goes far beyond anything we have seen from the government.

Supply

The government is committed to staying in power. The Reform Party is committed to making Canada work. The government will do anything it can to hang on to power, including gutting health care so that it can balance the budget and at the same time protect the bureaucracy behind it. The government will do anything it can.

If the government were really and truly concerned about Canadians, it would reverse that process. Instead of gutting health care it would gut some of its vested interests, who have been the hangers on in this country for so long and one of the reasons people are so cynical about government in Canada today.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party has brought forward this motion today which calls on the federal parliament to build a stronger federation by building a stronger partnership with provincial and territorial governments.

The motion calls on the federal parliament to strengthen the social fabric of the country by responding to the demands of all the provinces and territories. All the provinces and territories have put forward a framework of proposals and the federal government has not responded substantively to them. This motion calls for the government to do that.

• (1345)

The motion recognizes that federalism can be a dynamic and a flexible system, able to renew and reform itself in response to the aspirations and the needs of Canadians. This motion provides an opportunity for federal parliamentarians to show the positive leadership needed as we approach the 21st century.

Reformers have long believed that reform of the federation is essential and a national priority. The provinces and territories clearly agree. Reformers have long advocated a more balanced federation, decentralizing the delivery of government services, allowing the provinces and municipalities the flexibility to better meet their own social, cultural, linguistic and economic circumstances.

In November 1997, about a year ago, the official opposition put forward a motion in the House calling on the federal government to communicate the Calgary declaration, which talked about a framework for renewing the federation, to the people of Quebec and to consult with them on its contents. The government failed to act. We saw the results yesterday. When there is no option put forward by strong federal leadership, then we have the kind of result which we saw yesterday.

The provincial premiers and all of the opposition parties have endorsed the framework agreement on Canada's social union. Only the federal government refuses to show some imagination and courage and to enter into negotiations to accommodate the legitimate aspirations of Canadians from coast to coast.

The premiers have pointed out clearly, as have many experts, the difficulties with the present arrangements. The current arrangements for the delivery of social programs in this country have led to federal meddling in important areas of provincial constitutional jurisdiction. They have led to the duplication of effort and expense. They have led to inefficiency in the delivery of the services that Canadians desperately need and they have added unnecessary, burdensome cost to the delivery of the social programs which are so important to Canadians.

An example is the millennium scholarship fund. The federal government slashed support for post-secondary education. Then it set up its own brand of scholarships, which will go to less than 10% of Canadian students, with absolutely no notice to or consultation with the provinces. Government members just said "Hey, we are going to do this. We will slash what you do. We will slash the delivery of services by the provinces, and then we will gain a medal for spending \$2.5 billion in your area of jurisdiction".

Another example is the Canadian foundation for innovation. Again, there was no consultation with the provinces. The provinces had to scramble to bring together their side of the equation so that research and development could continue to work in the provinces.

There is one example of where federal-provincial co-operation did work, and that is the national child benefit. In this one anomaly the federal government decided to do it right. It actually talked to the provinces. It gave them notice. It consulted with them. It made some co-operative arrangements to help our families in this country. The program is working.

What could be more clear for the federal government than to say: "This is not working. Stop doing it. The way to go is with consultation and co-operation"? That is the way to help people in this country. That is what we have to do in the federal parliament.

We have a situation which the federal parliament needs to deal with. In August 1995 the premiers held their annual conference. At that time they said: "Social policy reform is one of the most significant challenges facing the nation". Every province and every territory was saying that social policy reform was the most significant challenge. They formed a ministerial council on social policy and renewal.

This was not a big secret. The premiers did not do this in a closet. It was very open and above board. They were forming a council to deal with the issue of social policy renewal. Where was the federal government in all of this? Nowhere. The federal government did not say "This is an important initiative. Social security and the delivery of social services to the people of this country is critical. We care about it too. Let us work with you on this important initiative". There was nothing like that.

Supply

• (1350)

In August 1995 the premiers go it alone. The same year this council, moving with commendable expediency, reported principles to guide social policy reform and renewal. The very same year this council had results. Again, what did the federal government do? Did it say: "Let us examine these principles. There are some things we could add. We could assist with this. This could work well because we will bring a national perspective to it"? Again the federal government was nowhere to be found in the process.

Then in August 1996, a year after the process started, the premiers adopted a paper called "Issues Paper on Social Policy Reform and Renewal: Next Steps", and established a provincial-territorial council on social policy renewal to design options to ensure national standards and principles and to deal with unilateralism on the part of the federal government. Again, where was the federal government in this important initiative? Nowhere.

In April 1997 the council presented its option paper.

In August 1997 the premiers said "Let us negotiate with the federal government". That was over a year and a half ago. The premiers agreed to continue to work on the framework agreement.

In September they adopted a framework agreement called the Calgary declaration and agreed on guidelines for social policy renewal.

In October 1997 there was a further meeting of this council, which stressed urgency, again pointing to the framework agreement.

In December 1997 the premiers met again and endorsed the framework agreement.

In March 1998 the council met to launch negotiations and for the first time in this whole process, nearly three years from the time it started, the federal government finally decided that maybe it should get involved. It appointed the justice minister to work with the premiers and the territorial leaders on this initiative.

What happened after March? In June the group met. Guess what? The meetings were described as tense. They were reported to be an "apparent failure". The justice minister, the federal representative who had finally come along on the train, said "We need more time to consider these proposals", never mind that they had been out there for two years or more.

In August the premiers met again. They issued a major news release concerning the framework agreement and said again how urgent it was.

What happened in September? The Prime Minister finally said something. Here is what he said in an interview with Southam

News: "If they don't want to take what I am offering, they take nothing. That is an alternative too".

The government, after all of the work done by all the premiers and the territorial leaders, simply says "It is my way or the highway". That is not what is called leadership.

What we are asking today is that this federal parliament fill the leadership vacuum that the Prime Minister and the Liberal government have failed to fill and simply move ahead, at a time when every single provincial and territorial leader has done all of the leg work, to get with the program, help put the ball through the goal and make social policy in this country stronger and better. That is what we are asking and I urge members to support the motion.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me quote from Premier Romanow. He stated: "The first order of business with a social union is negotiating it as quickly as we can, not under any artificial deadlines or timetables".

• (1355)

I would like to ask the member two questions. First, Reform members come into this House and purport to be acting on behalf of the provinces. Do they or do they not believe that there is a position for the federal government in these negotiations?

Second, how can they come forward to impose a deadline when the very chairman of the process they purport to support does not want it?

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy: Mr. Speaker, let me quote from the premiers' news release of August 6, 1998. The last sentence of paragraph 6 states: "Premiers stressed that negotiations should now proceed with a view to concluding a draft agreement by the end of the year". That is what the premiers said.

Clearly, there have to be some goals set. If the timeline for negotiation is infinite, all the federal government has to do is play the violin and say nice words about how wonderful it is to have co-operation within the federation. We will never get anywhere.

There has to be somebody, somewhere, at some time who drives it to conclusion. The premiers have made it extremely clear what they think the proper timelines are.

There is clearly a role for the federal government in this. What we are saying is "Get on with it. Play a role. Do something that will move this ball through the goal posts". The federal government has not only been doing nothing, not only dragging its feet, but the Prime Minister himself is saying "We are not going to be flexible. We are not going to negotiate. Either you take what we are going to give you or tough bananas".

That is not the way to give us a strong, co-operative federation. We will have to do something differently.

S. O. 31

The Speaker: I see by the clock that we still have a little over two minutes, but we will hear questions and comments after question period.

With your permission, in one minute we will move to Statements by Members.

* * *

[Translation]

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

The Speaker: I have the honour to lay upon the table the report of the Auditor General of Canada for the year 1998.

[English]

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(e), this document is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

THE LATE DULCE HUSCROFT

Mr. Lou Sekora (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for Dulce Huscroft, giving was a way of reaching out to people.

She gave freely of her time whenever called upon and often because she alone saw a need.

It seems only a few short weeks ago that her family and friends rallied together to show her just how much they cared. Today we gather again to pay our respects and to say goodbye to a truly caring person.

Dulce always put her family first and to them I offer my sympathy.

She touched many of us in her busy life as a school trustee, community volunteer and as a caring parent. We will all miss her.

* * *

BILL C-68

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today marks the beginning of the forced registration of law-abiding Canadians' hunting rifles and shotguns.

This Liberal folly has cost over \$200 million to date and has a long way to go yet.

The justice minister claims that Bill C-68 will save lives. A portion of the money being spent to set up this program could save over 1,700 breast cancer victims and dramatically reduce health

care costs in the process. That is far more than the total number of firearm related deaths.

The justice minister also claims that Bill C-68 will make streets safer. In British Columbia, the RCMP's campaign against organized crime has been curtailed, patrol boats are docked and patrol aircraft are grounded.

In rural areas, border surveillance and night patrols have been cut due to an \$8.5 million budget shortfall. That represents less than 5% of the money being wasted on her bill.

The bottom line is that Bill C-68 will cost lives and make the streets less safe.

Merry Christmas from the Liberal Party of Canada.

* * *

VOLVO ENVIRONMENTAL PRIZE

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Volvo environmental prize recognizes individuals who have made outstanding innovations or discoveries that have a significance in the environmental field and are of global or regional importance.

Dr. David Schindler, a professor at the University of Alberta, was a co-winner of the 1998 prize.

• (1400)

Dr. Schindler was recognized for his discoveries on freshwater pollution. The importance of this work becomes greater every year as the world's supply of quality fresh water comes under increasing stress. This prestigious award is one of a long list of honours given to Dr. Schindler for his outstanding achievements and contributions.

David Schindler chose to make Canada his home and we are blessed both by his presence and his work. As legislators it is our responsibility to listen to the David Schindlers of Canada and the world to ensure that we make good, healthy public policy decisions.

* * *

[Translation]

ACCESS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I invite all the people of Abitibi, James Bay and Nunavik, especially the various social integration partners, to take an active part in the events of Access Awareness Week.

It is vitally important we become aware of the importance of making our services accessible to people with functional limitations.

Whether we are talking about medical or rehab services, day care, schools, a recreation centre, work, a business or a cultural centre, we all must make the needs of disabled persons our business.

S. O. 31

These people are our parents, our friends, our neighbours, our clients and our colleagues. They are men, women and children who are entitled to expect greater openness on the part of the people around them and society in general.

I hope that this week provides an opportunity to discover new support for the social integration and involvement of persons with disabilities.

* * *

WORLD AIDS DAY

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, December 1 marks World AIDS Day. This year's theme is "Youth, a Force for Change".

The UN joint program on AIDS reveals that five new young people are infected every minute worldwide.

In Canada, the rate of infection among young people, who are particularly vulnerable, is a concern too.

We must therefore work with our government and non-government partners to respond to this concern.

Our young people are our future. They warrant our urgent attention, because they may be a driving force in changing the course of the epidemic.

I encourage all my colleagues to wear a red ribbon to draw attention to World AIDS Day. Let us as well give some thought to all those who have died from this disease.

* * *

[English]

FIREARMS

Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is December 1 and the justice minister's billion dollar boondoggle begins. Establishing a firearms registration system has cost over \$200 million so far and costs are projected to exceed \$1 billion before we even know if the computer set-up works.

Canadians have also paid many lesser known costs including \$10,000 for a special interest group in California that is preparing a global campaign against private firearms ownership and \$20,000 for the United Nations to publish and distribute a study on firearms registration. Taxpayers should know that \$10,000 was for translating the document into French and Spanish. Let us not forget about the more than \$40,000 the government spent last year to send bureaucrats to international workshops aimed at restricting private firearms ownership.

Where are the criminals this legislation is supposed to stop? They are laughing all the way to the bank, the bank they will rob with their unregistered firearms.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mr. Carmen Provenzano (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, violence against women is a national problem that demands the attention of all Canadians.

On December 6, 1989, 14 young women were savagely murdered at the École Polytechnique in Montreal. To commemorate the deaths of these women, the Government of Canada established December 6 as a national day of remembrance and action on violence against women.

Nine years after this horrible event I join men and women across the country in remembering those who have been injured or killed and in thanking community groups that help abused women on a daily basis.

This important work is done in my riding of Sault Ste. Marie by Algoma Women's Sexual Assault Services, Women in Crisis, the Sexual Assault Care Centre, Breton House and the Phoenix Rising Women's Centre. Like their counterparts across the country these groups are putting remembrance into action.

Let us all do our best to follow their example. Let us all do our best to put an end to violence against women.

* * *

2010 WINTER OLYMPICS

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that the Vancouver-Whistler bid was chosen today as Canada's official entry for the 2010 Winter Olympic Games. The voting was close with 20 votes for Calgary, 25 for Quebec City and 26 for Vancouver-Whistler.

● (1405)

This is extremely exciting news for British Columbia and all Canadians as I believe the Canadian bid will have an excellent chance of being chosen as the site for the 2010 Olympics.

The bid received excellent support from the public, sport and business communities, and from the local and provincial governments of B.C.

I thank those who played a part in making Vancouver-Whistler the official Canadian entry for the 2010 Winter Olympic Games. I hope to see them all in 2010.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it will be a bleak Christmas this year for communities and families working in Canada's natural resource sector. Many farmers are facing bankruptcy and foreclosure as a result of the collapse of the commodities markets and the government's don't worry, be happy attitude.

World oil surpluses are at record highs while prices are at record lows, creating a very uncertain future for those employed in the oil industry. Canada's world class miners have to go to Chile and Peru if they want to work in their industry. The Canadian forest industry is facing an unemployment crisis with more mills closing every day while the government continues to do nothing more than talk about solutions.

It will be a bleak Christmas for many Canadians working in the natural resources industries. We can only hope that the new year will bring less talk and more action from the government on behalf of these industries which represent the backbone of the Canadian economy.

* * *

QUEBEC ELECTION

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Robert Middlemiss, Mr. Réjean Lafrenière and Mr. Norman MacMillan for their great victory in the ridings of Pontiac, Gatineau and Papineau in yesterday's Quebec election. Their re-election with a comfortable majority proves that the people in these ridings want a strong Quebec in a united Canada.

I assure the people of Pontiac, Gatineau and Papineau that their federal member of parliament will work tirelessly with his provincial counterparts to guarantee that this beautiful region of ours remains forever in a united Canada.

* * *

WORKPLACE SAFETY

Mr. Peter Mancini (Sydney—Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out today to the families and loved ones of all those who suffered so tragically in the Westray Mine disaster.

It was one year ago today that the report on the Westray disaster was released. That report noted that management through its actions and attitudes sent a message that the safety of the workers was not a priority and that this was a contributing factor to the disaster. Based on a submission from the United Steelworkers of Canada union the report called for the federal government to introduce amendments to legislation to ensure that corporate executives and directors be held accountable for workplace safety.

The federal government has done nothing to act on that report even though on average 900 workers die needlessly in workplace related accidents each year in Canada.

In light of the federal government's inaction, the NDP will be bringing forward legislation in this session that will hold corporate managers and directors accountable for the safety of their workers, legislation that we hope will prevent any future disasters like the one at Westray.

[Translation]

S. O. 31

WORLD AIDS DAY

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, December 1 is World AIDS Day.

AIDS has been a part of our collective reality since the early 1980s. Who among us does not know or know of someone who has contracted the virus?

Every day some 11 people become infected with HIV in Quebec and Canada. Of course, the face of AIDS is changing, and today it is more closely associated with intravenous drug use. But make no mistake. When AIDS strikes, it strikes hard and indiscriminately.

That is why, on this occasion, I want to reiterate that prevention remains our best ally against transmission of the AIDS virus.

In addition, the network of community groups, which support, comfort and help those infected and their families on a daily basis, is the cornerstone on which we can base our actions and interventions.

To all those who are involved in this fight, I say a big thank you—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Brossard—La Prairie.

* * *

QUEBEC ELECTION

Mr. Jacques Saada (Brossard—La Prairie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last night, the people of Quebec clearly indicated who they wanted to represent them in the Quebec National Assembly.

Our congratulations to all those who ran in the 125 ridings. We should also acknowledge all the hard work done by volunteers, who spared neither time nor effort to make their organizations run smoothly.

Special congratulations to all those who ran under the Liberal banner.

• (1410)

Quebeckers have made it clear that they did not want another referendum. They see their future within Canada.

I congratulate the leader of the Liberal Party of Quebec and everyone on his team. Last night, they made us proud, they made every Canadian proud.

* * *

QUEBEC ELECTION

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC): Mr. Speaker, last night, I was proud to be in Sherbrooke to celebrate Jean Charest's

Oral Questions

victory. I congratulate Mr. Charest on that victory and on winning a higher percentage of the popular vote than the Parti Québécois.

Through this victory, Jean Charest sends a clear message to Quebeckers and to Canadians. Quebeckers do not want a government that talks about referendums and separation. They want a government that talks about jobs and health, and that looks for ways to make the federation work.

This is what Mr. Charest did, despite the Prime Minister's efforts to derail him. We can look forward to a very interesting fight in the National Assembly over the next four years. With Mr. Charest heading up a strong opposition, all Quebeckers stand to gain.

* * *

QUEBEC ELECTION

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Quebeckers renewed their trust in the Parti Québécois government and in their premier, Lucien Bouchard.

The people of Quebec gave the Quebec government a mandate to continue its determined efforts to defend their interests and to help them achieve their destiny. Through this democratic decision, Quebec is keeping all its future options open. It is still free to make its own choices.

For now, the Government of Quebec has been given a mandate to continue what it has begun: sound and responsible management of public finances, conclusion of a social union agreement based on the Saskatoon consensus, and an ongoing battle against all the federal government's interference in Quebec's areas of jurisdiction as set out in the Constitution.

