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WESTRAY MINE

The House resumed from March 3 consideration of the motion.

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Madam Speaker, it is certainly a pleasure for me to talk about this issue which stems from an awful disaster that happened in 1992 in Nova Scotia not too far from my riding. I remember it well. I was the member of parliament for Cumberland—Colchester at the time. I represent an area that has a large number of coal mines and we have seen our share of coal mine disasters in Springhill, River Hebert, Joggins and all those places that thrived on coal in the early years. This motion is very dear to my heart.

We will be voting on this motion. It will be interesting to see which members are in favour of amending the criminal code to protect workers in Canada from coast to coast. I am confident this motion will gain the support of the entire House or at least one would certainly hope so considering the ramifications.

This morning on the airplane coming to Ottawa I happened to open the Globe and Mail and there was a story that reminded me of the Westray incident. The article stated: “Ashen-faced relatives stood in silence watching rescuers coated in coal dust drag up the bodies of the people killed in the Ukrainian mine disaster”. That just happened hours ago and it sounds exactly like what happened in Westray. The draegermen were bringing up the bodies. It was such a sad thing and to think it could have been avoided.

I would like to take a moment this morning to read the motion. It is important that we remember what we are talking about. I will read the motion into the record so that everybody is clear about what we are dealing with. Motion No. 79 states:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Criminal Code or other appropriate federal statutes should be amended in accordance with Recommendation 73 of the Province of Nova Scotia’s Public Inquiry into the Westray disaster, specifically with the goal of ensuring that corporate executives and directors are held properly accountable for workplace safety.

What could make more sense than that? The awful thing is that the study to which the hon. member refers was started in 1992 and was just tabled in 1997. His motion stems from that study.

The need for a rational standard of business behaviour goes without saying. However it is every bit as important that once the laws are established, provisions are created to ensure that bureaucrats do not tokenize the enforcement of those laws. There can be no double standards.

Enforcement administrators often give way to political influences that persuade them that enforcement of workplace legislation will sacrifice jobs and scare away industry. Enforcement apathy is often rationalized by the political suggestion that by giving a company the right amount of time the problem will be fixed. This is often proven blatantly untrue.
Collectively workers represent the wealthiest group of people and consumers in the country. It is from these workers that taxes are collected which in turn fund the infrastructure which stimulates an environment that creates additional wealth, so long as the workers and employees remain healthy.

When injured, taxpayers often pay the financial costs of rehabilitation, death benefits, retraining and lost productivity that exceeds $16 billion annually. Every day through their efforts Canadian workers earn the right to be protected with enforceable legislation.

As an investment it is good business and cost justified to protect Canadian employees. A small number of executives still escape liability because their lawyers show them how to hide behind jurisdictional boundaries. Even if convicted of violating the occupational health and safety statutes, existing provincial penalties are minimal compared to the rewards generated by their violation. This motion would require total accountability of executives with no loopholes.

Unfortunately we have seen many examples of occupational safety in the workplace taking second spot behind the bottom line, especially in the mining industry where the very nature of the work involves a great deal of risk. It is the duty of company officers to ensure the work is done in the safest possible conditions.

I again refer to the newspaper article about the Ukrainian explosion which so mirrors the Westray explosion. The article said “a preliminary investigation suggested that Saturday’s accident was a methane explosion caused by a violation of safety standards”. That is exactly what happened at Westray.

Ukraine’s energy minister also said that safety violations were likely at fault. The miners usually blame accidents on the unwillingness of officials to spend money on maintaining or upgrading safety equipment. History certainly has repeated itself there.

Often corporate executives sometimes seem less interested in the merits of workplace safety in pursuit of the bottom line. This is a very dangerous scenario. We must be mindful of it and do everything we can to prevent it.

In the case of the Westray tragedy, labour safety standards, in particular minimal safety standards, were not adhered to to the extent they should have been, much like we have read about regarding the Ukrainian explosion.

Looking at this issue in the larger context, there must also be recognition of the role of government to ensure proper standards are met, not only set but met. It stands to reason that when weighing business goals versus those of safety, sometimes businesses find themselves pulled in many ways. They have to meet production deadlines, outperform competitors, increase bottom lines, etcetera. That is where the human element and the safety issue must be exercised.

Far too often businesses and indeed heads of corporations are obsessed with financial gain leaving the safety of their workers neglected. That type of short term gain often results in long term pain, as was the case at Westray.

One thing that really struck me was the name of the study. The report that was done on the Westray mine disaster was entitled “A Predictable Path to Disaster”. That is a sad commentary on safety in the mining industry and the executives involved in that industry. A predictable path; they could have predicted that the disaster was going to happen, yet it still did.

Safety regulations, management and government all failed in their duties to those miners. Tough economic times which exist in the country put further pressure on workers. That is why this is so timely. The economic impact of having to shut down a corporation affects everyone in that company. The employees, management, board of directors and anyone associated with that business are going to feel a negative impact if there has to be an operational shutdown as a result of a potential breach of safety.

That is the cost of doing business and we have to do everything to ensure that those safety practices are followed. In the case of Westray they were almost trivial things which were overlooked: sensors shut down, alarms disconnected, comments from the miners disregarded, and things like that.

Companies must ensure the avoidance of hazardous or illegal practices such as those which cannot be condoned in any capacity. If companies have not already done so, they should do everything within their power to implement safe and ethical work practices. Ethics such as these should be studied and followed everywhere in places of employment, especially in upper management. If this is not the case, action must be taken to demonstrate the importance and seriousness of the issue. Business executives must promote and nurture safe work ethics and have an open and approachable attitude toward all employees.

As Nova Scotia experienced with the Westray disaster, senior bureaucrats within the provincial workplace and enforcement agencies became compromised by regional politics and vested
interests. This practice is suspected to be occurring in other provinces even today, almost eight years after that explosion.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to address this motion. For me, one of the most profound and distressing events that occurred in Nova Scotia during my 14 years of serving as leader of the New Democratic Party in that province was the Westray disaster, which absolutely avoidably and unnecessarily cost 26 miners their lives and cost their families the loss of loved ones.

I have always taken seriously the request that was made to me by some of the widows of those Westray miners that I, along with every other elected politician in office, pledge to ensure that the fathers of the children of those Westray miners would not have lost their lives in vain because we would move to put in place the necessary legislation, the necessary protection, to ensure that no such disaster could ever occur again in Nova Scotia or anywhere in the country, and this is the subject of the motion that is before us.

I am torn by conflicting emotions as we discuss this motion. On the one hand I am filled with hope, and I think many Canadian workers will be, that health and safety is the subject of debate in the House. That is a very important thing and I want to commend the member for Pictou—Antigonish— Guysborough for bringing forward this motion and other members of the House who have risen to support the motion that is before us. The needless loss of 26 miners still buried beneath the ground has not been forgotten, and that is a very important message.

As the previous member who spoke indicated, one cannot be unmindful of the chilling news of the death of 80 miners in Ukraine which has occurred in the last few days. Let us not be so smug in the House as to think that the same kind of unsafe conditions, the same kind of neglect by employers and governments cannot repeat itself in Canada. Until we take serious legislative measures to put in place the protections that are necessary, including an enactment in legislation of the sentiment of this motion, this situation can and indeed will occur again.

The disappointing thing at this point in the debate about this very important health and safety topic is that it would appear that it is the intention of the federal Liberal government to never really put this debate into action. The intention of the government is not only to try to forget the lost lives at Westray, but to ignore the simple, horrifying reality across the country that there are workers who continue to be put into unsafe working conditions and the people who put them there remain immune from criminal responsibility.

There will be, no doubt, Liberal members of parliament who will stand in protest and they too will proclaim their concern, their care about Canadian workers, how they hope a disaster like Westray will never again happen. However, until we enact legislation that embodies the spirit of this motion, then such speeches will be little more than empty rhetoric.

Motion No. 79 is just that, it is a motion. It has no legislative implications. Indeed we have seen in the past that this government will from time to time support such motions, only to ignore the issue in its entirety when it comes to enacting legislation to express the intent of the motion.

However, in this case the government will not be allowed to fool the Canadian people so easily because it is our responsibility to ensure that the government is forced to act upon this.

At issue in this motion is recommendation No. 73 of the exhaustive Westray report. That recommendation would establish criminal responsibility for decision makers who knowingly put their workers at undue risk. It is the basis for this motion and the basis for my private member’s Bill C-259.

Supporting the motion which is before us would tell Canadian workers that their representatives will stand for them. Supporting Bill C-259 would show Canadian workers that their representatives will stand for them. Unfortunately, the government appears determined to send a very different message.