Bravo to the Parti Québécois for this second victory. Yesterday's verdict shows clearly that the tough measures of the last four years fell squarely in line with what our fellow citizens wanted.

Congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Bouchard on another term in office—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington has the floor.

* * *

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the current farm crisis is not only a rural issue in one province. It is an issue in all provinces across Canada. Urban Canadians share in the benefits the agriculture and agri-food sector provides.

Farmers' investment and labour provides delicious and nutritious food for Canadians at the second lowest prices in the industrialized world, costing less than 10% of our disposable income.

Production happens in the countryside where machinery dealerships and other input suppliers also live and work. However, transporters, processors, grocers and restaurant workers also live in cities and towns. The industry is Canada's third largest employer. Add to this the \$20 billion worth of agriculture and food products exported and we have some idea of the value of the farm sector in Canada.

Our hearts go out to farmers who are suffering extraordinary losses. We must act now and respond to their need. Friends and neighbours in my constituency of Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington tell me that family farms are a valuable resource that we must protect.

I urge all members of the House to support the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food—

The Speaker: Oral questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

• (1415)

[English]

SOCIAL UNION

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my questions for today are for the manager of the general store.

Last night's election in Quebec cries out for a positive signal from the Prime Minister. Quebecers are not happy with the status quo, but they would rather not separate either.

The best idea on the table is the social union proposal from the premiers which if concluded would improve the ways Ottawa and the provinces work together on health care and other services.

Does the Prime Minister agree that the speedy conclusion of a substantive social union proposal is the best way to strengthen the federation at the present time?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I initiated this process with the premiers a year ago. It was the suggestion of the Prime Minister.

Yesterday's election in Quebec had not even terminated on TV when the leader of the Reform Party was trying to get in bed with the separatist leader of Quebec.

Today Premier Harris, Premier Romanow, Premier Tobin and the leader of the Liberal Party of Quebec said we should not have any

artificial deadline. We should work together to find the appropriate solution in due course.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is only confusing things with that type of talk.

He implies that he wants a social union agreement. But he goes to sleep when he should be awake. He says the wrong things at the wrong time. He drags his feet.

The Prime Minister says he wants a social union agreement yet he continually drags his feet. He objects to an artificial deadline. What is his deadline for concluding an agreement? Is it the end of the year? Is it next month? Is it some other time?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the position of the provinces was developed over the period of January to July. Thirty days after that the federal position was tabled. Since that time they have been working to find the proper solution. Obviously they stopped the negotiations during the election period in Quebec.

The ministers are to meet in a couple of weeks or sooner. At that time we will see what the differences are and we will try to find an appropriate solution.

When I see the Leader of the Opposition trying to be such an opportunist when it is time to really work for the benefit of Canada, I cannot believe it. He cannot learn to be—

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am in a hurry on this issue. I want to get this country out of the 19th century and into the 21st century constitutionally, whereas Rip Van Winkle over there is prepared to snooze his way through the 20th century.

Again, when is the Prime Minister prepared to conclude a substantive social union agreement with the provinces to strengthen the federation?

• (1420)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are working on that. It is in our initiative but we do not want to have an agreement for the sake of an agreement. We want to have a good agreement to make sure the Canadian people will receive the proper services everywhere in Canada of first quality that makes the difference between a Canadian and others.

When I talk about the past and I see the leader of the Reform Party who wants to scrap social programs, this is not what we want. We want to have good programs for all Canadians in collaboration with the provinces.

Oral Questions

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, ten premiers were able to arrive at a unanimous position during a three day meeting in August. But the federal government has not been able to reach an agreement with the provinces in the subsequent four months.

The government says it is negotiating with the provinces but it has not said about what.

Can the Prime Minister tell Canadians what the hang-up is? Is it the dispute resolution mechanism, the opting out clause? What is the government's problem with the social union?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are in negotiations with the provinces at this time to find the proper solutions.

As the national government we will make sure we have national programs that will apply to all Canadians. We do not want a situation where the rich provinces have great programs and the poor provinces have nothing. It is not why we are here. We are here to make sure there will be justice for all Canadians.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the funding is part of this arrangement.

In August the premiers felt they could conclude a deal with the federal government by the end of December. However, they were not counting on the Canadian version of Stonewall Jackson defiantly protecting and defending his turf.

How can this government ever sign an agreement with the provinces when it does not even know what it is negotiating?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can see the jealousy of the opposition. It knows we are making progress. All the premiers are saying we are making progress. They say we do not need any artificial deadline because it will be counterproductive.

The Leader of the Opposition tried to score some political points. It was not me who replied to him this morning. It was Mr. Harris, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Romanow and Mr. Charest. I think I am in better company.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last August, all the premiers reached agreement in Saskatoon to propose a framework for social union aimed at setting out guidelines for the federal spending power.

Yesterday, Quebecers gave their premier a mandate to settle this question once and for all.

Does the Prime Minister intend to respond promptly to this appeal and to hold a meeting with his provincial counterparts in order to finalize the agreement on social union?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the real winners by more than 25,000 votes yesterday in Quebec were the Liberal Party and Jean Charest—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien: —who told the press, and who told me personally a few hours ago, that what is important is to ensure that we work together.

Mr. Charest discussed the social union with me in May, in June. Only in August did Mr. Bouchard start showing interest in it, when he said there were already nine other people on board the bus.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister should keep in mind that he was elected in 1997 with 38% of the popular vote across Canada.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

• (1425)

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister says that, in the matter of spending power and the right to opt out with full compensation, Quebec only showed an interest in August. But talk has been going on about this for 50 years.

My question to the Prime Minister is this: Is his collaboration with the premier of Quebec done by negotiating behind the back of the Premier of Quebec with the leader of the opposition in the National Assembly? Is this his idea of collaboration? I would like to know.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is true that we only received over twice as many votes as the leader of the opposition in the last election—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien: —and it is absolutely normal for me to talk to my colleague, and I imagine he talks to Mr. Bouchard. I saw Mr. Bouchard on television last night. He was smiling at the beginning of the evening, but he had no smile left by the end.

I believe we spoke last year in December about making some progress. Our position is in the 1996 Throne Speech. We ourselves were the ones to propose—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Roberval

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, most certainly, the Prime Minister of Canada with his majority of five ridings out of 300 would be comfortable with a majority of 27 out of 125.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Michel Gauthier: However, that is not what I want to talk to him about. Clearly the Prime Minister's remarks are suspect, because each time he has spoken behind the back of the Premier of Quebec—we know what that led to in 1982—he is starting again.

My question for the Prime Minister is the following: what principle gives him the right to decide on health care, when it is not his responsibility and he has never campaigned on it?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here we go again. The poor martyrs are weeping again. The humiliated are back complaining again.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien: It was this government that proposed limiting spending power in the 1996 throne speech, and the Bloc Québécois voted against the throne speech.

They voted against the resolution to give Quebec special status. They voted against legislation giving a veto to the regions in Canada, including Quebec. But they continue with their hypocrisy, whining all the time.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

• (1430)

The Speaker: I would remind hon. members that I would prefer they not use words like "hypocrisy".

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Roberval.

Mr. Michel Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, on the subject of hypocrisy—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: I would remind hon. members that I asked they not to use such words.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: I ask hon. members to choose their words very carefully. I would ask the hon. member for Roberval to put his question now.

Mr. Michel Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

What do we call a person who visits Quebec, who is the Prime Minister of Canada, who makes promises, and who, at the first opportunity, breaks them? A hypocrite.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

• (1435)

The Speaker: I ask the member for Roberval to please withdraw his words.

Oral Questions

Mr. Michel Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister will withdraw his, I will be pleased to withdraw mine.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: I will return to this problem at the end of Oral Question Period.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister talks about co-operation to improve Canada, but he does the opposite.

A government that cuts health care is not co-operating with the provinces. A Prime Minister who refuses to negotiate the social union is not working to improve the federation.

For the good of Canada, will the Prime Minister come out of his hiding place and sit down at the negotiation table?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I simply want to quote what was said. I apologize, but the text is in English.

[*English*]

“The first order of business is the social union, negotiating it as quickly as we can, not under any artificial deadlines or timetables, doing it with dispatch, doing it with determination. The Prime Minister wants to do it. The premiers want to do it”. It is Mr. Roy Romanow who said that on Newsworld on November 30, 1998.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Exactly, Mr. Speaker. On this day I want to say the Prime Minister is absolutely right to ignore Reform’s artificial deadline. It is a formula for failure. At the same time Canadians want the Prime Minister to be a leader, not a straggler, in securing a stronger social union. To build on the positive momentum, the Prime Minister must send a positive signal.

Will he reinvest the \$2.5 billion so desperately needed in health care now? Will he do that?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are negotiating the social union. We are not negotiating the budget of the federal government. It is not a question of trading. We are not in the business of trading anything there.

What we need to do is to find a formula for a good social program which will apply to all Canadians and which is done by the provinces and the federal government in a co-ordinated fashion.

The question of the budget is another problem. I said in August in New Brunswick, long before the question was asked, that the first investment will be in health care. I said that five months ago.

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Mr. Speaker, the minister of intergovernmental affairs said this morn-

ing on the social union that the provinces have a proposal and that his government also has a proposal, but no one knows what that proposal is. What is the government afraid of? Will it take another letter from the minister to Mr. Bouchard for us to find out what that proposal is?

Does the government have a proposal for the provinces, for Canadians, and if so, what is it?

• (1440)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that we are negotiating with the provinces with the following objective in mind: to ensure that all Canadians have access to the social and health services to which they are entitled, through a better framework for negotiations between the federal and provincial governments.

We will have nothing to do with the booty policy.

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Mr. Speaker, there is a problem.

Will the government wait until the infamous general store goes bankrupt before making a move? What does it have to say to the provinces that are anxiously waiting for concrete proposals?

Could the government inform the House of its plans? Will it take action? Its credibility is at stake. The government must act and act now.

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the provinces stated their position in June and we replied in July. It took them six months to come to an agreement. We are not blaming them, because this is a complex issue.

We replied to the provinces in July, and the Quebec premier took an interest in this issue in August. When the Quebec premier is not there to take a leadership role, it is always more complicated.

It took us much less time to agree on the need to clarify the federal spending power—because we started in February 1996—than it took the Conservative government, which had eight years to do so, but did nothing.

* * *

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister is gouging workers by \$350 each on their EI premiums. Today he expects us to cheer because he is only going to

Oral Questions

gouge them by \$292. He is gouging every small business person \$500 per worker, but today the announcement is that he is only going to gouge \$417 out of them.

Let me ask a question of the tax collector. His knife is in the back of every small business by nine inches. He is going to put—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: My colleagues, of course in question period we expect strong words but I think today we are going a little bit overboard. I think if we are going to get on with question period we have to be civil to one another.

I would ask the hon. member to please go directly to her question.

Miss Deborah Grey: Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what is overboard. It is a finance minister who will overcharge and take too much money out of our pockets.

I would like to ask—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: The question.

Miss Deborah Grey: The question is, why will he not obey the law? Why is he overcharging?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to confirm the announcement that was made this morning by my colleague, the Minister of Human Resources Development, that following the recommendation of the Employment Insurance Commission the government will be reducing the employment insurance premiums by 15 cents to \$2.55.

• (1445)

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure Canadians feel good. It is sort of like when a mugger steals your purse and gives you bus fare so you can get home—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development and the Minister of Finance have decided to lower contributions to the employment insurance program by only 15 cents.

How can the Minister of Finance lower contributions by a mere 15 cents, when the program could operate for three years just on the

surplus accumulated to date, without a penny being raised in contributions?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques is in such a bad mood this afternoon. I think it has nothing to do with the announcement the Minister of Finance and I made today about the contribution rate.

It probably has more to do with the fact that the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques having lost his provincial election in both Rivière-du-Loup and Kamouraska, where he had worked very hard just recently.

The reason for his bad mood cannot be found in the fact that we have lowered the contribution rate for the fifth consecutive year. It is the lowest it has been in Canada in more than eight years.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in our regions, people are expecting more than petty politics from the Minister of Human Resources Development.

The employment insurance program is not intended to allow the government to accumulate billions of dollars in surplus; in fact, the act specifically prohibits unreasonably high premiums.

On the basis of what kind of legal opinion does the Minister of Finance think he can announce a reduction that is one quarter of what could have reasonably been expected?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is time the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques came back to this House; he would notice that the recommendation the Minister of Finance and I made to lower contributions is one that was unanimously passed by the employment insurance commission, where both labour and management are represented.

We respected the law and our system. It is absolutely incredible that, on that side, they would try to have people believe that the system does not respect the integrity of a reform of the employment insurance program we had the courage to carry out.

• (1450)

This reform will put \$1 billion back into the pockets of Canadian taxpayers.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Stats-Can is reporting that income taxes are rising at twice the rate of

Oral Questions

Canadian incomes. In fact, now Canadians are being forced to dig into their savings accounts to pay the head tax collector. Oh, how that must warm the spot where the finance minister's heart should be.

Now that Canadians are cleaning out their savings accounts to pay taxes, will the minister acknowledge that his high tax policies really are hurting Canadians?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a heart. Reform is the party without heart. The fact is—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Paul Martin: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that the numbers he is referring to vary from quarter to quarter. In fact, they vary from month to month. What does not vary are the longer term trends.

I simply announce that real personable disposable income in Canada increased substantially in 1997, rising over 8% from 1996.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that there has never been a finance minister in the history of the country who has taxed Canadians more ruthlessly than this finance minister.

Instead of taxing Canadians ever more to build up surpluses in the government, when is the finance minister going to start working for Canadians? When is he going to bring in a program of long term, deep tax relief for Canadians?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the last budget we brought in over \$7 billion in tax relief over three years. Today my colleague, the Minister of Human Resources Development, decreased employment insurance premiums by 15 cents, which represents well over a billion dollars.

Every single year that we have been in office employment insurance premiums have come down. There are two things to count on: employment insurance premiums coming down; and their popularity going down.

* * *

[Translation]

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ): Mr. Speaker, each year the federal government forks out over \$3.7 billion in professional services contracts over \$25,000. Over half of these contracts are awarded without competitive bidding. This was what the auditor general had to tell us this morning.

Apart from patronage, what explanation can the Minister of Public Works give for the fact that so many contracts do not go through the competitive bidding process?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the auditor general's observations are based on 1995 figures. We agree completely that 55% of contracts being awarded without competitive bidding is a percentage that had to be improved.

And improve it we did. Once the problem was identified, the necessary action was taken and now over 80% of professional services contracts go through the competitive bidding process.

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the problem is worse than that. Because of the carelessness of the Minister of Public Works, a contract that started out at \$25,000 went as high as \$300,000, still without being tendered.

• (1455)

How does the government explain such carelessness, when it is bursting its buttons telling us how well it manages taxpayers' money?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are completely valid reasons for sole sourcing, such as when only one supplier is able to provide the professional services.

It is therefore possible to sole source for reasons that are in the public's interest. But, I repeat, we have already corrected the error pointed out by the auditor general and, since 1995, we have increased the number of contracts that go through competitive bidding from 55% to over 80%.

* * *

[English]

MULTICULTURALISM

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the multiculturalism program is a case study in government waste. According to the auditor general, fully one-third of all grants given out by the heritage minister cannot be justified. The minister has no idea what the program is supposed to achieve, where the money goes or why she is giving the money away in the first place.

How many more years will Canadians have to pay for programs that have no reason to exist?

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the multiculturalism program, we have just finished a complete review of new program guidelines. We have given it a three-year transition.

We are at the end of our first year and we are very pleased that the auditor general was able to pinpoint exactly what we wanted, evaluating how we are moving over the first year of a three-year transition to ensure accountability in the system.

Oral Questions

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is nothing but waste. But it does not end there. The government is spending billions of dollars on contracts with no competitive bids.

Contracts are handed out, according to the auditor general, to people who are identified before the contract is granted. We have heard of a case in which \$3,000 per day was paid to a person on a non-competitively bid contract.

Is \$3,000 a day to an individual on a non-competitive contract value for money? Who is looking after the taxpayer?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question.

The report of the auditor general on that question is based on data that were collected for 1995. This was a problem. We have now rectified the problem and over 80% of these professional service contracts are granted under competitive bidding.

* * *

[Translation]

AIDS

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonnette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the plight of AIDS victims.

What is less known though is the extreme slowness with which the federal Minister of Health is acting to approve AIDS medication.

How does the Minister of Health explain that, since 1996, the United States has approved two drugs against AIDS, while only one of these products has been approved in Canada?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today marks the 11th World AIDS Day. It is important to reflect on the problems and the challenges before us, and to develop an awareness of the risks involved, particularly among young people.

It is to that end that we have adopted a Canada-wide strategy against AIDS. The Government of Canada has displayed leadership in this matter and on the issue of drug research.

We are now improving the approval process for new drugs, and we have already taken action in that respect. This is in the public interest.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask on world AIDS day if the Minister of Health could tell us what is being done to combat this terrible disease which is a growing epidemic, especially among young people around the world. Recent statistics show us that half of new HIV

infections are among young people. What is the strategy to combat this terrible disease among young people?

• (1500)

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this morning I published the first annual report from the Government of Canada to Canadians on the progress of our strategy against HIV and AIDS, a strategy in which we are investing \$42 million each and every year.

While there are daunting challenges before us there were some encouraging things that were reported this morning. We are working in partnership with Canadians. The voices of the communities are being heard. We are targeting youth in particular, aiming toward prevention through education and instruction. We are investing in research. We are supporting community efforts. We are focusing this year on youth.

* * *

[Translation]

The Speaker: The oral question period that just ended was a little more difficult than usual for all members. One must realize, as I do, that we sometimes get a little carried away during question period.

During today's oral question period, one member, the Prime Minister, used the word "hypocrisy". I asked him not to use that word, and when the hon. member for Roberval took the floor, he also used the word "hypocrisy". I asked him not to use such a word and, later, for some reason, the hon. member said that another member was a "hypocrite".

I find this language to be unparliamentary. I asked my colleague, the hon. member for Roberval, to withdraw his comment that another member was a hypocrite, but he would only do so if the other member also withdrew his comments.

It is now up to me, as Speaker of the House, to make a decision.

• (1505)

This is not a simple decision to make, and I once again address myself directly to my colleague, the hon. member for Roberval, for whom I have a great deal of respect. I respectfully ask him to withdraw the word he used, when he said that another member was a "hypocrite".

I address myself directly to the hon. member for Roberval and I ask him to withdraw his comments.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, may I ask you to look at the blues before making your decision?

It is my impression that there is an important nuance between what I said and what you tell me I said. I believe that looking at the blues would be the best thing for you, for myself, for everyone and

for the Standing Orders. After that, you and I can take the proper steps within the parliamentary process.

If I might ask you this rather small favour of looking at the blues and we can then discuss this situation again. I will make honourable amends, if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you to check the blues first. Is it possible to ask you to do so?

The Speaker: As the hon. member said, there may be some nuances in the words used.

In my judgment, the words used, the words “il est un hypocrite”, he is a hypocrite, caused a disturbance in this House, in my opinion. For that reason, I am asking the hon. member once again—

An hon. member: The Prime Minister provoked it.

The Speaker: Once again, in my judgment the words used during the Oral Question Period by the hon. member for Roberval, were unparliamentary. I ask him once again to withdraw the words he spoke.

Mr. Michel Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the Chair, for the institution, but for once, I will have to accept your verdict. Unfortunately, I cannot comply with your request. It goes against my principles.

I consider that I have been unfairly treated compared to the Prime Minister.

* * *

• (1510)

NAMING OF MEMBER

The Speaker: It is not with great pleasure that I say the following:

Mr. Gauthier, I must name you for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Pursuant to the powers vested in me under Standing Order 11, I order you to withdraw from the House for the remainder of today's sitting.

[*Editor's Note: And Mr. Gauthier having withdrawn*]

* * *

[*English*]

PRIVILEGE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF SPORT IN CANADA

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege with regard to yet another leaked document, this time on the subcommittee on sport.

I propose to spend a brief amount of time on this, but I will suggest a solution to the House on behalf of our members on how to curtail this.

Privilege

While browsing through press clippings this morning I noted that the debate on the report of the subcommittee on sport began on Friday in the Toronto *Star*. Tim Harper in an article makes the following comment: “Canada's professional sports teams could be eligible for tax breaks if they can show they are providing substantial revenues to their communities but need some help to continue, a committee will recommend”.

It goes on to quote the chairman, the member for Broadview—Greenwood, saying: “His committee will recommend Canadian sports franchises playing in North American leagues could be eligible for tax breaks if—” and it goes on and on. The article lists a number of items from the report.

The Saturday edition of the *National Post* on page A17 reports much of the same thing and uses the language “A Commons committee recommends”, and on it goes.

Today in the Ottawa *Citizen* the debate continues on the report. In an article Gare Joyce states that the opposition members leaked details of the report late last week.

We have circumstantial evidence that points to the chair openly discussing the report and the article in the Ottawa *Citizen* actually cites members as leakers. Whatever the case may be, there are leakers among us.

I am not surprised this committee is ignoring parliamentary practice since it was this committee in fact that decided to ignore parliament altogether when it travelled to Toronto without the permission of the House. It is my understanding that the committee actually brought with it a host of Commons interpreters and other staff.

This committee and its members have absolutely no respect for parliament. But then again, why should they? Leaking a report before it is tabled in the House is more common than waiting for a report to be tabled.

• (1515)

There are some recent examples are, Mr. Speaker, and you have heard them all from us. There is the third report of the justice committee, the fourth report of the fisheries committee, the second report of the health committee, the child custody report, the foreign affairs report, and now the report on sport in Canada.

What is happening here, Mr. Speaker, is that these people who leak this information are being rewarded by getting a hit in the news and the news organization that receives the leaked information gets a news scoop.

Since there is no deterrent for leaking reports, reports continue to be leaked in this House. This has happened so often without the House taking responsibility that committees and their members have now decided to ignore parliament altogether. I wonder what will be next.

Privilege

If parliament is going to be known as a good place for a leak, then we have to talk about a little more transparency on the issue. We might as well openly leak reports.

I am faced with this situation with my colleagues. We have not leaked reports but we are sick and tired of reports being leaked from all of the committees. Either these reports will stop being leaked from these committees or this party here will consider reports from committees to be open public documents.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that you consider this and consider that time after time we come to this House and appeal to you to have this sort of thing stopped with no satisfactory resolution whatsoever.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can only speak to that portion of the member's remarks that deals with the subcommittee on sport. I can say two things. It was approved in the heritage committee this morning that the report would be tabled here on Thursday morning. I can also say to the hon. member that he will not find one sentence of any article anywhere in this country in the report that will be tabled here on Thursday. The report as of this minute has not been leaked in any way, shape or form to the press.

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the chair of the subcommittee in question has just indicated that to the best of his knowledge nothing that is in the report in fact has appeared elsewhere.

May I respectfully recommend to the Chair that before determining whether in fact there has been a leak, let alone what is done with it, that one should await the tabling of the document in question. That would not ascertain whether there has been a leak but it certainly would ascertain of course if the allegations made today in the media are false. We would at least know that as a first proposition.

That being said, I understand that the procedure and House affairs committee has received representations from hon. members. In fact it intends to start a discussion of this issue very shortly and of course subsequently to report its findings to the House.

There are two things. One, we do not have a copy of the report of the said subcommittee before the House and no way to compare whether or not the allegations in the paper are factual. Two, we should also wait for the report of the committee on procedure and House affairs.

That being said, I must say that I profoundly agree with anyone who suggests that it is improper to leak reports from standing committees. I as a parliamentarian and all members of this House have the right to be the first to know of what is prepared by a committee of our own colleagues. I fully subscribe to that proposition and I fully condemn anyone who attempts to make a report of

ours as members of parliament available to someone else before our own colleagues.

• (1520)

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say that I share the concern expressed by the House leader of the Reform Party and for that matter by the government House leader about the pattern of leaked committee reports.

I will have more to say on a subsequent point of order about question period, but one just feels the whole place here is teetering on the brink of chaos. People each in their own way are showing no respect for a variety of customs that have been established in this place to keep us from descending into chaos. One of those things has been the provision that committee reports are private and confidential until such time as they are tabled in this House.

This is part of a larger pattern of disregard for the House. It is not surprising to me, although I say this in no way to excuse it, but over time members would come to see the media as the place to make announcements when a pattern has developed over the years where the government itself does it. The House itself is used less and less by ministers, by the Prime Minister and by the government to make announcements. It is not just committee reports that we read about in the paper; it is government policy announcements and other kinds of major announcements that we read about in the paper. It is a pattern that is destroying this place.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what you can do about it because in the end it is something we all have to do something about. It does not just have to do with committees. It has to do with a pattern of government disregard for the House which has caught on and which has become endemic and is reaching its way into every aspect of our undertakings here.

I would urge members in whatever their capacity, whether they are government or opposition, that wherever they have an opportunity, to uphold the view that here is where we hear about things first. Here is where members of parliament get elected so they can hear about things first, instead of reading about it in the newspaper whether it is a committee report or an announcement by a minister. Then we can get back to being a parliament for a change.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the House leader of the NDP. As usual I appreciate his experience in this place and his observations of what has happened over the years. It is well known that members of the Reform Party are willing to look at new ways and different ways of doing business in this place.

There are things that need to be respected. What needs to be respected are the rules that we have agreed on going into the game. As happened yesterday, rules were changed on Private Members'

Business by resolution of the House. That is how you change the rules and until such time you live under those rules.

But when constantly day in and day out and week in and week out reports are leaked to the press, ideas and balloons are floated in the press, then imagine the whip's job as he tries to get people into committee and argue with them that it is important work of parliament and we are doing the people's work by doing these studies. People come back to me and other people in the party and say halfway through that it is totally irrelevant because the government leaks it to the media.

The question of was an exact quote attributed verbatim out of a report does not matter in this instance. On talking about the sports report that was leaked earlier, when someone quotes somebody as saying that his committee will recommend Canadian sports franchises playing in North American leagues could be eligible for tax breaks, that may not be a word for word quote out of the report, but what is the difference? The report is out. It is now public debate. The work of committee members who have been slogging it out for months on that report is now irrelevant. We may as well all go down and talk to our favourite reporter and duke it out.

That is not the way to come to consensus. Members of parliament who do not like that can come to this place and try to change the rules. But the rules should be followed.

● (1525)

This party is following the rules. I believe this side of the House is following the rules. That side of the House had better smarten up or, as the House leader of the NDP has already said, we are going to devolve into more disrespect for parliament unless they get their act together.

The Speaker: As was stated by the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona, we are indeed talking about a broader problem. It is a problem here with parliament where we were elected to serve.

What we have with the point of privilege that was brought up by the hon. member for Langley—Abbotsford, at least at this point from what I can hear, is that the hon. member is saying that someone from the government side leaked a document. He does not name a member but he seems to indicate that one of the members may have done it.

The member that he seems to have indicated, the member for Broadview—Greenwood, stood on his feet and as an hon. member he told us here in this House that he and no one else that he knows of has leaked this particular document.

We are right about one thing, that we do have the rules in the House and ultimately the rules are going to be kept by us, the

members of this House. I do not know how many times that I as the Speaker have to appeal to all members. These rules are made for all of us.

At this point, from what I have heard, we have a dispute on the facts of what happened. I find that there is no prima facie case for a point of privilege.

However, how many times do we all stand in this House and bemoan this fact? The government House leader says that he is absolutely opposed to anything like this. We have the Leader of the Opposition who is absolutely opposed. The spokesperson for the New Democratic Party is opposed. We all agree and yet these things still go on.

Unless we the parliamentarians together make a decision as to how we are going to conduct ourselves in here, we must not just deteriorate into the chaos of pointing fingers at one another.

I find that there is no prima facie case for a point of privilege.

I appeal to all my colleagues that unless we want to make this place work, it will not work. I appeal to your sense of honour that this type of thing should not happen. The best place for these announcements is here in our House where we are. This is where they should be made.

I encourage all of you, whoever the person is who leaked this, if they are indeed in this House or close to the people in this House, in the name of respect for this institution, that this cease forthwith.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my point of order has to do with question period.

As some members know, like some other members around here I am closing in on 20 years in this place and I have to say that was one of the worst question periods I have ever experienced. I think we all have some thinking to do about what is happening in question period and what happened to it in the extreme today.

I do not think we can continue in a situation where there is this sort of collective bellowing and clapping that goes on after every exchange. This is not a soccer game here for God's sake.

● (1530)

I can be as partisan as the next person. I like a good heckle and a good exchange, but everything that has been happening throughout this fall is going beyond the beyond.

Points of Order

I must confess a collective self-interest in the matter. It is not just a question of decorum for us, it also a question that the smaller parties get pushed off at the end of question period when this happens. The people who are generally at fault in this, who have the power collectively in their numbers to bring the House to a standstill, are not the people who suffer. Either the government or the Bloc or the Reform Party each take its turn at this and who suffers? Who gets pushed off at the end of question period? It is not the people who have the power to create this kind of situation.

I am concerned about it from the point of view of the NDP and the Conservatives, but it is not just that. It is also the people on the end of the list for the Reform Party, on the end of the list for the Bloc and the government backbenchers who were on the list. I do not think we can tolerate this situation any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with you to rethink your own tactics in this regard. I know that you do not want to say "order", but I am very concerned that the tactic which you employ of simply standing until the House reconvenes, until it quiets down by itself, is not working. As much as I know your reasons, which I think are noble, for not wanting to say "order", there are certainly times in this place for the Speaker to intervene and say "order", as speakers do with gavels or orally in parliaments all around the world. There is a time and a place for this. I would urge you to rethink your strategy in this regard because it is visibly, obviously, clearly not working.

Today was a perfect example of that. There were moments when I felt that an intervention by the Chair might have brought order or might simply have moved us on. If you feel one party or another is contributing negatively to decorum, move on to the next party. Do as speakers in the past have done and use the discretion of the Chair to punish people who are not contributing to decorum.

It may be that people who are members of the parties which are acting up will be punished for the sins of their colleagues, but collectively they will have a discussion about it after the fact and maybe better behaviour will come of it.

When people watch this on television they cannot tell who is yelling. All they see is you, Mr. Speaker, so they think we are all yelling. We are not all yelling. Some of us are sitting here hoping the place will get quiet so we can get on with our questions. It does not help the public perception of the House of Commons to have you standing there for literally five minutes at a time sometimes, as was the case today, while there is this terrible background noise. It cannot be good for parliament in terms of its perception and it certainly is not good for parliament in terms of its everyday practice.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to add to the remarks of my

colleague from Winnipeg—Transcona. He is absolutely right when he says that those who are perhaps the most active in this raucous behaviour that is delaying question period are the direct beneficiaries of that behaviour and that the people who pay the price are those in the smaller parties.

Let us have something else on the record. The loss of two or four questions from the two smallest parties in this House is significant in terms of our overall presentation and our ability to participate in a fair way in the question period process.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to your sense of fairness and even-handedness that you do intervene and that you move quickly. There should be some consequence for the type of behaviour we have seen displayed.

• (1535)

There are certain members who continuously and repeatedly ask questions that cause this place to deteriorate into an uproar and there seems to be little consequence for that behaviour.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you and ask you to use your discretion in the Chair to move quickly. As has been stated previously by the hon. member from the NDP, there has to be some sense of fairness and justice if question period is to work.

I certainly do not have the experience of the previous member, but in the short time I have been here, in the past number of months, I have seen the deterioration. Perhaps today was an aberration, but I believe that there has been deterioration. There has to be some intervention on the part of the Chair if this behaviour is to stop.

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I want to put on the record that I am also disgusted to be one of the 301 people sitting in the House today. I am ashamed to be part of this collective House and what went on in here.

I concur with the comments of both of the last two members who spoke. It is not just today. We have seen this all fall.

Look, for example, at what happened today. There was no punishment by throwing the member out of the House for the rest of the day. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that you have to take serious action and maybe even not recognize people in the future. Something has to be done to bring decorum back to this House.

I said to one of my colleagues "I wonder what it looks like through the eyes of the camera, to the people out there? How bad is it?" I can say that I was disgusted to be one of the members sitting in the House today. We are collectively part of this institution and it is time we changed this situation.

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not specifically want to

Points of Order

comment on the strategies employed by the Chair, other than to indicate my support for the Chair and its occupant.

I do agree that this was not one of our better days. I do not want to say it was the worst one we have ever seen. I have been around here a long time too and I remember a number of others. But it is true that this was not up to the standard which we have established over the last year, year and half or perhaps before that.

Maybe one good idea would be for all of us, as we gather tomorrow at our weekly caucus meetings, to review and gather our thoughts to determine what we can do.

In the spirit of the season, notwithstanding the insults flying across the way, we should do what we can to co-operate at least over the number of days remaining before we adjourn for the holiday season.

If there are parties that have been aggrieved today, and no doubt some were because of the shortage of questions, maybe if we do a better job of being brief in our questions over the next few days, then we will at least make up for any grievance that might have come forward today.

That is what I would hope and I offer it as a suggestion not to the Chair, but to all of us, to help make this place work better over the next five or six days until we adjourn for the holiday season.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague, the parliamentary leader of the NDP, has just raised a very important point.

Your, in my opinion very harsh, ruling against the hon. member for Roberval was made on the basis of order or disorder. Our colleague earlier—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: There will be no questioning the Speaker's ruling. The matter is closed, and I want no more discussion of the hon. member for Roberval.

I would ask my hon. colleague to direct his remarks to the point of order raised by the parliamentary leader of the New Democratic Party.

• (1540)

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, if the government House leader would let me continue, I would have an opportunity to establish a direct connection with the point raised by our colleague from the New Democratic Party.

A moment ago, and you did not interrupt him, our colleague from Saanich—Gulf Islands suggested that the ruling you had just made was not a real punishment of our colleague.

Anyone who knows the member for Roberval knows that he is an experienced parliamentarian with profound respect for parliamentary institutions and, as such, fully aware that his decision not to comply with your ruling—

The Speaker: I have asked that no reference be made to the hon. member for Roberval. If you have a point to make, please make it now so that we can continue. I do not want any further reference to the hon. member for Roberval.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, if in order to make my point I must refer to my colleague without naming his riding, as did the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, I shall carry on without naming his riding, confident that all the members of this House know full well who I am referring to.

His decision not to comply with your ruling was a very difficult decision for him to make. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, you made this ruling on the basis of the disturbance his remarks may have caused in this place.

I respectfully submit that his request, which, in my sense, was a very reasonable one, was for you to examine remarks—

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

[*English*]

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I think probably what my colleagues feel is that there is not equality in the way in which every member is treated. I can understand the position that you are in. It is awkward. You have to make a call on the fly and it is a difficult thing for you to do. I think my colleague from Winnipeg made a good point that rather than just standing there for what seems forever when we are in the short, tight period of question period, maybe you do need to be a little more proactive.

I have just gone up to my office and reviewed the tape of my question period time and over five minutes was spent on that. There was nothing unparliamentary in what I said. But what I sensed from you, Mr. Speaker, was that because you were angry with the Bloc you ended up taking it out on me. I am not sure there is any wisdom in that.