I bring to the attention of the House where the Liberal government stands today on workplace safety. I will quote from letters written by members of the government in response to my requests for support for Bill C-259. What did the Minister of Labour say? She said that it falls under the jurisdiction of the justice department. The translation of her statement is that worker safety is not the labour minister’s problem.

What about the Minister of Justice? She said:

I share your concern that people in Canada should not be able to hold themselves above the law. . .my officials are giving this recommendation every consideration.

The translation of that statement is “We have had three years to do something about this, but don’t hold your breath”.

I think the clincher comes from the Prime Minister’s office:

I share your concerns about the Westray Mine explosion. . .that is why the government has a comprehensive range of programs to promote workplace safety.

The translation of that statement is “Despite everything that the Westray inquiry documented, despite the recommendations coming
out of the Westray inquiry, despite the fact that workers continue to be put in unsafe working conditions, there is no real problem. The existing regime does the job.”

If the existing regime did the job, then there would not have been 26 miners’ lives lost in the Westray explosion.

I plead with members of the House to recognize that this is not a partisan issue. We all know that every member elected to the House of Commons has constituents who, at this very moment, as we speak about the motion which is before us, are working in unsafe conditions, who are forced to work in unsafe conditions because of the inadequacy of the legislation that exists in the country.

Whether to stand for those working Canadians is not a choice. Standing for those Canadians working in unsafe health and safety conditions is our obligation and I urge every member of the House to vote in support of the motion which is before us.

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to speak to Motion No. 79. I commend the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough for his commitment to this issue and his foresight in introducing this motion in the House of Commons for debate.

It is unfortunate that an issue of this importance—the issue of accountability for corporate executives and occupational safety—is not taken more seriously by the government. It is very frustrating for individual members of the House to pursue public policy issues with such vigour, initiative and vision on behalf of Canadians when they are continually shut down by the government. Instead of focusing on the types of important public policy initiatives that Canadians need into the next century, it is only focused on next week’s polls.

The Westray disaster of May 9, 1992 continues to resonate as a beacon of what should be done to improve worker safety, not just in Canada but around the world.

Earlier today I heard the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester speak of the recent mine disaster in Ukraine. Canada can play a role in introducing changes to our criminal code that would be world leading in terms of their impact on occupational health and safety issues and corporate accountability, not just in Canada but around the world.

I remember the time of the disaster in 1992. I was on business in New York when I heard the news. It was one of the few times I listened to national public radio in New York. I was running in Central Park when I heard the news. It was one of the few times that I ever heard about Nova Scotia in the U.S. national media. It was a sad moment because, of all the positive things that we understand about Nova Scotia and Canada, it is often this kind of disaster that captures the U.S. media. The sadness continues to affect those families, whose lives have been forever changed by the disaster.

I am not surprised that the government is opposed to improving corporate accountability on occupational health and safety issues. This is the same government that ignores issues of accountability even for its cabinet ministers. One of the fundamental tenets of our democratic system and of parliamentary democracy is the accountability of ministers of the crown. The government ignores even the accountability of ministers in its own cabinet. For example, the debacle with the HRDC minister has focused the attention of Canadians on issues of waste in government in recent weeks. I guess it is consistent with this government that it continues to ignore issues of accountability, whether it is corporate accountability in the case of Motion No. 79 or ministerial accountability in terms of the government’s malaise in effecting positive change with respect to the accountability of its own ministers.

The chilling message that came from the Westray disaster was that every day, in this day and age, occupational health and safety issues continually are ignored by companies, particularly, it would seem, in the coal mining industry, but in other sectors as well.

Increasingly executives are compensated based on stock options. While that can be very positive in terms of creating a synergistic relationship between the goals of the executive from a compensatory perspective and the goals of the shareholders by encouraging executives to maximize shareholder value, it can also focus the efforts of executives on very short term results which can often have a negative impact on the long term results of a company, whether it is corporate and financial, or in this case the safety of workers.

We cannot put a price on life. It is impossible to value human life on a balance sheet or on an earnings statement. Often companies are so focused on the bottom line that they forget the basics of humanity in terms of providing a safe work space for workers who, every day of their lives in the coal mining industry, in this case, risk their lives.

Government needs to provide a role in overseeing and ensuring that on an ongoing basis these workers are protected by changing the criminal code as recommended by the Westray inquiry. With this legislation we would ensure that government continue to play the very important role that only government can play to ensure that the corporate sector does its part to ensure the safety of workers in what is a very dangerous industry.

Part of the issue as well is temptation. Far too often in areas like Atlantic Canada that have seen significant economic issues and a downturn over the last 30 years, in the haste to attract and to maintain industry there is a tendency to turn a blind eye to some of
the health and safety issues. That very short term focus is going to have some very negative long term results.

The Government of Canada can play a proactive role in the same light that the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough is playing a proactive visionary role in introducing this motion. The government can play a proactive visionary role in actually supporting legislation to ensure that there are not different sets of health and safety standards for different regions of the country. Just because a region has some economic downturn issues, the workers in that region should not have to suffer with poorer occupational health standards.

The legislation proposed in the motion would effect change in the criminal code which would actually ensure that across Canada corporate executives faced the same stringent level of accountability. Atlantic Canada would see, whether it is in the coal mining industry or another industry, a greater level of protection for workers. They go to work every day and struggle to make ends meet, to try to build a better future for themselves, for their families and for Canada. They should not have to live under the pall of a daily unnecessary threat to their lives and their safety because of corporate negligence.

I encourage all members of the House to support Motion No. 79. I commend the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough for proposing very sound legislation in the motion. We need to ensure that occupational health and safety issues are dealt with in the same way that environmental issues are dealt with strongly by the criminal code.

Corporate executives must be responsible not just to their shareholders but to Canadians at large, to the workers who toil in the mines, to the wildlife that depend on a clean environment. We need to ensure that environmental standards, health and safety and occupational health issues are dealt with appropriately.

The only way to deal with these issues in the economically driven and globally competitive society we live in today is through strong changes to the criminal code to ensure that all workers are safe in their workplace. All corporate executives must do everything they can to ensure that Canada has the highest standards in occupational health and safety in the world.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it was not my intention to speak to the motion. However because the previous three members who spoke have more or less moved away from the generalities of the motion and directed their attention solely to the Westray disaster, I would like to make a contribution. I am a mining engineer by profession and I have worked many years underground in many parts of the world. I would like to give the House my particular take on this disaster.

The last member who spoke made specific reference to the negligence of the regulatory system. He did not use those words but I will use them. I believe that the heart of the problem at Westray was that there was such enormous political pressure to open this mine in the first place, when there was good advice from mining experts that it was not a viable operation, that the shaft should never have been sunk, that they had had methane problems in that area historically every time they tried to mine there. There was definitely a recommendation that the mine not be developed. However, because of provincial and federal pressures and the huge amounts of government money put forward to get this thing going, there was also pressure on the regulatory system. As I understand it, and I stand to be corrected, I believe the mine inspector was under considerable pressure not to shut that operation down.

When I was working in the mines, I never ever encountered a situation where line management was anything but safety conscious. Line managers would do whatever was necessary to keep a mine safe. They had the advantage of having the mine inspectors behind them. In other words, even if management in Toronto said they had to get production up, line management could still do whatever was necessary to keep the mine safe. They had the full weight and force of the mine inspector behind them because the mine inspector could shut them down. They had that power.

We are perhaps shooting at the wrong target here. The problem at Westray was not governance. The problem at Westray was safety enforcement. Perhaps we might say that line management was guilty but the mine inspection system failed. Any mine inspector should have been able to spot the violations which have been described here which took place in that mine.

Because there was this one particular disaster, let us not talk about revamping a law which has served us well over the years. That is the law which exempts directors. I am not talking about executives or line management; I am talking about directors. Who in the devil would want to be the director of a company if he or she was going to be held responsible for things that are happening out in the field? The directors do not make managerial decisions. They have nothing to do with it.

A man would have to be insane to accept a directorial position for which he is paid a very small amount of money with most companies. There are directors of multinational companies who are well paid, but the directors of most companies work for an honorarium. They get paid so much a meeting and that is it. Who would take on a position like that? Not me, not if I were going to be held responsible for something that happened 2,000 or 3,000 miles away that I did not know anything about and had no input into.

The problem here is government, government, government. The government failed. The civil servants failed. A group of miners was unnecessarily killed because the inspection system did not work. The inspection system did not do its job. We rely on regulators in industry in this country to keep everyone honest and they did not do it.
The Government of Canada, through the Department of Justice, should institute a study of the accountability of corporate executives and directors for the wrongful or negligent acts of the corporation and should introduce in the Parliament of Canada such amendments to legislation as are necessary to ensure that corporate executives and directors are held properly accountable for workplace safety.