The Speaker: I am getting a pretty good picture of where we are going. With respect to this point of order I am going to make a suggestion.

At the beginning of this parliament the House leaders came to me with a suggestion about question period. It seemed like a good suggestion at the time and I think it is a good suggestion even to this day.

This was a bad question period. It was probably the worst that I have been through as Speaker of the House. Perhaps the blame should rest on my shoulders. After all, I am your Speaker. You have

Supply

chosen me. Perhaps the tactics that I have used have been less than proactive, as was suggested. However, I have always been of the view that members of parliament, indeed most people, are reasonable people. You have come to the same conclusion today. You have seen what we can do to ourselves in this institution.

I would like to convene before the question period tomorrow. I see that most of the House leaders are here now. I would like to convene the House leaders and if they so wish their whips, but if not just the House leaders, in my chambers. I will have them contacted before the end of this day with a time. This is serious enough that I would like them to sit down with me in my chambers. We will address this problem together and we will solve this problem.

• (1545)

The House leaders are here, except for of course my colleague who is not here. He will be informed and he will come to be with us also.

I want this point of order closed down. If there is another point of order I will listen to it.

[*Translation*]

Does the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve have another point of order?

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like another element to be added to the debate. Since all parties have spoken on the topic and since one element was missing, I can assure you that this has nothing to do with your ruling.

The Speaker: We will leave the matter as it stands.

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF DOCUMENT

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In response to a question from the Leader of the Opposition today in question period the Prime Minister stated that the federal government had tabled an agreement in December 1997 in response to the premiers' social union agreement.

We cannot find any such agreement and we are wondering if the Prime Minister could please table it so that it could be made available to us.

The Speaker: As far as I know he did not quote directly from the document. If he did not quote directly from the document, we might ask him through the government House leader if there is such a document and then go from there.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—SOCIAL PROGRAMS

The House resumed consideration of the motion; and of the amendment.

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with a colleague.

Members of the House deal with many different issues on a day to day basis. During any given session we could be talking about bank mergers, agricultural subsidies or assistance to northern communities. The topics are as diverse as the physical and human geography of the country. Each is important in its own way because each impacts on the communities and the people we represent.

I am sure we would all agree that Canada's social union is an issue that touches both the hearts and minds of every Canadian in each corner of this great nation. I am happy the Reform Party has taken an active interest in the social union framework. It is certainly an issue which the government and the Prime Minister take seriously.

Today's motion neglects to mention that the idea of the social union framework arose not from the Saskatoon agreement but rather from a meeting between the Prime Minister and his provincial colleagues in December 1997.

The government has always supported the initiative from the start. While I understand the opposition's desire to speed things along, I cannot support the motion. Nor should the House support it. Negotiations are still ongoing and we must resist the temptation to rush recklessly forward. There are important issues on the table and it demands that they be addressed both thoroughly and thoughtfully.

Thomas D'Arcy McGee, one of the architects of our modern system of government, once characterized federalism as a great principle that speaks to the very foundations of human nature. I like this. It shows the kind of spirit that went into the development of this great country.

• (1550)

The principles at the heart of the federal idea are noble ones: mutual support, understanding and accommodation. These are the principles upon which the country was built and helped make Canada what it is today.

Supply

[*Translation*]

But when we focus on disagreements and disputes, we lose sight of these principles. We lose sight of how we all benefit from federalism.

Our parliament and our country were not built by men who kept saying that it was beyond their ability or wondering what they would get out of it. They were built by people who focussed on what they could accomplish together.

We need a bit more of this kind of enthusiasm today, because Canada is constantly evolving. It is a work in progress. We have a solid foundation, but we must keep building.

[*English*]

That is exactly what the government is doing. The Reform Party asked about our plans concerning the social union framework. The answer is straightforward. We are negotiating with our partners. It is that simple.

The government is confident that we will negotiate a framework agreement that is good for the country and all citizens. That is how the government operates. We take a reasoned approach designed to produce maximum benefits for Canadians.

That is certainly the approach we are taking toward renewing the federation. We promote national unity by building a better Canada for all Canadians. That is what Canadians want. If we ask people on the streets of Kitchener, Halifax or Drummondville what their priorities are, we will get the same answers: jobs, safe streets, good health care and a healthy environment for themselves and their children. That is what Canadians want and that is exactly what we are working on giving them.

Despite what some may be implying, building a stronger Canada does not mean focusing exclusively on the Constitution. The Constitution is a useful tool for state building that continues to serve the country well. It needs to be respected, but constitutional change is not the only way to improve the federation.

The government has worked very hard over the past five years to improve our country. It has worked systematically in partnership with the provinces to address the needs of Canadians. Negotiation of the social union framework is part of these efforts.

A number of our initiatives have been introduced on a variety of different fronts. They have been developed with the goal of better positioning Canada as we enter the 21st century. We have a plan that we outlined in the Speech from the Throne. We are following that plan systematically.

First I will discuss some of the advantages we have made on the fiscal side of things. Getting our books in order is fundamentally important because it allows us the freedom to pursue our goals.

Then I will identify the principles that underlie our current efforts toward renewing the federation.

We must look at the initiatives the government has undertaken which prove that progress has and will continue to take place. That should give members of the House a good idea of how much has already been accomplished over the past five years.

The government has made historic inroads in deficit reduction and has worked with Canadians to balance our books. I am proud to say that the world has taken notice. The financial gurus who were disparaging us just a few short years ago are now changing their tunes.

Thanks to the sacrifices that Canadians made and the conditions we have set in place to ensure a strong Canadian economy, we have continued a five year tradition of beating every one of our fiscal targets. The federal budget balance has improved from a deficit of \$42 billion in 1993-94 to a surplus of \$3.5 billion in 1997-98, a \$45.5 billion turnaround in just four years.

• (1555)

While unemployment is still too high it has fallen from the 11.4% in the fall of 1993 to the 8.1% of today, the lowest level in eight years and a record improvement exceeded only by the United Kingdom among the G-7 nations.

Throughout the decades of the seventies, eighties and the early nineties our deficits were much higher than those of the U.S. Now we have a surplus. Interest rates on long term government bonds which directly affect mortgage rates and business loans are at their lowest levels in three decades. A good economy goes a long way in promoting a strong and unified Canada.

The opposition motion fails to recognize that when we are in a partnership it takes agreement and it takes consensus among all the players. While it is true that there has been consensus reached and the government will build on that coming from the Saskatoon meeting of August 7, there is not the unanimous consent the motion is predicated upon.

The government has shown that it is willing to work in a meaningful way in a partnership with the provinces and territories to continue to have a government and a nation that are relevant and good for Canadians both today and into the next century.

Mr. Gerry Byrne (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to what I call a wonderful accolade which has been given to the government, a wonderful vote of confidence, a wonderful gesture of the opposition stating that it has the utmost confidence in the government to conclude in 31 days what I would call one of the most fundamental, one of the most important and one of the most significant agreements in Canadian political history.

Supply

The opposition through the Reform motion is calling on the government to conclude an agreement by December 31, 1998 on what its version of social union would be. It is calling on the government to unilaterally conclude those discussions and to come up with an agreement by December 31.

If we really reflect on it, as the hon. member for Burin—St. George's should do instead of babbling on over there, the opposition is telling us that we should have a clear and full mandate to unilaterally, without the scrutiny of the opposition, conclude that agreement.

If we think about what social programs are to Canadians, the values that Canadians instil through their social programs and what they mean to them practically in their day to day lives, this is quite an accomplishment. The opposition is giving us quite an accolade.

On social programs, our health care system, our employment insurance system and our job training system, things that Canadians cherish and rely upon, the opposition is telling us that with unanimous consent of the House we should be able to conclude an agreement within a 31 day period.

Canada is a nation that has evolved over 130 years. If we think about it, the opposition is now telling us that we should have 31 days to conclude a very significant piece of work. I take the compliment very seriously and gratefully, but I think the issue is far too serious, far too important and far too fundamental to the wishes and aspirations of Canadians for us to do so without fully engaging our partners in this discussion.

Social programs are very important. We take very seriously our role in guarding them and making sure that they are available to future generations just as they are available to us today. It is not so much ensuring that they are available as is but that they evolve according to the wishes and the needs of Canadians over time.

The agreements and discussions that will come forward in coming months and years must reflect the priority of Canadians. They must reflect their wishes. That involves citizen engagement. That cannot be done in a 31 day period as the opposition is telling us.

• (1600)

I do not think any agreement could be drafted, and I am not saying should be drafted, in a 31 day period given the fact that there probably would not be too many opposition members around on December 31, 1998 to review it, to reflect upon it or to offer their opinion.

I do not think that bodes well for the conduct and activities of the House. I do not think that those are the original intentions or wishes of the opposition. However, it reflects their very poorly thought out, opportunistic and ill spirited intent to corner the government

for the sake of cornering it by suggesting that it would be appropriate to conclude such a significant agreement within a 31 day period.

Canadians are far more intelligent, far more reflective and take their social programs far more seriously than to be boondoggled by such a very inappropriate and ill conceived notion.

We are working diligently toward building a consensus, working with our partners and working with all sides of the House in an honest debate, not on something that is preconceived and arbitrary, not in the best interest of Canadians and not reflected by the premiers of the province. Within the past 24 hour period they have come forward and said that we should do this thoughtfully and responsibly and get the best possible social union, not just any social union.

That is the difference between members on this side of the House and members on the other side of the House. We are looking to get what is in the best interest of Canadians. That means not concluding a deal just for the sake of concluding a deal. It means making sure that we build upon the 130 year history of our country and that we build upon the efforts, the initiatives and the strengths of our forefathers, the people who built the country.

We have to remember the country did not evolve within a period of 31 days as is now being suggested as the objective, the motive or the principle we should adopt. It is being suggested that as at December 1, 1998 we should put in place an arbitrary deadline for the form and the finality of a social union which will be the cultural base of our social programs for the future and will be the rigid structure.

That is not what this is all about. We are not engaging in a debate that will actually determine the nature of social programs. We are engaging in a discussion about how the implementation of those programs will proceed. We will still need a lot of flexibility over time. We will still need the input of Canadians over time. No matter when or whatever agreement is concluded, Canadians must, should and will be a part of any process. Canadians have to be. We have to engage our citizens in any such discussion.

If we include a December 31, 1998 deadline and say that there will be no further discussions after that point, on New Year's Eve 1998 while the Reform Party is out celebrating the Government of Canada will be finalizing the entire form, structure and nature of the social union.

Let us think about it. Canadians across the country have already thought about it. They do not want it. They want a process which is a lot more responsible, inclusive to their wishes and abides by the wishes of the 10 provinces. The provinces have spoken. They have said that we should continue the discussions, not put arbitrary deadlines on anything but build an agreement which is substantive,

in good form and reflects the needs of current and future generations.

I do not think there is much more to say. Canadians know what they need. They know what they want. They know what they deserve.

• (1605)

What they deserve is a process that is fair, equitable, transparent and reflects the fact that it is irresponsible to negotiate an agreement with a gun to the head as the Reform Party is suggesting through a motion that binds the Government of Canada to a December 31, 1998 deadline to conclude all future discussions, to finalize it, to finish it and to have no more involvement.

I will conclude where I began. The Reform Party has given us quite an accolade. It is quite an acknowledgement of our capabilities, our spirit and our willingness to work for Canadians. It is quite a show of confidence. However, it is unfortunately one that I will reject right now because this party and this government are more interested in doing things right, in including the citizens and in doing things the responsible way.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the member opposite. He said that we have asked them to settle this most fundamental and important agreement ever for the government in 31 days.

I was here during question period and I heard the Prime Minister tell the House that the government originated the social union talks. It must have some parameters upon which it supposedly built, although I disagree with who originated it. He also said that they had a response report in December 1997. We are talking about the government having a response to the premiers social union 12 months ago.

If the government has been negotiating long enough to respond to the premiers a year ago, is he telling me that it cannot wrap up a year and a half long or a two year long discussion in 30 days?

I cannot believe that the member rapped about 31 days. We are not talking about 31 days. According to the Prime Minister, the government has had at least 12 months from the time it gave a response to the premiers on the social union.

Mr. Gerry Byrne: Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand why the member from the Reform Party would be confused or not understand how members on this side of the House could actually enter into a discussion without a preconceived notion. When the Reform Party caucus meets and decides automatically who the Reformer of the week is, all those discussions have usually come to a preconceived conclusion. That is why that particular aspect of my comments today may not fall on completely sensitive ears.

Supply

The hon. member is quite right. This is a process that does take time and has taken time. Quite frankly it will take even more time. The country was not built in 31 days. Nor was it built in a year and a half. Nor was it built in a decade. It took several years to come to the point where we have a national health care system with universal principles that is universally accessible.

It took several years to build an economic system where we have infrastructure from one end of the country to the other, where we have different ideals and beliefs about the implementation of labour market principles and where individual provinces agree with it.

Good things take time and it is about time the hon. member learned that.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just have a quick question for the member. The member who just spoke is well known as an advocate for his region of the country, Atlantic Canada. He spends a lot of time thinking about, debating and working on the issues that are comprised within the social union envelope.

Could he tell the House whether there has been a cry on the part of the Atlantic premiers for a deadline? Are they expressing concern about the speed of this? In his experience are they asking for a specific deadline?

• (1610)

Mr. Gerry Byrne: Mr. Speaker, that question actually focuses the debate and the discussion much better. I am pleased to answer it. The premier of Newfoundland and Labrador has gone on record. He specifically said that we should continue to work, take our time, be diligent in our discussions, be thoughtful in our discussions and do it right.

The premier of Newfoundland and Labrador has been joined by premiers from western Canada as well the constituencies, places or regions that some members opposite may purport to best represent. However, premiers from across the country have said that they support the federal government. They acknowledge the federal government. They are equal partners in the discussion.

They should not be sidetracked into a secondary role based on a Reform motion which imposes upon the federal government alone to conclude the discussions and the negotiations by December 31, 1998. That is not the spirit. That is not the substance of what we are trying to do. The Reform Party should learn that and understand it once and for all.

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the province of Quebec voters again turned to the

Supply

separatist government of the Parti Québécois, or did they? I submit that Quebecers did not vote for Lucien Bouchard as much as they voted against status quo federalism. Polls indicate that the majority of Quebecers believe in Canada. However they have made it very clear that Confederation must be rejuvenated. This will not be an easy task.

The federal government has avoided it for over 30 years. Despite this terrible record members opposite can make their first steps in the right direction by voting in favour of the motion by the hon. member of South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, more importantly by beginning to create winning conditions for Canada.

Canada was formed into Confederation in 1867 at a time when the Constitution Act guaranteed the division of power between the federal and provincial governments. However, since that time the federal government has clawed back control over areas that rightfully belong to the provinces such as employment training, social services and education. Because of this, Quebec and other Canadian provinces alike continue to feel marginalized by the federal government.

In 1980 René Lévesque took Quebec to the polls in a bout on sovereignty. This was a wake up call to the House of Commons that the social union between the provinces and the federal government was not functioning. Still nothing was done to solve the problem. Instead the federal government under Liberal leader Pierre Trudeau continued to pick away at areas of provincial responsibility and attempted to impose the federal government's will in every facet of social spending.

The Constitution was repatriated to Canada in 1982 with great fanfare, much horn blowing and flag waving. Accords were appended at Meech Lake and in Charlottetown. By 1992 both these agreements had been defeated due to their fundamental failure to address the issues of provincial-federal relations. Worse still, neither of these agreements responded to the grassroots voices of Canadians.

Canadians rightfully rejected the Meech Lake and Charlottetown accords. At the time only the Reform Party stood against these backroom, made in Ottawa solutions to Canadian unity. I am proud of our record in this regard.

Inevitably in 1995 the Parti Québécois launched a second vote on separation. Throughout the referendum campaign the Prime Minister led Canadians to believe he was not concerned or worried about the outcome. Canadians were loath to sleep because of these assurances. The Prime Minister was terribly wrong in this assessment of Quebecers' desire for change and we fortunately achieved a no victory by the narrowest of margins.

Why the history lesson? Because all these efforts have brought us exactly nowhere. As of Monday we again sit on Canada's

break-up. The clock is ticking. Premier Bouchard is already at work in attempting to manufacture a yes vote in the next referendum. In the last 30 years federal politicians have talked around the issue of Quebec separation. They have never addressed the core problems of federal-provincial responsibility. This head in the sand approach has resulted in two referendums in succession, two failed constitutional accords and the growth of two full blown separatist parties in the Bloc Québécois and Parti Québécois.

The people of Quebec are clearly dissatisfied and the narrow margin of a no referendum victory in 1995 sent a very clear message of the vital need for real change in the country.

• (1615)

Not only Quebecers but British Columbians, Albertans and people from all provinces want greater control over the decisions which directly impact the economic, social and cultural fabric of their lives. The symbolic gestures of distinct society and regional vetoes that were made following the referendum vote have proven ineffective and irrelevant to resolving the crisis. In particular, the passing of Motion No. 26 recognizing Quebec as a distinct society demonstrated a blatant disregard for the wishes of Canadians who had twice expressed their opposition to such recognition in Meech Lake and Charlottetown. It had no effect on the desire of sovereignists to separate.

The Reform Party has consistently set out to resolve these problems, not with empty rhetoric and blind faith, not with rolling dice in backroom deals. We have proposed substantive and workable change in the Canadian federation.

In January 1996 we published "20/20: A Vision for The Future of Canada". This document outlined 20 realities to secession so that the federal government would be prepared to face future threats of separation. More important, we provided 20 proposals for a new confederation. I believe these proposals were the beginning of creating winning conditions for Canada.