This recommendation gives us the opening I mentioned earlier to intervene in this matter and especially to do a detailed study of all aspects of mining safety. I therefore move this amendment.

[English]

Mr. Peter MacKay: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Prior to the expiry of private members’ hour I wish to advise the Chair that following consultations with my colleagues from all parties, I believe you will find there is unanimous consent to defer the vote on Motion No. 79 until Tuesday, March 21, 2000 at the end of government orders.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is there unanimous consent of the House to proceed in such a manner?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in the House as a member from Nova Scotia to discuss the merits of Motion No. 79 put forward by the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, one of my neighbouring ridings.

I want to thank the hon. member for bringing the motion to debate in the House of Commons. I believe that health and safety is something that should be debated in the House of Commons on a regular basis.

On behalf of the New Democratic Party, and on behalf of workers across the country, I would like to offer a solemn prayer and hope in our hearts for the wives and children of the 80 miners who were recently killed in a blast in Ukraine. I believe I speak on behalf of all members of the House of Commons in sending our sincere condolences to everyone in Ukraine.

This motion works in conjunction with Bill C-259, a private member’s bill which the hon. member for Halifax, the leader of the New Democratic Party, introduced concerning workers’ health and safety rights and bringing those who are criminally responsible to justice.

What happened at Westray did not have to happen. Miners and their families are very concerned about their loved ones who go underground on a daily basis to earn their bread, and to pay their taxes so that we in the House of Commons can put forth legislation to protect them. For us to ignore their demands and wishes is a dereliction of our responsibilities and our duties. We simply cannot allow this to happen any longer.
There was an exhaustive Westray report which made some very serious and admirable recommendations, but that report is now three years old. What has the government done? Absolutely nothing. I wonder if it is waiting for the next mine disaster before doing something. Is it waiting for an election to be called before it enacts legislation? It seems that is the only thing that will make the federal Liberals move.

After a balanced and exhaustive report which was done to improve the lives and the health and safety of workers in the communities, especially in the extremities of the country outside Ottawa, the government sits on the report and does absolutely nothing.

Our party was founded on the principles of workers’ safety and workers’ rights. We started in the CCF, with J. S. Woodsworth, right up to the NDP led by the hon. member for Halifax. We have been fighting day in and day out with our provincial counterparts and our friends in the labour movement, with the CLC, to fight for and protect workers’ rights throughout the country.

On average, three workers lose their lives on a daily basis. Three workers is three workers too many.

When I was growing up in Vancouver, 15 workers lost their lives working on the Portmann Bridge.

On behalf of all Nova Scotians and working people throughout the country, I encourage all political parties, especially those in government, to take heed of this very special motion, as well as the bill of my leader, Bill C-259, to take very seriously the recommendations for workers’ rights and safety and to ignore the concerns of people like Clifford Frame and Peggy Whitte who have absolutely no moral leadership in the country, who want to extract wealth at the cheapest price possible, including that of labour, and who leave the country when a disaster happens. There was absolutely no moral leadership, and for any government to support those two people over workers’ rights is absolutely disastrous and scandalous.

I encourage the entire House to support Motion No. 79 put forward by my hon. colleague from Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The amendment moved by the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm is in order.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Pursuant to order made earlier this day, the recorded division stands deferred until Tuesday, March 21, at the end of the time provided for Government Orders.

The Speaker: Before I hear a point of order from the hon. parliamentary secretary, I would inform the House that I have received two letters this morning.

[Translation]

I received a letter from the hon. member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes, chief whip of the Bloc Quebecois, and another from the hon. member for Rimouski—Mitis, deputy leader of the Bloc Quebecois.

These letters have to do with the question of privilege raised earlier by the hon. member for Rimouski—Mitis.

If these are new questions of privilege, I will hear them. If this is about the question of privilege that was raised earlier by the hon. member, I will hear members on new facts surrounding that question, since I am now in the process of preparing the ruling regarding this question of privilege.

I am told also that another letter was sent by the Bloc Quebecois leader regarding this issue and I am sure that the hon. Bloc Quebecois leader also wants to address this issue.

If there are new facts, I will hear them.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

AMENDMENTS TO BILL C-20

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important that I raise this question of privilege
Privilege

regarding what I told you about on March 1, and regarding the
point of order raised by the hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry, on Friday, March 3.

At the time, I asked you to examine a serious violation of the
privileges as parliamentarians of Bloc Quebecois members in this
House.

I gave you proof that the deputy principal clerk had rejected
amendments that we had not even tabled with the Journals Branch,
since he based his decision on the legislative counsel’s data bank,
rather than on the amendments actually tabled by the Bloc Quebe-
cois.

I demonstrated to you that the freedom of speech of the members
of my party and their right to confidential dealings with the
legislative counsel had been violated.

Not only had the House staff usurped the right of the Bloc MPs
to select the amendments they intended to propose, but it also
committed a breach of confidentiality by consulting the body of
amendments the Bloc Quebecois had had the legislative counsel
prepare.

At the time I raised this question of privilege, I expressed serious
misgivings about the decision making process surrounding the
receivability of the amendments at the report stage. In fact, certain
amendments that were declared out of order were amended in
accordance with the comments by the Deputy Principal Clerk in
order to render them in order. Yet they were again deemed to be out
of order.

This new decision was then made the object of a point of order
by my colleague for Beauharnois—Salaberry who expressed, on
behalf of his colleagues, his dismay about this new refusal by your
staff. These events, which occurred during the week prior to last
week’s parliamentary recess, have a negative effect on the debate at
report stage on Bill C-20, which was begun on Friday, March 3 and
is scheduled to resume today.

Some amendments will be neither debated nor voted on, while
we have serious reservations about the grounds on which the staff
based the decision that they were not in order. The very process by
which amendments were selected might be questioned, as it seems
to be tainted by a number of defects and irregularities.

On these grounds, Mr. Speaker, you have a duty to bring down
your decision on my point of privilege of March 1 last, and on the
point of order raised by my colleague for Beauharnois—Salaberry,
and to do so before resuming the debate at report stage and before
beginning today’s voting process, because the government House
leader is obviously preparing to propose a time allocation motion,
which will force the House to decide on the motions at report stage
starting at 6.30 this evening.

The Bloc Quebecois will have great difficulty in taking part in a
process of debate and voting which is a deviation from the rules
and conventions of this House.

Do not treat this point of privilege lightly. The gravity of the
situation imposes a duty to exercise diligence. The credibility of
the institution that is the House of Commons is at stake.

I would remind you that I am still prepared to make the
necessary motion to return this matter to the Standing Committee
on Procedure and House Affairs, particularly the one element—for
my point of privilege involved two matters—relating to the
examination of a motion of privilege, which would refer to that
committee the question raised by the rejection of two never-
introduced amendments.

Before the debate is resumed, or as promptly as possible, and
especially before we vote, I expect your decision on the point of
order raised by my colleague for Beauharnois—Salaberry.

The Speaker: What I have heard is simply a summary of what
you said on March 1, before we left for the week’s recess. I have
heard nothing new at this point. I have heard no new facts at this
point. I ask the members again, if they wish to intervene, to keep to
the facts. The hon. leader of the Bloc Quebecois.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr.
Speaker, what is new is that there will be closure in a few minutes
and we want to know whether you will give a ruling on either the
motion by the member for Rimouski—Mitis or on the question of
privilege raised on the point of order before we vote this afternoon.

It is new, because as far as we are concerned, and I am speaking
for myself personally and for all the members of my party, we
would be put in a situation where we would feel the debate on Bill
C-20 would not be impartial here. That is a serious matter.

The Speaker: What the hon. leader of the Bloc Quebecois has
just said is very serious. It questions the position of the Speaker of
the House. We must absolutely be impartial. We must manage as
the rules we have here require. I hope the impartiality of the
Speaker of the House of Commons will never be challenged.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, if we were to vote without
hearing a decision or a ruling on what was raised, which is very
serious, my colleagues and I would be in such a situation.

I want to know whether the ruling will be given before we vote.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr.
Speaker, the leader of the Bloc Quebecois just presented in a very
eloquent way the problem that confronts us,
A question of privilege was originally raised by the hon. member for Rimouski—Mitis, who just reminded you of its nature. There is at least one new development, namely that the government is about to impose closure, with the result that we will likely begin to vote this evening, at 6.30 p.m., on the various amendments proposed at report stage of Bill C-20.

This creates two problems. The first one, which was raised by the hon. member for Rimouski—Mitis, is that two of our amendments, on which we worked with the legislative counsel, were deemed out of order before even having been tabled.

This greatly affected our ability to actually table these amendments later on, since they were deemed out of order before even having been tabled. This is not to mention the much more fundamental issue of the confidentiality that must exist between each member of parliament and the legislative counsels.