In May 1988 the Reform Party again proposed changes to modernize the Canadian government when we introduced the new Canada act. To date the government has taken no action on any of these recommendations. We cannot afford to sit on our hands any longer.

The motion of the floor of the House today speaks to the heart of these matters. If passed it would be the first real step in achieving a fair relationship between the federal and provincial governments from coast to coast. It is not specifically designed for Quebec, nor should it be. However, the framework put forward today addresses key concerns on the minds of people both in and out of Quebec.

There is an understanding among all 10 premiers and both territorial leaders that health care is a top priority. The Parti Québécois of Quebec, the NDP Government of Saskatchewan, the

Supply

Conservative Government of Alberta, the Liberal Government of New Brunswick all have called for greater input into the provision of social services. The widespread support for the Calgary declaration should have been used as a springboard for this government to tackle some of the outstanding problems in federal-provincial relations. Instead it sat largely untouched and unused.

The motion on the floor today addresses many of the concerns Canadians have been expressing across the country. It provides a framework of discussion that will lead to a bilateral, universally accepted social union between different levels of government and remove uncertainty facing Canadians. It will provide direction for legislation that can address a wide range of outstanding issues on health care and constitutional reform. Currently there is no federal-provincial dispute resolution process.

As mentioned earlier, the Constitution Act, 1867 guarantees the right of provinces to provide these services. Despite this, the federal government has consistently pursued a policy that has limited the input of provincial authorities. We cannot continue to unilaterally dictate the terms of social union and provincial authorities and expect co-operation under the terms of Confederation. We must establish a framework for open discussion and equal footing.

I am from British Columbia. I state for the record that I am dismayed with the performance of the present provincial government. It has helped to drive British Columbia to the brink of financial ruin. Nurses threaten widespread picketing and doctors continue job action. They are critically understaffed. But the federal government is equally culpable. B.C. is like all provinces handcuffed by the \$7 billion removed from health care transfers. This motion lays the framework for legislation that will ensure that when the federal government promises to pay 50% of program costs the promises will be kept. Without this blind assurance, the long term planning of health, social welfare and educational budgets is impossible.

Currently the federal government is the prosecutor, the judge and the jury of any disputes. British Columbia, Alberta and Quebec have all been forced to structure their social welfare programs within very strict guidelines despite the federal government's ability to unilaterally reduce funding through the Canada health and social transfer.

All provinces are not the same. However, all provinces must be treated equally and fairly by providing realistic and mutually acceptable approaches to the participation or non-participation of provinces in Canada and Canada's social programs. This motion gives more latitude in the provision of social care.

The government is focused on the December 31 date. I hear it over and over again.

• (1620)

This is the beginning. We are saying it has to get the framework in place. Obviously the details would be ironed out down the road. We have to make it happen and there has to be a target date. It is nonsense to say we will solve everything. But the entire framework and how it is to happen has to be in place. It is very achievable.

Historically the federal government has guarded this right zealously. However, it has not provided provinces the ability to operate creatively within this framework. The motion today provides that opportunity.

We have an opportunity today to put a positive step forward and engage the provinces in a meaningful manner, a way that does not require constitutional amendments nor placing any one province in an unequal position to that of the others.

The motion on the floor today proposes a social union between the provinces and the federal government. It would create a mechanism to constructively move this process forward. It would give British Columbia a greater say in social policy. It would give Newfoundland fair and even footing with dealing with Ottawa. And yes, it would provide the Quebec people with the greater control they seek without separation.

This motion does all these things from a position of equality and openness. It will provide the blueprint for a secure social safety net and a more solid foundation for the Canadian federation.

I encourage all members of the House to vote in favour of it and to help ensure that Canada, which we are rightfully proud of, will be intact and stable for our children.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): 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 Halifax West, aboriginal affairs; the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, health.

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, I listened with some interest to the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands and his history lesson. As a student of history and someone who reads a fair amount of history, both ancient and modern, I would like to repeat a bit back to the member about Canadian unity and the ability of the provinces to sit down as equals and hopefully work toward a better country for all Canadians.

As the hon. member was speaking I was thinking of an ad that his party supported during the previous election. It said not another leader from Quebec. They were all crossed out. That is a very difficult thing to overcome and that is the type of thing the member has to wrap his head around and overcome if he and his party are to move ahead toward unity in this country.

Supply

The motion on the floor today is not about bringing the provinces together. It is a motion to set in place the next referendum in Quebec. It is impossible for the people to meet by December 31. It is an artificial date. It will not happen. Everyone is off over Christmas. It is totally fraudulent and ridiculous and cynical. If the date had been the end of January, the end of February or the end of March I think the member and the party would have received some support for the motion.

How cynical can we be. There is no open discussion. There is no equal footing among the provinces at this time. They cannot meet a deadline when everyone is off during the Christmas holidays. We will not achieve unanimity and it will fail and the new government that sits in Quebec today will say "Look at that. We can't even get agreement on a December 31 deadline therefore the door is open, let's look at a referendum". That is what will happen.

Mr. Gary Lunn: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his comments. People are focused on this very narrow part, the date. If that is the only problem, as the member suggested, let us change it to January or February. Let us change it. I am not stuck on the date. I am stuck on this country. We have to make changes.

It is not working. The people of Canada spoke on Charlottetown. They sent us a clear message. We still have status quo. It has not changed. We need change. We need winning conditions for Canada if my children are to have the country that I had to grow up in. That is what this is all about. I read the motion that we set the framework up. But if the date should be changed let us change it. We are not stuck on the date. Let us change it and make it happen.

• (1625)

Mr. Reg Alcock (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the issue of the date he dismisses and does not dismiss. He said if the 31st is not suitable then let us have another date.

This is a negotiation or discussion with the provinces. How can this House commit the provinces to a date? Do we not have to consult our partners? Is it not a little presumptuous of the House to say this or that date? This thing will be a negotiation among partners. Perhaps we should leave the decision about the timing of this to the partners who are negotiating.

Mr. Gary Lunn: Mr. Speaker, I quote a government news release: "Premiers stressed that negotiations should proceed with a view to concluding the draft agreement by the end of the year".

If we are stuck on that date, change it. The premiers want change and if there is no goal it does not happen. If there is no target it will not be achieved. We have been sitting for years in the House with

the status quo. This system is broken. It needs fixing. It is not working.

Let us provide winning conditions for my children so they will have a great country in which to grow up. If the date is what they are stuck on let us change it to January or February. I have no problem with that at all. If they want to put a motion forward to change the date I am sure they would get the consent of the House. If that is the only problem I suggest they put a motion forward to change it and see what happens.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to this official opposition motion put forward by my colleague from Calgary Southwest.

The motion reads as follows:

That this House urge the government to conclude an agreement with the provinces and territories, prior to December 31, 1998, and based on the unanimous resolution of the provinces as agreed to last August 7 at Saskatoon, to strengthen the partnership between the federal, provincial and territorial governments in order to secure Canada's social programs for the future.

This is a very important motion in the light of yesterday's election in Quebec. It is very important for this House to consider the issue of social union.

[*English*]

What we saw yesterday was Quebecers saying they are not satisfied with status quo federalism nor are they satisfied with the radical option of separation. What Quebecers said by granting a parliamentary majority to the Parti québécois but an electoral plurality to the Parti libéral du Québec was that they do not support either the status quo or the radical option of separation.

What they said in the public opinion polls and the exit polls was that they do not support the radical option of separation but they do want change. In this desire they form common cause with most other Canadians, certainly with the representatives of the official opposition and the vast majority of those we represent in western Canada, with the various provincial governments which in August agreed on an entente to address the need for change in the federation, and apparently with all or most of the opposition parties in the Chamber.

The premiers and the governments they represented gathered together in good faith several months ago to put forward some constructive concrete proposals for the rebalancing of powers between the two levels of government. What did they receive in terms of a response from the federal government? Little or nothing. They received a duck and dodge which the provinces are all too familiar with from the government.

• (1630)

What does it come down to? Let us be blunt. The Liberal Party of Canada really believes its own propaganda, that it is the sole saviour of confederation, that it is the one and only political vehicle for federalism in this country.

It really is a kind of political arrogance that is endemic in the psychology of the Liberal Party of Canada. It is attached to the idea that Ottawa knows best, that top down big brother in Ottawa can unilaterally weave its way into areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction through its spending and taxing powers, that through this enormous intervention on the part of the central government the federation can somehow be kept together.

The story of our federation in the past three decades is one of growing and almost fatal tension between the centralizing, Ottawa knows best mentality of the members opposite who I believe hold the view sincerely. There is the growing need of the provinces and regions to more ably represent their regional concerns in a more flexible federal context. This is the tension that really lies at the heart not only of the sovereignty debate in Quebec but so much of the feeling of alienation and discontent in the rest of the country.

It is very disappointing for me to pick up the newspapers today and read various quotes of members of the Liberal government saying essentially that change in the federation is a non-starter, that we are going to just set our feet into concrete and that we are not going to allow the federation to evolve into the 21st century.

In an article in today's Ottawa *Citizen* for instance I read a statement from the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River who said "I have not met an MP who is prepared to negotiate away an element of the federal government's role just so we can achieve temporary peace with the brawling provincial children. It just is not on".

This is typical of the attitude of members opposite. Instead of a constructive, collaborative and co-operative approach, the kind of co-operative approach upon which a healthy federation must be founded, we find this kind of belligerent attitude regarding sovereign provincial governments. They are sovereign in their own jurisdiction, sovereign as defined in the original Constitution of this country in their own areas of competence.

Instead of regarding them as co-operative sovereign governments, the hon. member and many of his colleagues refer to those provinces as brawling children. He says that we just cannot negotiate a single element of what this federal government does, the government that spends \$160 billion with a cabinet of 35 ministers.

This government has one of the largest cabinets probably of any federation in the world, much larger than the federation to our south, or Germany or Australia. It is a federal government that encroaches its way into virtually every area of provincial jurisdiction.

Supply

The most galling thing about it is that while these Liberals refuse to accept the kind of co-operative change proposed by the provinces, at the very same time they undercut the very authority upon which the federal government's spending power is asserted.

Look at the Canada Health Act. The only guarantee of the enforcement of federal standards in the Canada Health Act is the federal transfer, the Canada health and social transfer.

When the federal medicare system was developed 30 years ago, of course it was predicated on a commitment of 50% funding. That is the basis upon which the unilateral federal standards are imposed on the provinces. Yet today this government which prides itself on its commitment to unity and federal standards has reduced that funding share to 11%. And it still expects the provinces to accept the standards as defined by Ottawa.

What the provinces are asking for in the social union agreement of this August, what the official opposition and other parties are asking for is not unilateral imposition of federal standards but rather, co-operative national standards agreed to by all the provinces co-operatively, not by one of the governments, the central government, unilaterally. It is not a radical concept. It is a concept embraced by virtually every mature and healthy democratic federation in the world.

• (1635)

I appeal to my colleagues opposite to try to be a little more flexible when it comes to this.

[*Translation*]

A social union should consider collaborative approaches to the exercise of the federal spending power in provincial jurisdictions. This is very important for Quebec, as this is one of its traditional demands. Western Canada has asked for the same thing and, in this respect, it has a great deal in common with Quebec.

When the federal government spends money in provincial areas of responsibility or arbitrarily withdraws funding from a provincial jurisdiction, this may cause friction in federal-provincial relations and problems in service delivery. We need a new agreement describing how powers are shared between the federal government and the provinces. I would ask that the members of this House support this Reform motion.

[*English*]

In closing, much has been raised about the timing, the deadline in this motion, which was simply taken from the accord of the premiers in August. We would like to respond to the legitimate arguments raised about the deadline by members of various parties. I would like to ask for consent to move that the motion be amended by deleting the words "prior to December 31, 1998", and substituting therefor the following: "before the next federal budget is introduced".

Supply

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Calgary Southeast has requested the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion. Does the hon. member for Calgary Southeast have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Bachand: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Before giving consent to anything, I remind you that this motion was introduced this morning, and I would like to know why I was not allowed—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am sorry, but this is not a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Reg Alcock (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can deal with both issues.

The member in his remarks made a point of talking about the arrogance of the federal government simply ordering things around in the union in a top down fashion. This government for quite some time now has been working very hard in co-operation with the provinces on a whole range of problems.

The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and the Minister of Justice in the social union discussions have been working very diligently with all of the provinces to bring about a consensus on needed changes to the social union framework. That is what is going on.

For the federal government to order—actually not the federal government in this case but the House—by passage of this motion, whether it is December 31 or before the first budget, is setting a condition around these negotiations that we have no authority to set. The provinces are partners in this so how can we presume to tell them when they are going to conclude this agreement? I would also suggest it introduces an item into the negotiation that mitigates against the kind of consensus we are all trying to achieve. These are extremely important services that affect all Canadians in all parts of the country.

The member is absolutely right when he makes the case that they should be conducted in an atmosphere of co-operation and consultation. We should work toward a consensus, all partners to the agreement, all the provinces, the territories and the federal government. That is the final part of the comment. The federal government is not a passive bystander in this. It has a role to play.

The question I have for the member is, in supporting so fervently the consensus arrived at by the provinces, is he saying that this position is the position of the Reform Party?

• (1640)

Mr. Jason Kenney: Mr. Speaker, the precise position of the Reform Party with respect to the social union reform of the federation has been laid out in some considerable detail in our proposed new Canada act, a copy of which the hon. member opposite can find at our web site at www.reform.ca, or by writing to my office postage free. I would be happy to send him a copy of the new Canada act. It endorses in large part the recommendations of the premiers on the social union but goes further in other areas. It is not identical, but we do believe that social union is a major addition to the debate.

The hon. member said he was going to address both issues, one of which was timing. All day we have heard from the Liberal members that the December 31 deadline in our motion was unrealistic. We have listened to the concerns of various members opposite. We want to be co-operative in this.

[*Translation*]

This morning, we supported a motion from the Conservative Party to extend the deadline.

[*English*]

Just now I sought unanimous consent for a motion to extend the deadline to later in the year 1999.

Perhaps the hon. member opposite has a better idea about a deadline, but some kind of deadline is necessary if we are going to stop the vacillation of the federal government. That is all we are saying.

This does not come arbitrarily from the official opposition. It comes from the premiers themselves. Paragraph 6 of the framework on the social union says the “premiers stressed that negotiations should now proceed with a view to concluding a draft agreement by the end of the year”. That is where the idea came from, not from ourselves.

I would once again invite the Liberal members opposite to reconsider our support for an earlier motion on the part of the Conservative member to extend the proposed deadline. We are not stuck. We do not want to split hairs here. We do not want this very constructive motion to be not supported because of arbitrary deadlines. We are prepared to be flexible. But at the end of the day, as the premiers indicated, we do need a deadline to ensure the government does not endlessly vacillate, prevaricate and obfuscate.

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

Supply

This motion is a very important subject which is very important to the government and very important to Canadians. The motion however is an unfortunate mix of good intentions and a blatant attempt to score cheap political points. As such it is insupportable.

The motion before us asks the House to urge the government to conclude an agreement on the social union with the provinces prior to December 31. When the Prime Minister and the other first ministers initiated these negotiations last December, they intentionally avoided setting artificial deadlines. This initiative is too important for Canadians. It must be done right.

Last night both Premier Romanow and Premier Tobin rejected establishing artificial deadlines. It is unfortunate the focus of this motion is an attempt to capitalize on what is an important issue, one that this government takes seriously and one that is important to all Canadians.

Let us look at the important elements of our social union and what this government is trying to achieve in these negotiations.

[Translation]

What the federal, provincial and territorial governments are trying to do is to arrive at a framework agreement on the social union. The idea is to strengthen the social partnership between the provinces, on the one hand, and the governments and citizens, on the other hand.

The Government of Canada feels that the new partnership should have three objectives: to provide equal opportunities to all Canadians, wherever they live or travel in the country; to increase co-operation between the governments so as to better serve Canadians; and to make governments more accountable to Canadians for the results they achieve.

To provide equal opportunities also means to respect the great diversity that is an integral part of Canada. We must therefore be flexible enough to meet the diverse needs of Canadians. That diversity is the result of cultural, linguistic and geographical factors, or of other specific circumstances or features.

• (1645)

This means that governments must work together with the aboriginal peoples of this country to meet their particular needs.

As the premiers pointed out in the Calgary declaration, it also means recognizing that the equality of the provinces is compatible with recognition of Quebec's particular needs, in the form of its French-speaking majority, its distinct culture and its tradition of civil law.

Finally, equality of opportunity means ensuring that Canadians are free to travel anywhere in their country, without facing obstacles related to place of residence and without concerns about access to social benefits.

[English]

Our social union is about our solidarity with one another. It is about our understanding that we are stronger together, that when Canadians in one part of Canada are in need, Canadians from all parts of Canada are prepared to help. This in turn means greater collaboration among governments in Canada, learning to manage their interdependence to ensure the most effective and efficient service to Canadians.

In this era of globalization, with an increasingly competitive world economy, it is no longer possible, if it ever was, to segregate public policy into neat, air-tight compartments of social policy and economic policy, federal and provincial-territorial responsibilities, or even domestic and international considerations.

Canadians want their governments to work together to modernize our social programs, to face the challenges ahead, to help individuals and regions adapt to the new knowledge-based global economy and to ensure that social programs work and are affordable and sustainable.

How do we translate all of this into action? Practically speaking, it means that all governments should make commitments to information sharing, to joint planning and to joint action where this would provide more cost effective service to Canadians and to advance notice and consultation.

We are already working together with the provinces and territories in this new collaborative partnership approach. A good example of this is the new national child benefit which the Government of Canada developed with the provincial and territorial ministers. It focuses on the goal of helping Canada's children. This collaborative approach promises to bear fruit in other areas, including developing a national children's agenda, programs for persons with disabilities and youth employment.