As for the voting process that will likely begin this evening, you will agree with me that it poses a problem.

The second problem concerns the amendments that were first deemed to be out of order. Explanations were provided to us by the Deputy Principal Clerk, who told us why these amendments had been deemed out of order.

We went back to the drawing board. We rewrote these amendments by taking into account the points raised and, surprise, these amendments were again deemed to be out of order.

You will agree that, if you were to rule in favour of the question of privilege raised by my colleague, it would then be necessary to include in the various groups of amendments all those amendments that were deemed out of order for a reason that we feel totally unjustified. It would be necessary to include these amendments in the various groups, so that they could be voted on this evening.

You will agree that we cannot possibly begin the debate on the amendments to Bill C-20. Moreover, we cannot begin to vote on these amendments if the Chair has not rendered its decision.

I want to stress what the Bloc Quebecois leader just said. If we were faced with the prospect of beginning the debate and, worse yet, of voting on the amendments proposed at report stage of Bill C-20, without the Chair having first made its ruling, we would have no other choice but to conclude that Bloc Quebecois members are not treated impartially.

**The Speaker:** You are facing me with a dilemma. I intend to render my decision before the voting this evening.

It is a bit of a concern to me that an hon. member is questioning the impartiality of the Chair of this House. I know that the matters we are going to discuss, debate and vote on today are very important ones.

As I have said, I intended to bring down my ruling before the votes, but I do not know when the voting will take place. The hon. member may know, but I do not. Perhaps it will be this evening, as he said, at 6.30 p.m. Perhaps it will be next week. I do not know at this point, because I have no document or opinion before me indicating how we are going to proceed.

It is troubling, however, that the Chair be asked to tell when this will be done, or face having his impartiality questioned. It is my intention to bring down my rulings before today's voting. If that is what the hon. member wanted to know, that is my intention.

**Government Orders**

[Translation]

AN ACT TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE REQUIREMENT FOR CLARITY AS SET OUT IN THE OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA IN THE QUEBEC SECESSION REFERENCE

BILL C-20—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

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

That in relation to Bill C-20, an act to give effect to the requirement for clarity as set out in the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec Secession Reference, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage of the bill and one sitting day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill and, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the day allotted to the consideration of the report stage and on the day allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the state of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

[English]

**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.
Speaker's Ruling

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

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

(Division No. 760)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asood</td>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Auccelin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Bachand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Bachand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliveau</td>
<td>Bellettehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellefleur</td>
<td>Beranr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevilaqua</td>
<td>Bevilaqua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonin</td>
<td>Biglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouliod</td>
<td>Bortoalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyda</td>
<td>Brison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budis</td>
<td>Brison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryden</td>
<td>Canel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caccia</td>
<td>Casey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canim</td>
<td>Cerf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>de Savoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causchon</td>
<td>Debien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouthier</td>
<td>Dub (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collette</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collette</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coley</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullen</td>
<td>Godin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalaln</td>
<td>Gouin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devillers</td>
<td>Grunding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>Guarnier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominski</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duhameal</td>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggerton</td>
<td>Hill (Prince George—Peace River)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
<td>Hill (St. John—Shad Bay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnano</td>
<td>Huard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodale</td>
<td>Hubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnier</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hthédy</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karetak-Lindell</td>
<td>Hilstrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilger</td>
<td>Hill (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korsun</td>
<td>Hodgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Sloan</td>
<td>Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leung</td>
<td>Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacAulay</td>
<td>Houde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malhi</td>
<td>Howlett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manley</td>
<td>Huot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>Hundschoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td>Hurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLellan</td>
<td>Hurlston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McWhinney</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills</td>
<td>Lawther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Manning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td>Martin (LaSalle—Éméard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Reilly</td>
<td>Martin (St. Cuthbert—Churchill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradis</td>
<td>Martineau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patry</td>
<td>Massey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Maury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickett (Chatham—Kent Essex)</td>
<td>Meek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proulx</td>
<td>McPherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenzano</td>
<td>McGuigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>McNeice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robillard</td>
<td>Meighen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saada</td>
<td>Mckinley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sené</td>
<td>Macdonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>Mackay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Denis</td>
<td>MacMaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steckle</td>
<td>MacPherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
<td>MacPherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telzghl</td>
<td>MacPherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torney</td>
<td>MacPherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valleri</td>
<td>MacPherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whelan</td>
<td>MacPherson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

Hoeppner Kilgour
Nunziata Wood

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[Translation]

POINTS OF ORDER

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT TO BILL C-20—SPEAKER’S RULING

The Speaker: I am now prepared to deal with the point of order raised by the hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry on March 3, 2000 relating to certain motions in amendment to Bill C-20, an act to give effect to the requirement for clarity as set out in the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec Secession Reference, which were found out of order.