The Prime Minister and the Minister of Health have also made it clear that renewing medicare and modernizing Canada's health care system will require co-operation among all governments in Canada.

[Translation]

The future social union framework agreement will give effect to the new partnership between governments in the social policy sector by requiring a more co-operative approach to federal spending authority.

In all the world's large federations, the national government has this authority. It is because of this authority that the Government of Canada, in co-operation with the provinces and territories, can ensure that all Canadians have access to more or less comparable benefits and services. This was how the government promoted equality of opportunity for all Canadians.

Supply

It is clear that, without this spending authority, we would not have Canada-wide social programs, such as medicare. In fact, we would not have the national social safety net.

Even if the federal spending power is an essential component of the Canadian social union, one that is recognized in the Constitution, we must exercise it prudently, taking into account and respecting the important responsibilities assumed by the provinces in the area of social policy.

For this reason, the Government of Canada promised in its 1996 Throne Speech not to implement any new cost-shared programs without the consent of the majority of provinces. Provinces opting out of these programs would be entitled to financial compensation, provided they offered a comparable or equivalent program.

• (1650)

Similarly, the legislation creating the Canadian Health and Social Transfer, the CHST, which is the main federal instrument of support to the provinces in the area of social policy since 1995 calls for the drawing up of new principles or objectives, by mutual agreement.

The Government of Canada has also made an effort to make the funding of social transfers more predictable, by having multi-year financial commitments, by establishing a minimum guaranteed floor for the cash component of the CHST, and by holding consultations prior to renewing or modifying any taxation agreements.

[*English*]

Social policy principles and commitments to collaboration among governments must be put into practice and made effective. A social union framework must include appropriate mechanisms and means to ensure this through public accountability and transparency. This means public reporting by all governments, linking expenditures to results for Canadians. It means developing comparable measures and, where appropriate, making use of experts and non-governmental organizations for independent evaluation and social audit.

It also means recognizing publicly the roles and contributions of each government, so the public knows who should be held accountable for what. And it means engaging Canadians, providing opportunities for their input into policies and programs and the assessment of their effectiveness.

This is a far cry from the old style government-to-government accountability and traditional bean counting. The key must be accountability to Canadians for results.

This is how a social union framework can be made real and meaningful to citizens and taxpayers and it should not be restricted by the timeframes suggested by this motion.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Simcoe North said at the outset that the premiers oppose an arbitrary deadline. If that is the case, how would he characterize the statement in their accord of August 6 of this year which states “The premiers stressed that negotiations should now proceed with a view to concluding a draft agreement by the end of the year”? Was that an arbitrary deadline? Was it not? If so, what is the difference between that statement and the deadline proposed in this motion? That is my first question.

My second question is, if he does not want arbitrary deadlines and if he does not like the one in this motion, why did he and his colleagues oppose two efforts to amend our motion to extend the deadline? Does he have a better idea? Does he have another deadline in mind, or no deadline at all? Did he just want this to go on indefinitely as it has for 30 years?

Mr. Paul DeVillers: Mr. Speaker, as far as a deadline is concerned, whether it is the end of the year, budget time or next June, that is not the proper way to negotiate an issue that is as relevant and as important to all Canadians as this issue.

With respect to the member’s first question dealing with the position of the premiers, it is clearly the case that when this engagement was undertaken, the negotiations on the social union, there was never an intention of imposing a deadline at that point. The negotiations need to be permitted to continue without this kind of external imposition.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I noted that the hon. member opposite talked about accountability and the need for the federal government to manage programs because it is more accountable and more visible to the Canadian public. He left the impression that he does not feel the provinces are capable of managing these programs in an efficient and accountable manner.

Is it not true that the QPP is more financially sound than the CPP? The Quebec pension plan is more financially sound than the Canadian pension plan.

The provinces are very capable of administering programs, in some cases far better than the federal government is capable of monitoring them, and they are accountable to the auditor general as well as to the people of Quebec.

• (1655)

Mr. Paul DeVillers: Mr. Speaker, I would invite the hon. member to consult *Hansard*. I certainly did not say what she is imputing to me, that the provinces are not capable of remaining accountable or demonstrating their accountability in the areas of their jurisdiction.

My comments dealt with the entire governmental process and all levels of government. I said that what we need to accomplish in the

Supply

process of negotiating this social union is accountability at all levels. That is the most important factor.

I invite the member to consult *Hansard*, but there was certainly nothing in my speech that would suggest or imply that the provinces are not capable of being as accountable as the federal government.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings that I contribute to this debate because I look forward to opportunities to discuss the social union in this Chamber and to debate the social framework, the agreements that are going to guide the federal and provincial governments in the delivery of improved services. I think this is a very important topic. I do not want to reflect too much on the motives of the official opposition in bringing forward this motion, but I have to wonder why we are into this kind of debate the day after the Quebec election.

I hear a lot of language on the other side of the House that talks about an open debate and the desire to improve programs in Canada. I also hear, quoted by the previous speaker for the Reform Party and in his question to my colleague, this sense of a desire to facilitate this process based on a statement by the premiers in August of this year.

Let me share with the House some statements which were made by the premiers yesterday and today, not five or six months ago. The chairman of the process, the premier of Saskatchewan, stated: "The first order of business is the social union, negotiating it as quickly as we can, not under any artificial deadlines or timetables, doing it with dispatch, doing it with determination. The Prime Minister wants to do it, his ministers want to do it and the premiers want to do it". That is a statement made yesterday by the chairman.

Let us take a Liberal premier of Atlantic Canada, Brian Tobin of Newfoundland. He stated: "On the question of social union and the negotiation that is ongoing, I think that is something that we will get back to in the new year. I think we are making good progress with the national government".

Let us take a Conservative premier, the premier of Ontario, who today at one o'clock said: "We obviously would like to see some progress after the budget—I mean on the social union discussion". He is not demanding a December 31 deadline.

Based on what did the Reform Party undertake to draft this motion upon which we are going to be called upon to vote in 15 minutes?

The motion states:

That this House urge the government to conclude an agreement with the provinces and territories, prior to December 31, 1998, and—

I have two problems with this. The first problem is the deadline; not the specific deadline but a deadline. Let the process go on. Let the provinces in good faith come to the table to discuss this along with the federal government. These are people who want to solve problems on behalf of the people we all serve. Let us not presume from the federal House of Commons to set any deadline for them. They are responsible people. I heard the member talking about the ability of the provinces to manage these programs. That is a position I endorse. Certainly they can and certainly they are competent to make the decisions about how and when these negotiations should proceed.

• (1700)

The second part, the second reason why I cannot support this resolution is that it is based on the unanimous resolution of the provinces.

We are the federal House of Commons. What I find disturbing about Reform's position on this is that it seems to act as though there is no federal role, as if there is no reason for the federal government to concern itself with these programs. I do not share that view.

Do they need to change? Absolutely they need to change. Change is something we are always going to have to face and it is hoped that we create a framework, a relationship with the provinces that allows change to be ongoing. Circumstances have changed. Economic circumstances have changed. People's mobility has changed. People's opportunities have changed and the programs that the federal government and the provincial government operate jointly should change in order to reflect those changes in the community. That is a given.

As someone who comes out of the social policy, the social program area, as director of child welfare in Manitoba for a period of time, not only do I believe that the provinces have the capacity and the ability to deliver these programs, I think they are better able to deliver these programs. I think that case oriented decisions about social services should be made by those people who are working closest to the people who are receiving them. I absolutely endorse that. I do not have any difficulty with those positions.

However, I also believe, as the people who created this federation believed, and as we have acted in accordance with throughout the life of this country, that there is a reason for our being a federation and that there are certain rights and abilities we all exercise because we are a federation. I also want those things considered and respected.

I want to know that when a disabled person moves from one province to the other they will receive services. I want to know that when a person goes into another province they will have the ability to work. I think there are pan-Canadian issues here. There also is a very real ability for the provinces and the federal government,

Supply

working collectively, to learn a lot about a better way to deliver services.

I am a little saddened, frankly, by the discussions I hear coming out of the Bloc, because when I meet with members of the Bloc and I meet with people within the province of Quebec who are working in social services, and I do this rather regularly, what I see is a very creative approach to a great many of the services I have worked with. I think they have really captured some very important concepts and have developed some very important policies in how one activates communities and involves communities in the way of services.

I think in many ways some of the activities that have taken place in social services in the province of Quebec have proved to be a model for the rest of Canada. I think they are an important contributor to the development of policies and services across Canada. So I am saddened when I hear this debate sort of draw back into a discussion of powers and rights because I think when we focus our attentions and energies on powers and rights, we are talking about things that are mainly of interest to a few politicians and we marginalize the rest of Canada.

I think what Canadians want to hear us talking about is services and opportunities, ways we can be supportive of the kinds of goals they have, whether they live in Chicoutimi or Winnipeg or Prince Albert. They want to know their children will have a good education. They want to know they will have work. They want to know their health care will be of the highest quality possible. If we focus on solving those problems, if we focus on building a relationship with the provinces that allows us to collectively focus all our talents and energies on solutions to those problems, we will have done a great service to this country. But if we simply fall back on to endless arguments about powers and rights, I think we all lose. I think the people of Canada lose. I think the people in this Chamber and in all the chambers across the country lose.

I am very pleased with what I heard coming from the New Democrats and the Conservatives. What I heard the speaker for the New Democrats talk about was a commitment to services. He wanted to talk about services, as I heard from the Conservatives. I just wish we could find a way in this House to put aside on these important services some of this battling that seems to serve no one other than perhaps a few of our friends in the media.

• (1705)

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member at the outset of his remarks questioned the motivation of the official opposition putting this motion before the House at this time suggesting that for some reason it was peculiar to put it forth the day after the Quebec election.

The hon. member will know that each opposition party is allocated a limited number of supply days to debate motions of this

nature. We have been planning for some time to hold a motion on the balancing of powers, reform of the federation, the social union and our new Canada act. We did not schedule this day. It appeared this way on the parliamentary calendar.

I think it is quite propitious that we have an opportunity to debate this in light of the democratic decision of the people of Quebec yesterday. Had we done this before an election of course the hon. member would have said it was interfering in the Quebec election and so forth.

This timing is a complete red herring. There have been two motions now to extend what is not a deadline in the motion before the House. It is a target date. It simply urges to the government to conclude an agreement with the provinces and territories prior to December 31. It is a very similar wording they use in their own declarations.

If the hon. member does not agree with that deadline or that suggested date of conclusion, perhaps he has another one he could suggest. The Prime Minister told us he has always in his political career supported Senate reform as an objective. He has been here for 35 years. Is that how expeditiously this government operates with respect to its constitutional agenda?

I want to ask the member why he does not allow some flexibility with respect to the timing in this motion. Why is it he who is denying unanimous consent to extend the proposed time line in this motion?

Mr. Reg Alcock: Mr. Speaker, the member is absolutely correct when he says he did not choose the day but his party chose the topic. There are a great many things the House can be talking about at any point in time. They chose today to put on the agenda the social union discussions.

As to the deadline, the motion says that this House urge the government to conclude an agreement with the provinces and territories prior to December 31. If that is not a deadline I do not know what we call a deadline.

Whether we say prior to December 31 or prior to the next budget, what we are doing is setting up an icon which is a pressure on those discussions that perhaps is not in the best interest. If the hon. member truly believes that the provinces and the federal government should and can get together and work co-operatively as they say, if we look at the statements of the premiers, none of the premiers is calling for this deadline or any deadline and they are all saying this thing is moving, they are happy with the way it is going.

Let me quote one more time from the chairman: "The first order of business is the social union, negotiating it as quickly as we can, not under any artificial deadlines or timetables, doing it with dispatch, doing it with determination". This is a quote from Premier Romanow: "The Prime Minister wants to do it, his ministers want to do it, the premiers want to do it".

Supply

If that is not an endorsement of the process, I do not know what is. I am not certain what is served by the Reform Party's trying to insert itself into this debate. Frankly I am a little surprised that the Reform Party is so willing to sign a blank cheque. I understood Reformers ran for this Chamber because they had an interest in the federal government. I am deeply concerned about their willingness to run in and sign on sight unseen to a provincial position.

• (1710)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address today the matter of the social union, which will be increasingly prominent in political affairs for various reasons.

Let us first try to define to some extent what underlies the notion of social union. The premiers of all the provinces, for some time now, have been working to force the federal government to reinvest where it cut money, that is, in social programs including health and education, where it substantially and unilaterally cut its transfers to the provinces.

The provinces began discussions to make sure that this sort of thing did not recur in the future and that their ability to manage social programs would be protected to some extent.

The premiers got an agreement permitting them to manage their programs themselves and allowing them to opt out of federal programs, and I will provide a specific example of this in the last minute allocated to me.

In this agreement as well, the provinces clearly indicated their intention to reinvest the money in the coming years in health care. They also mentioned that they had already begun to do so and that the only government that had not done so was the federal government, for the current fiscal year.

The provinces want more money invested in health. As everyone knows, the health system everywhere in Canada needs reinvestment.

Since they have had to cope with difficulties in recent years, however, they are best placed to know where the money ought to be reinjected, how to make adjustments to situations requiring very precise interventions. In the health field, the administrative infrastructures are a provincial jurisdiction. The provincial governments do not want to see the federal government turning up with all manner of programs just to score political points.

I will give an example, this time in post-secondary education. The federal government reduced its contribution considerably. Then suddenly, feeling in need of a higher profile, the Prime Minister launched the millennium scholarship program. Through it, the federal government will be handing out numerous bursaries in the next decade to numerous students. It will certainly do this

itself, through a foundation to which it will be sure to appoint its friends, people who will carry out the wishes of the federal government.

All this is intended to ensure that the students see that the money comes from their good friend, the federal government. We in Quebec already have a financial assistance system in place, with eligibility criteria which take into consideration the student's situation, that of the parents, and so on. Now, the federal government can turn up with other criteria, with another infrastructure, adding excellence to the list.

At the same time, it has made hundreds of millions of dollars in cuts to education. Would the priority in education not have been to reinvest so that all students could benefit? At the present time, there is a crying need at the university level. We saw this in the last election campaign. A number of rectors and representatives of the education sector called for money to be invested in the university system, but not necessarily as a priority in the loans and bursaries system. If there were needs to be adjusted, we could have taken part of the \$2.5 billion reinjected into the loans and bursaries system, but we could have taken and managed the rest according to our own priorities.

This is a striking example of federal-provincial relations in which each government tries to define its priorities in what should be provincial jurisdictions.

This is a fine example of a situation that will create a dispute between governments, rather than real co-operation, initiated by a federal government in need of visibility. It does not meet the real on-site priorities.

But why reach an agreement before December 31? Because we want to avoid having the same thing happen in the next federal budget. Let the federal government announce now its intention to honour the spirit of the agreement, to comply with it, to reinject funds into health and to respect provincial jurisdictions. The federal government must show its respect for provincial jurisdictions by allowing them to manage their own programs, if it contributes to them, with the right to opt out when the provinces have similar programs or the same objectives.

That seems laudable and very reasonable to me. However, the federal government is not co-operating. We hope it will wake up in time. We support the motion that was put forward today by the Reform Party.

We want the government to move in the coming weeks, and quickly, to improve the situation for everyone. In Quebec, everyone, federalists and sovereignists alike, of whatever political affiliation, agree that we have to move forward based on what appears to be a political consensus of all parties in Quebec to move in this direction, as was seen during the last election campaign.

Supply

• (1715)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It being 5.15 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

[*Translation*]

The question is on the amendment. 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 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.

• (1750)

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 278*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bergeron
Bigras	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Cadman	Canuel
Cardin	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Debien
Desrochers	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Elley
Épp	Forseth
Fournier	Gagnon
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harris	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Loubier
Lowther	

Lunn	Manning
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McNally
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Obhrai
Pankiw	Penson
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay	Reynolds
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	St-Hilaire
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Vellacott	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—96

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brisson	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Davies
Desjarlais	De Villers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Hardy
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lill
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire

McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Power
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Jacques
Stoffer
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Ur
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—182

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated. The next question is on the main motion.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (1800)

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

(Division No. 279)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman
Cardin

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Canuel

Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad
Laurin
Loubier
Lunn
Marceau
Mark
Mayfield
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Pankiw
Perron
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vellacott
White (North Vancouver)

Supply

Chatters
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Desrochers
Duceppe
Duncan
Epp
Fournier
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Harris
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Johnston
Kerpan
Lalonde
Lebel
Lowther
Manning
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ohrai
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Reynolds
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—96

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Boudria
Brisson
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Casey
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Easter
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collette
Copps
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Eggleton
Finlay
Fry
Galloway
Goodale

Supply

Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Hardy
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Ifody
Jackson	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lill
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Power
Price	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	St. Denis
Steele	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—182

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.*[Translation]*

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B)

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.)
moved:

That the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, be concurred in.

*[English]***The Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.**Some hon. members:** Yea.**The Speaker:** All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.**Some hon. members:** Nay.**The Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.*And more than five members having risen:*

● (1810)

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

(Division No. 280)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casey
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Ifody
Jackson	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	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	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell

Muise
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Jacques
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Power
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—166

Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)

Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—113

Supply

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that Bill C-60, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1999, be read the first time.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that the bill, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (1820)

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The members of our party will vote yea to this motion.

[*English*]

The Speaker: It is too late now to be inscribed with the yeas unless of course we have unanimous consent of the House.

An hon. member: No.

The Speaker: The answer is no, you will not count.

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

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Canuel
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
Davies
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Duceppe
Duncan
Elley
Forseth
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grewal
Guay
Hanger
Harris
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Johnston
Kerpan
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Lowther
Mancini
Marceau
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Obhrai
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman
Cardin
Chatters
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Earle
Epp
Fournier
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Hardy
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
Lunn
Manning
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Pankiw
Perron
Plamondon
Reynolds
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
Stinson
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp

Supply

(Division No. 281)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélaire	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	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	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—149	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders

Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bigras	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Cadman
Brien	Cardin
Canuel	Chatters
Casson	Crête
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Dalphond-Guiral
Cummins	Debien
Davies	Desrochers
Desjarlais	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dockrill	Dumas
Duceppe	Earle
Duncan	Epp
Elley	Fourmier
Forseth	Gilmour
Gagnon	Godin (Châteauguay)
Girard-Bujold	Gouk
Goldring	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grewal	Guimond
Guay	Hardy
Hanger	Hill (MacLeod)
Hart	Hilstrom
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Johnston
Jaffer	Kerpan
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laliberte
Konrad	Laurin
Lalonde	Lill
Lebel	Lowther
Loubier	Mancini
Lunn	Marceau
Manning	Mark
Marchand	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	McDonough
Mayfield	Ménard
McNally	Meredith
Mercier	Morrison
Mills (Red Deer)	Obhrai
Nystrom	Penson
Pankiw	Picard (Drummond)
Perron	Ramsay
Plamondon	Rocheleau
Reynolds	Schmidt
Sauvageau	Solberg
Scott (Skeena)	St-Hilaire
Solomon	Stoffer
Stinson	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Strahl	Turp
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Vellacott
Vautour	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wasylcia-Leis	Williams—111
White (North Vancouver)	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Milliken in the chair)

[Translation]

The Chairman: Order, please. The House is now in committee of the whole on Bill C-60.

[English]

(On clause 2)

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

Supply

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Chairman, could the President of the Treasury Board confirm that the bill is in the usual order.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Chairman, the form of this bill is the same as that passed in previous years.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvan Loubier: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I would like to put a question to the President of the Treasury Board.

He answered a question from the hon. member of the Reform Party. In what way are these statements similar to those tabled in the two previous years? I would like him to elaborate on that.

The Chairman: I think that, in his response, the President of the Treasury Board indicated that the form of the bill is the same as in previous years. I think that about covers it.

Mr. Yvan Loubier: Mr. Chairman, the President of the Treasury Board replied that these figures reflected those of last year. But do they reflect those of two years ago?

The Chairman: Perhaps the President of the Treasury Board could answer the question.

• (1825)

Hon. Marcel Massé: Mr. Chairman, the form of this bill is the same as that of the bills approved in previous years, including that of two years ago.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Chairman: All those in favour of clause 2 will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Chairman: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Chairman: In my opinion the yeas have it.

(Clause 2 agreed to: Yeas, 161; Nays, 107)

The Chairman: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Chairman: All those in favour of clause 3 will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Chairman: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Chairman: In my opinion the yeas have it.

• (1830)

(Clause 3 agreed to: Yeas, 165; Nays, 103)

(On clause 4)

The Chairman: Shall clause 4 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

Clause 4 reads “Any commitment resulting from an item mentioned in section 2, or based on subsection (2), be deemed, or as regards the authority corresponding to the level of the amount that is specified—”

The Chairman: Order, please.

There is no opportunity in committee of the whole to present arguments on this bill.

[*English*]

We are operating under the rules that require that every question be put without debate or amendment. There is one traditional point of order permitted during the committee of the whole proceedings. That has been done twice. As Chair I am not disposed to allow any further points.

Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Chairman: All those in favour of clause 4 will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Chairman: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Chairman: In my opinion the yeas have it.

• (1835)

(Clause 4 agreed to: Yeas, 164; Nays, 105)

The Chairman: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Chairman: All those in favour of clause 5 will please say yea.

Supply

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Chairman: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Chairman: In my opinion the yeas have it.

• (1840)

[*Translation*]

(Clause 5 agreed to: Yeas, 162; Nays, 101)

The Chairman: Shall clause 6 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*English*]

The Chairman: All those in favour of clause 6 will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Chairman: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Chairman: In my opinion the yeas have it.

• (1845)

[*Translation*]

(Clause 6 agreed to: Yeas, 159; Nays, 102)

[*English*]

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. In the negotiations preceding this vote tonight there was an understanding among all parties that there would be no shenanigans during the Christmas party season. I am now going to release members who have children at our Christmas party and I ask them to go home and look after them.

The Chairman: Shall the schedule carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Chairman: All those in favour of the schedule will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Chairman: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Chairman: In my opinion the yeas have it.

(Schedule agreed to: Yeas, 154; Nays, 101)

The Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Chairman: All those in favour of clause 1 will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Chairman: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Chairman: In my opinion the yeas have it.

• (1850)

[*Translation*]

(Clause 1 agreed to: Yeas, 151; Nays, 102)

The Chairman: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed

Some hon. members: No.

[*English*]

The Chairman: All those in favour of the preamble will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Chairman: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Chairman: In my opinion the yeas have it.

• (1855)

[*Translation*]

(Preamble agreed to: Yeas, 155; Nays, 108)

The Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*English*]

The Chairman: All those in favour of the title will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Chairman: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Chairman: In my opinion the yeas have it.

(Title agreed to: Yeas, 155; Nays, 95)

(Bill reported)

• (1900)

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (1910)

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

(Division No. 282)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casey
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepolo
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	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)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	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
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Power	Price
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis

Supply

Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—163	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Cadman
Canuel	Cardin
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Dalphondu-Guiral	Davies
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Fournier
Gagnon	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Hardy
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lill
Loubier	Lowther
Lunn	Mancini
Manning	Marceau
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	McDonough
McNally	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Nystrom	Obhrai
Penson	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Ramsay
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
Wasylcia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—105

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

Supply

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (1920)

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

*(Division No. 283)***YEAS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brisson	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
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)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	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 McCormick
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Power
Price	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—161

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Alarie
Anders	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Blaikie
Bigras	Cadman
Brien	Cardin
Canuel	Chatters
Casson	Crête
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Davies
Dalphon-Duval	Desjarlais
Debien	Dockrill
Desrochers	Duceppe
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duncan
Dumas	Epp
Earle	Gagnon
Fournier	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Goldring
Godin (Châteauguay)	Grewal
Gouk	Guay
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Guimond	Hart
Hardy	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (MacLeod)	Jaffer
Hilstrom	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Johnston	Laliberte
Kerpan	Laurin
Lalonde	Lill
Lebel	Lowther
Loubier	Mancini
Lunn	Marceau
Manning	Mark
Marchand	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	McNally
McDonough	Mercier
Ménard	Morrison
Meredith	Obhrai
Nystrom	Picard (Drummond)
Perron	Ramsay
Plamondon	Sauvageau
Rocheleau	Solberg
Scott (Skeena)	St-Hilaire
Solomon	Stoffer
Stinson	Strahl
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vautour
Vellacott	Wasylcia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—98	

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

TOBACCO ACT

The House resumed from November 26 consideration of the motion that Bill C-42, an act to amend the Tobacco Act, be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: Pursant to order made on Thursday, November 26, 1998, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the motion at the third reading stage of Bill C-42.

● (1930)

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

(Division No. 284)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brien
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Canuel
Caplan	Cardin
Carroll	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Cullen	Dalphondu-Guiral
Debien	Desrochers
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Easter	Eggleton
Finstone	Finlay
Fontana	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	

Ianno	Ifody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne
Lebel	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	Loubier
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
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	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—188

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Blaikie
Brison	Cadman
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Davies
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle	Epp
Gilmour	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Hanger	Hardy
Hart	Harvey
Herron	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Laliberte
Lill	Lowther
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Manning
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
McNally	Meredith

Government Orders

Muise
Power
Ramsay
Solomon
St-Jacques
Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Wasylycia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)

Nystrom
Price
Scott (Skeena)
Stinson
Stoffer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vautour
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—66

Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—144

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

MARINE CONSERVATION AREAS ACT

The House resumed from November 26 consideration of the motion that Bill C-48, an act respecting marine conservations areas, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the motion that the question be now put.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Thursday, November 26, 1998, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the previous question at the second reading stage of Bill C-48.

● (1940)

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

(Division No. 285)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopoulos
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Drouin
Easter
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hubbard

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Copps
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie
Brison
Canuel
Casey
Chatters
Davies
Desjarlais
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Epp
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guay
Hanger
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Mark
McDonough
Ménard

NAYS

Members

Alarie
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Cadman
Cardin
Casson
Crête
Debien
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Earle
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grewal
Guimond
Hardy
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Lunn
Mancini
Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McNally

Government Orders

Mercier
Muise
Picard (Drummond)
Power
Ramsay
Solberg
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vautour
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—95

Meredith
Nystrom
Plamondon
Price
Rocheleau
Solomon
St-Jacques
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Wasylycia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)

Eggleton
Finlay
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Harb
Harvard
Herron
Ianno
Jackson
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Knutson
Laliberte
Lavigne
Leung
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McDonough
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Minna
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Jacques
Stoffer
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Ur
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—169

Finestone
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Grose
Hardy
Harvey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Jordan
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marchi
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Power
Proud
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (1950)

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

(Division No. 286)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Boudria
Brisson
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Casey
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Coppes
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Cullen
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Easter

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Cadman
Casson
Dalphond-Guiral
Duncan
Gilmour
Goldring
Grewal
Guimond
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Lalonde
Lebel
Lowther

Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Brien
Canuel
Chatters
Duceppe
Epp
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laurin
Loubier

Government Orders

Lunn
Marchand
McNally
Meredith
Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay
Sauvageau
Solberg
Stinson
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—59

Marceau
Mark
Mercier
Obhrai
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vellacott
White (North Vancouver)

Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fry
Galloway
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murray
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patri
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Provenzano
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Easter
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Goodale
Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Phinney
Proud
Redman
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—136

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

* * *

[*Translation*]

FIRST NATIONS LAND MANAGEMENT ACT

The House resumed from November 26, 1998, consideration of the motion that Bill C-49, an act providing for the ratification and the bringing into effect of the Framework Agreement on First Nation Land Management, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the motion that the question be now put.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Thursday, November 26, 1998, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the previous question at the second reading stage of Bill C-49.

● (2000)

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 287*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Augustine
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Carroll
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Copp
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Bélaïr
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Caplan
Catterall
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Drouin

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie
Brison
Canuel
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Davies
Desrochers
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Earle
Gilmour
Goldring
Grewal
Guimond
Harvey
Hilstrom
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Lalonde
Lill
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)

Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bigras
Brien
Cadman
Casey
Chatters
Dalphond-Guiral
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Duncan
Epp
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hardy
Herron
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laliberte
Lebel
Loubier
Lunn
Mancini

Government Orders

Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough	McNally
Mercier	Meredith
Morrison	Muise
Nystrom	Obhrai
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Power
Price	Ramsay
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Solomon	St-Hilaire
Stinson	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Turp
Vautour	Vellacott
Wasylcia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—95

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

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

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

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

● (2005)

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

(Division No. 288)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bakopanos
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Blaikie
Bigras	Bonin
Blondin-Andrew	Boudria
Bonwick	Brien
Bradshaw	Brown
Brisson	Bulte
Bryden	Calder
Byrne	Caplan
Canuel	Casey
Carroll	

Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collette
Copps	Crête
Cullen	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	Desjarlais
Desrochers	De Villers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goodale
Graham	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Harb
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lalonde
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lebel	Lee
Leung	Lill
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marceau	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Massé	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Perron	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Power	Price
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp	Ur
Volpe	

Government Orders

Wappel
Whelan
Wood—199

Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Earle
Fournier
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grewal
Guay
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lalonde
Lill
Lowther
Mancini
Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Mercier
Morrison
Obhrai
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
Stoffer
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Duceppe
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Johnston
Laliberte
Lebel
Loubier
Lunn
Marceau
Mark
McDonough
Ménard
Meredith
Nystrom
Perron
Ramsay
Sauvageau
Solberg
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vautour
Wasylycia-Leis
Williams—84

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Benoit
Cadman
Chatters
Epp
Goldring
Grewal
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lowther
Mark
McNally
Morrison
Ramsay
Solberg
Strahl
Vellacott
White (North Vancouver)

Anders
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Casson
Duncan
Gilmour
Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hilstrom
Johnston
Kerpan
Lunn
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Meredith
Obhrai
Scott (Skeena)
Stinson
Thompson (Wild Rose)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—38

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

* * *

SPECIAL IMPORT MEASURES ACT

The House resumed from November 26 consideration of Bill C-35, an act to amend the Special Import Measures Act and the Canadian International Trade Tribunal Act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Thursday, November 26, 1998, the House will now proceed to the taking of several deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of Bill C-35.

The question is on Motion No. 1.

• (2015)

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

(Division No. 289)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit
Bigras
Brien
Canuel
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Desrochers

Alarie
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Blaikie
Cadman
Cardin
Chatters
Crête
Davies
Desjarlais
Dockrill

Adams
Anderson
Augustine
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brison
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Casey
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Copps
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Grose
Harb
Harvey
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Lincoln
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Minna
Muisse
Nault

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Bradshaw
Brown
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chan
Collenette
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Easter
Finlay
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Guarnieri
Harvard
Herron
Iftody
Jones
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Miffin
Mitchell
Murray
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)

Government Orders

O'Reilly
 Patry
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Price
 Reed
 Robillard
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Serré
 Speller
 Stewart (Brant)
 St-Jacques
 Szabo
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Valeri
 Wappel

Pagtakhan
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Power
 Proud
 Richardson
 Rock
 Sekora
 Shepherd
 Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 St-Julien
 Telegdi
 Torsney
 Volpe
 Wood—126

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
 Bakopanos
 Bélair
 Bellemare
 Benoit
 Bertrand
 Blondin-Andrew
 Bonwick
 Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead)
 Bryden
 Byrne
 Cadman
 Cannis
 Carroll
 Casson
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
 Coderre
 Collenette
 Cullen
 Dion
 Doyle
 Drouin
 Duhamel
 Easter
 Epp
 Fontana
 Gagliano
 Gilmour
 Goldring
 Gouk
 Grewal
 Guamieri
 Harvard
 Herron
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Hubbard
 Iftody
 Jaffer
 Johnston
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
 Knutson
 Lastewka
 Lee
 Lincoln
 Lowther
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Marchi
 Marleau
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 McCormick
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 McWhinney
 Mifflin
 Mitchell
 Muise
 Myers
 Obhrai
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Pagtakhan
 Patry
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Price
 Provenzano
 Redman
 Richardson
 Rock
 Scott (Skeena)
 Serré
 Solberg
 Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 St-Jacques

Baker
 Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Bevilacqua
 Bonin
 Boudria
 Brison
 Bulte
 Caccia
 Calder
 Caplan
 Casey
 Catterall
 Chan
 Chatters
 Clouthier
 Cohen
 Copps
 DeVillers
 Discepola
 Dromisky
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Duncan
 Eggleton
 Finlay
 Fry
 Gallaway
 Godfrey
 Goodale
 Graham
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Harb
 Harvey
 Hill (Macleod)
 Hilstrom
 Ianno
 Jackson
 Jennings
 Jones
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Keys
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Kraft Sloan
 Lavigne
 Leung
 Longfield
 Lunn
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Malhi
 Manley
 Mark
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Massé
 McGuire
 McNally
 Meredith
 Minna
 Morrison
 Murray
 Nault
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 O'Reilly
 Paradis
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Power
 Proud
 Ramsay
 Reed
 Robillard
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Sekora
 Shepherd
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Brant)
 Stinson
 St-Julien

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 2.

• (2025)

(The house divided on the Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 290)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
 Bachand (Saint-Jean)
 Bergeron
 Blaikie
 Canuel
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
 Dalphon-Guiral
 Debien
 Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
 Dumas
 Fournier
 Girard-Bujold
 Guay
 Laliberte
 Lebel
 Loubier
 Marceau
 McDonough
 Mercier
 Perron
 Rocheleau
 Solomon
 Stoffer
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
 Vautour

Asselin
 Bellehumeur
 Bigras
 Brien
 Cardin
 Crête
 Davies
 Desrochers
 Duceppe
 Earle
 Gagnon
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 Guimond
 Lalonde
 Lill
 Mancini
 Marchand
 Ménard
 Nystrom
 Picard (Drummond)
 Sauvageau
 St-Hilaire
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
 Turp
 Wasylcia-Leis—50

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
 Alcock
 Anderson
 Augustine

Adams
 Anders
 Assadourian
 Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)

Government Orders

Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vellacott
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wilfert	Williams
Wood—187	

Kerpan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Lowther
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McGuire
McNally
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mitchell
Muise
Myers
Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Power
Proud
Ramsay
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Scott (Skeena)
Serré
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Ur
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams

Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague
Meredith
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—192

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

• (2035)

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

(Division No. 291)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Anders
Anderson	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Brison
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casey
Casson	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Duncan	Easter
Eggleton	Epp
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goldring	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hubbard
Ianno	Ifody
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)

Alarie
Bigras
Cardin
Crête
Davies
Desjarlais
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Fournier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Hardy
Lalonde
Lebel
Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Ménard
Perron
Sauvageau
Stoffer
Wasylycia-Leis —39

NAYS

Members

Asselin
Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphonso-Guiral
Debien
Desrochers
Duceppe
Earle
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Marchand
McDonough
Mercier
Plamondon
Solomon
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 carried.

[English]

The question is on Motion No. 4. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 4 obviates the necessity of the question being put on Motions Nos. 5 and 6. A negative vote on Motion No. 4 requires the question to be put on Motions Nos. 5 and 6. The vote on Motion No. 5 also applies to Motion No. 6.

• (2040)

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

(Division No. 292)

YEAS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Bellehumeur	Bigras
Blaikie	Canuel
Cardin	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	Debien
Desjardis	Desrochers
Dockrill	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas	Earle
Fournier	Gagnon
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay	Guimond
Hardy	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lill
Loubier	Mancini
Marchand	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough	Ménard
Mercier	Nystrom
Perron	Plamondon
Sauvageau	Solomon
Stoffer	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vautour	Wasylycia-Leis —46

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brisson	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre

Government Orders

Cohen	Collenette
Copps	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Kraft Sloan
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Massé
McCormick	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Power
Price	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—144

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 5. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 6.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (2045)

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

*(Division No. 293)***YEAS****Members**

Alarie	Asselin
Bellehumeur	Bigras
Blaikie	Brien
Canuel	Cardin
Crête	Dalphondu-Guiral
Davies	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas	Earle
Fournier	Gagnon
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay	Guimond
Laliberté	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Lill	Loubier
Mancini	Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
Ménard	Mercier
Nystrom	Perron
Pfamondon	Sauvageau
Solomon	St-Hilaire
Stoffer	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vautour	Wasylcia-Leis —46

NAYS**Members**

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bradshaw	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casey
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Doyle	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Easter	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard

Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Jackson
Jennings	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Briely
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Power	Price
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—148

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 6 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 7.

• (2055)

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

*(Division No. 294)***YEAS****Members**

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bignas
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Brien
Blaikie	Canuel
Brisson	Casey
Cardin	Dalphondu-Guiral
Crête	Debien
Davies	Desrochers
Desjarlais	Doyle
Dockrill	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dumas
Duceppe	
Earle	

Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Hardy
Herron
Keddy (South Shore)
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
Mancini
Marchand
McDonough
Mercier
Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)
Power
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wasylycia-Leis —67

Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Harvey
Jones
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Ménard
Muise
Perron
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Solomon
St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vautour

Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Provenzano
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—167

Government Orders

Myers
Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud
Ramsay
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Scott (Skeena)
Serré
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Ur
Vellacott
Wappel
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anderson
Augustine
Bakopanos
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bryden
Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Cohen
Coppes
De Villers
Dion
Drouin
Duncan
Epp
Fontana
Gagliano
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Iftody
Jaffer
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kerpan
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Lowther
MacAulay
Malhi
Marchi
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McNally
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna

Adams
Anders
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bélair
Bellemare
Benoit
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Cadman
Cannis
Casson
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
Finlay
Fry
Gallaway
Godfrey
Gouk
Grewal
Grose
Harb
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Ianno
Jackson
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keys
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
Lunn
Mahoney
Maloney
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Mitchell

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 defeated.

● (2100)

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (2110)

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

(Division No. 295)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Alarie
Anders
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Bélair
Bellehumeur

Adams
Alcock
Anderson
Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Bélanger
Bellemare

Government Orders

Bennett
 Bergeron
 Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
 Bevilacqua
 Blondin-Andrew
 Bonwick
 Bradshaw
 Brien
 Brown
 Bulte
 Caccia
 Calder
 Canuel
 Cardin
 Casey
 Catterall
 Chan
 Chatters
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
 Coderre
 Collette
 Crête
 Dalphond-Guiral
 Desrochers
 Dhaliwal
 Discepola
 Dromisky
 Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
 Duceppe
 Dumas
 Easter
 Epp
 Fontana
 Fry
 Gagnon
 Gilmour
 Godfrey
 Goodale
 Graham
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Guarnieri
 Guimond
 Harvard
 Herron
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Hubbard
 Ifody
 Jaffer
 Jones
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Kerpan
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
 Knutson
 Lalonde
 Laurin
 Lebel
 Leung
 Longfield
 Lowther
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Marceau
 Marchi
 Marleau
 Massé
 McGuire
 McNally
 McWhinney
 Meredith
 Milliken
 Mitchell
 Murray
 Nault
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 O'Reilly
 Paradis

Benoit
 Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
 Bertrand
 Bigras
 Bonin
 Boudria
 Breikreuz (Yellowhead)
 Brison
 Bryden
 Byrne
 Cadman
 Cannis
 Caplan
 Carroll
 Casson
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
 Clouthier
 Cohen
 Copps
 Cullen
 Debien
 De Villiers
 Dion
 Doyle
 Drouin
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Duhamel
 Duncan
 Eggleton
 Finlay
 Fournier
 Gagliano
 Gallaway
 Girard-Bujold
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 Gouk
 Grewal
 Grose
 Guay
 Harb
 Harvey
 Hill (Macleod)
 Hilstrom
 Ianno
 Jackson
 Jennings
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Keyes
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Kraft Sloan
 Lastewka
 Lavigne
 Lee
 Lincoln
 Loubier
 Lunn
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Malhi
 Manley
 Marchand
 Mark
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 McCormick
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 McTeague
 Ménard
 Mifflin
 Minna
 Muise
 Myers
 Obhrai
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Pagtakhan
 Parrish

Patry
 Perron
 Pettigrew
 Picard (Drummond)
 Pillitteri
 Power
 Proud
 Ramsay
 Reed
 Robillard
 Rock
 Sauvageau
 Scott (Skeena)
 Serré
 Solberg
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Brant)
 St-Hilaire
 St-Jacques
 Strahl
 Telegdi
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Torsney
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
 Ur
 Vellacott
 Wappel
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)
 Williams

Peric
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Plamondon
 Price
 Provenzano
 Redman
 Richardson
 Rocheleau
 Saada
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Sekora
 Shepherd
 Speller
 Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Stinson
 St-Julien
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Thompson (Wild Rose)
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
 Turp
 Valeri
 Volpe
 Whelan
 Wilfert
 Wood—231

NAYS

Members

Blaikie
 Desjarlais
 Earle
 Laliberte
 Mancini
 McDonough
 Solomon
 Vautour

Davies
 Dockrill
 Hardy
 Lill
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 Nystrom
 Stoffer
 Wasylcia-Leis—16

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

EXTRADITION ACT

The House resumed from November 30 consideration of the motion that Bill C-40, an act respecting extradition, to amend the Canada Evidence Act, the Criminal Code, the Immigration Act and the Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act and to amend and repeal other acts in consequence, be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the third reading stage of Bill C-40.

● (2115)

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

(Division No. 296)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brien
Brisson	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Canuel	Caplan
Cardin	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collenette	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Fournier	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Hardy
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Ifody
Jackson	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne
Lebel	Lee
Leung	Lill

Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marceau	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Massé	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Perron	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Power	Price
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—215

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Duncan
Epp	Gilmour
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Jaffer	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Lowther
Lunn	Mark
McNally	Meredith
Obhrai	Ramsay
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—34

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

*Government Orders***ROYAL CANADIAN MINT ACT**

The House resumed from November 30 consideration of the motion that Bill C-41, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act and the currency Act, be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-41.

• (2125)

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

*(Division No. 297)***YEAS**

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélanger	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brien
Brison	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Canuel	Caplan
Cardin	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collenette	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Fournier	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Hardy
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jones	

Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Lill
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marchand
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McGuire
McTeague
Ménard
Mifflin
Minna
Muisse
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon
Price
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Sekora
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—215

Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kraft Sloan
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Leung
Lincoln
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marceau
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé
McDonough
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Perron
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Power
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rocheleau
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Jacques
Stoffer
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Duncan
Epp	Gilmour
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Jaffer	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Lowther
Lunn	Mark
McNally	Meredith
Ohrai	Ramsay
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—34

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

Adjournment Debate

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Order, please. I wish to inform the House that because of the delay the hour provided for consideration of Private Members' Business will not take place today. The order is therefore deferred to a future sitting.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP): Madam Speaker, I rise to express my sorrow that the Dene of Deline on Great Bear Lake in the Northwest Territories continue to be treated with disrespect and callous disregard by the government. I share the sadness that members of the community feel as their pleas for immediate crisis assistance continue to be ignored by the government.

Since March 20 of this year members of the community felt hope that after decades of neglect their tragic story and the grave injustices inflicted upon their people would be addressed. The Dene of Deline listened as the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development stood in the House on March 30 and stated "the government takes this issue very seriously".

The country listened to the minister state on CBC National Radio on Saturday, May 17:

We are deeply concerned about potential impacts associated with the historic uranium mining operations in the NWT.

The country listened as the minister further stated her government's position:

—which is making sure that today, and on a go-forward basis, we are protecting the communities and the people.

The potential impacts have occurred. A people are devastated by radiation deaths in Deline and along the route the ore carriers travelled from the north to Fort McMurray. The impacts are the

loss of an entire generation of elders who pass on the traditional knowledge and honourable ways to the next generations.

The impacts are the result of a federal government's inexcusable disregard and contempt for not warning the Dene in the early 1930s when the effects of these, to use the government's words, deadly and insidious substances were first identified. With a warning the people could have protected their families and their children. The families travelled with the ore carriers exposing an entire generation to the uranium radiation dangers carried on their backs in burlap sacks.

At the United Nations conference on human rights this past weekend in Edmonton this tragic story was told before representatives from countries around the globe. Six months has passed since the minister issued grand statements of caring and action. Since her empty statements Dene representatives appeared before the House Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development. Elder Baton after 30 years told the Deline story. Members were shocked. Some moved to tears.

Dene representatives met with the minister and her colleagues in June and left with hope. They still wait.

A community delegation travelled to Hiroshima in August to express their sorrow and to apologize that they did not know they were assisting in war and would contribute to the nuclear bombs that killed thousands.

I raise today the travesty that continues through the government's inaction.

• (2130)

This community of honour does not deserve the dishonourable treatment meted out by this government before Canadians and the world.

I ask today for the honourable answer. Where is the immediate crisis assistance? Where is the funding for the community's 14 point plan? Or will this government admit today that these past six months have been empty promises and false hopes?

Mr. David Iftody (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased on behalf of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to respond to the hon. member for Halifax West on past mining activities in Deline, Northwest Territories.

The Government of Canada is very concerned with potential impacts of historical uranium mining and other activities at the Port Radium uranium mine located at Great Bear Lake, Northwest Territories.

Along with the Minister of Health and the Minister of Natural Resources and the Secretary of State for Children and Youth, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development met with representatives of the community of Deline on June 10, 1998 in Ottawa.

Adjournment Debate

The outcome of this meeting was a commitment by the ministers to work in a partnership with the community to try to address three subject matters. First, the immediate and long term health concerns of the community including assessments on health and the environment. Second, to establish a co-operative approach and a joint committee that includes administrative and financial assistance for the participation of the Deline community. Third, to establish a common understanding of the history and the impacts of the Port Radium mine and related activities.

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development wrote to confirm that all parties will work co-operatively and will provide the community with discussion papers to assist in implementing those commitments.

On August 26 and September 15, 1998 departmental officials met with Deline Chief Raymond Taniton in Yellowknife and Ottawa respectively to open up a dialogue with the community and

to investigate how to move ahead on this very critical and important issue. This work continued through meetings and correspondence in October and November.

We have recently reaffirmed our commitment to provide contributions to the community to assist its participation in these important investigations and to conduct biological sampling programs in the—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I am afraid I must interrupt the hon. parliamentary secretary as the time has expired.

[*Translation*]

The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 9.31 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, December 1, 1998

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) 10685

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Adams 10685

Committees of the House

Public Accounts

Mr. Williams 10685

Procedure and House Affairs

Mr. Adams 10685

Motion for concurrence 10685

Petitions

Grandparents' Rights

Mr. Harb 10685

Tobin Tax

Mr. Malhi 10685

Euthanasia

Mr. Hill (Macleod) 10685

Property Rights

Mr. Mills (Red Deer) 10686

Criminal Code

Mr. Mills (Red Deer) 10686

Human Rights

Mr. Szabo 10686

Multilateral Agreement on Investment

Mr. Blaikie 10686

Merchant Navy Veterans

Mr. Adams 10686

Nuclear Weapons

Mr. Adams 10686

Divorce Act

Mr. Bellemare 10686

Mr. Adams 10686

Committees of the House

Procedure and House Affairs

Motion for concurrence 10686

Mr. Adams 10686

(Motion agreed to) 10687

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Adams 10687

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply

Allotted Day—Social Programs

Mr. Manning 10687

Motion 10687

Mr. Strahl 10687

Mr. Manning 10687

Mr. Blaikie 10689

Mr. Manning 10689

Mr. Szabo 10689

Mr. Manning 10689

Ms. Meredith 10690

Amendment 10691

Mr. Manning 10691

Ms. Meredith 10691

Mr. Bryden 10691

Ms. Meredith 10691

Mr. Dion 10691

Motion 10693

Mr. Manning 10693

Mr. Dion 10693

Miss Grey 10693

Mr. Dion 10694

Mr. Duceppe 10694

Mr. Bryden 10695

Mr. Duceppe 10695

Mr. Blaikie 10695

Mr. Dion 10697

Mr. Blaikie 10697

Mr. Manning 10697

Mr. Blaikie 10698

Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska) 10698

Mr. Dion 10700

Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska) 10700

Mr. Brien 10700

Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska) 10700

Mr. Jaffer 10701

Mr. Bryden 10702

Mr. Jaffer 10702

Mr. Szabo 10702

Mr. Jaffer 10702

Mr. Alcock 10702

Mr. Jaffer 10702

Mr. Obhrai 10703

Mr. McWhinney 10704

Mrs. Ablonczy 10705

Mr. McWhinney 10705

Mrs. Ablonczy 10705

Mr. McWhinney 10706

Ms. Bakopanos 10706

Ms. Meredith 10707

Ms. Bakopanos 10707

Mr. Obhrai 10708

Ms. Bakopanos 10708

Mr. Hill (Macleod) 10708

Mr. Assadourian 10709

Mr. Hill (Macleod) 10709

Mr. Dubé (Lévis—et—Chutes—de—la—Chaudière) 10709

Mr. Hill (Macleod) 10710

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) 10710

Ms. Hardy 10711

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) 10711

Mr. Kilgour 10712

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) 10712

Mr. Mahoney 10712

Ms. Meredith 10713

Mr. Mahoney 10713

Mr. Dubé (Lévis—et—Chutes—de—la—Chaudière) 10714

Mr. Mahoney 10714

Mr. Myers 10714

Ms. Meredith 10716

Mr. Myers 10716

Mr. Boudria	10732
Mr. Blaikie	10732
Mr. Strahl	10732
The Speaker	10733
Points of Order	
Oral Question Period	
Mr. Blaikie	10733
Mr. MacKay	10734
Mr. Lunn	10734
Mr. Boudria	10734
Mr. Bergeron	10735
Miss Grey	10735
Mr. Ménard	10736
Request for Tabling of Document	
Ms. Meredith	10736
The Speaker	10736

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply

Allotted day—Social Programs

Motion	10736
Mrs. Redman	10736
Mr. Byrne	10737
Ms. Meredith	10739
Mr. Byrne	10739
Mr. Alcock	10739
Mr. Byrne	10739
Mr. Lunn	10739
Mr. Keddy	10741
Mr. Lunn	10742
Mr. Alcock	10742
Mr. Lunn	10742
Mr. Kenney	10742
Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	10744
Mr. Alcock	10744
Mr. Kenney	10744
Mr. DeVillers	10744
Mr. Kenney	10746
Mr. DeVillers	10746
Ms. Meredith	10746
Mr. DeVillers	10746
Mr. Alcock	10747
Mr. Kenney	10748
Mr. Alcock	10748
Mr. Brien	10749
Amendment negatived	10751
Motion negatived	10752

Supplementary Estimates (B)

Mr. Massé	10752
Motion in concurrence	10752
Motion agreed to	10753
Bill C-60. First Reading	10753
Mr. Massé	10753
(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)	10753
Bill C-60. Second reading	10753
Mr. Massé	10753
Mr. Harvey	10753
Motion agreed to	10754
(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Milliken in the chair)	10754
(On clause 2)	10754
Mr. Solberg	10755

Mr. Massé	10755
Mr. Loubier	10755
Mr. Massé	10755
(Clause 2 agreed to)	10755
(Clause 3 agreed to)	10755
Mr. Ménard	10755
(Clause 4 agreed to)	10755
(Clause 5 agreed to)	10756
(Clause 6 agreed to)	10756
Mr. Strahl	10756
(Schedule agreed to)	10756
(Clause 1 agreed to)	10756
(Preamble agreed to)	10756
(Title agreed to)	10756
(Bill reported)	10756
Motion for concurrence	10756
Mr. Massé	10756
Motion agreed to	10758
Third Reading	10758
Mr. Massé	10758
Motion agreed to	10759
(Bill read the third time and passed)	10759

Tobacco Act

Bill C-42. Third reading	10759
Motion agreed to	10760
(Bill read the third time and passed)	10760

Marine Conservation Areas Act

Bill C-48. Second reading	10760
Motion agreed to	10761
Motion agreed to	10762
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ...	10762

First Nations Land Management Act

Bill C-49. Second reading	10762
Motion agreed to	10763
Motion agreed to	10764
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ...	10764

Special Import Measures Act

Bill C-35. Report stage	10764
Motion No. 1 negatived	10765
Motion No. 2 negatived	10766
Motion No. 3 agreed to	10767
Motion No. 4 negatived	10767
Motion No. 5 negatived	10768
Motion No. 7 negatived	10769
Motion for concurrence	10769
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	10769
Motion agreed to	10770

Extradition Act

Bill C-40. Third reading	10770
Motion agreed to	10771
(Bill read the third time and passed)	10771

Royal Canadian Mint Act

Bill C-41. Third reading	10772
Motion agreed to	10773
(Bill read the third time and passed)	10773

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Earle	10773
Mr. Iftody	10773

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,
45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,
45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9