[English]

I would like to thank the hon. member for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.
The hon. member stated that the motions in amendment submitted to the journals branch were intended to clarify the working of clauses 1(5) and 2(3) of Bill C-20 and did not go beyond the scope of the bill. He maintained that, because the amendments were ruled out of order, not only was he prevented from debating them but that this action interfered with the rights of all members of the House and constituted a restriction on his freedom of expression and that of other members.

I can assure the hon. member that the scope and substance of the amendments submitted by him were carefully considered.

I also want to underline to the hon. member and the House that, while preliminary assessments about such matters may be taken by officials of the House, the review and approval of such decisions remain the responsibility of the Speaker.

I have myself re-examined all of the amendments ruled out of order, not in relation to their substance, but from a strictly procedural perspective and I remain convinced that those amendments the hon. member referred to do in fact go beyond the scope and alter the principle of the bill as already agreed to by the House.

I refer the hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry to page 666 of the House of Commons Procedure and Practice. I wish to reassure the member that the decision is purely procedural and not based in any way on whether the subject matter is worthy of debate. It was made in accordance with the traditions and practices of this House.

For these reasons, I must conclude that the matter does not constitute a valid point of order. I thank the hon. member for raising this issue and trust that this ruling has been helpful to him and to other hon. members.

Further to the question raised by the member for Rimouski—Mi-tis on Friday, March 3, 2000, I wish to inform the House that there was an error in the table for the voting on Bill C-20. The vote on Motion No. 70 will apply to Motion No. 71. A revised voting table is available from the table. I regret any inconvenience this may have caused the hon. members.

* * *  

PRIVILEGE  

AMENDMENTS TO BILL C-20—SPEAKER’S RULING

The Speaker: The deputy House leader of the Bloc Quebecois raised a question of privilege on March 1, 2000 relating to the rejection of two motions in amendment to Bill C-20, an act to give effect to the requirement for clarity as set out in the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec Secession Reference.

These motions in amendment, declared out of order by the clerks involved with the bill, were never forwarded to the journals branch for inclusion in the Notice Paper.

Before beginning I would like to thank the hon. member for raising the matter. I also want to acknowledge the contributions of the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, the hon. member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes, as well as the House leader for the Reform Party on this subject.

The acting House leader stated that on Tuesday, February 29, 2000, the Deputy Principal Clerk of the legislative unit forwarded a letter to the office of the leader of the Bloc Quebecois presenting the procedural details for rejecting some 700 motions in amendment to Bill C-20. These motions in amendment were appended to the letter. The Bloc Quebecois had, in fact, never forwarded two of the motions in amendment bearing the reference numbers 5180 and 5163 to the journals branch for inclusion in the Notice Paper.

After inquiries by the office of the leader of the Bloc Quebecois, it became clear that the clerks working on the bill had made an error by including reference to those two motions in the covering letter. The acting House leader argued that the privileges of the Bloc Quebecois members and all members of the House have been breached because of the actions of those clerks involved in the performance of their duties, namely consulting a database that the member contends is intended for the exclusive use of the legislative counsel.

The member went on to assert that the relationship of confidentiality that must exist between the legislative counsel and those members who request the drafting of amendments had been breached and that this action constituted a contempt of the House.

On behalf of all members of the House, I have looked carefully into the actions and events related to this matter. Hon. members should understand that House legislative counsel do not work in isolation.

They are part of an operational team that supports the legislative work of the Chamber and its committees. This group is comprised of procedural clerks as well as legal drafters who are assisted in their functions by text processing operators and administrative support staff. The confidentiality to which the acting House leader...
Government Orders

refers is shared by all staff within this group for operational purposes.

There is no separate database for legislative counsel as the hon. member suggests. The legislative database supports the work of all persons having duties within the field of legislative support operations.

[English]

Members should also understand that with respect to report stage, there must be interaction between the staff of the legislative services group, the clerk of the committee to which the bill was referred, and the staff of the journals branch.

[Translation]

All staff of the House working in support of members in their legislative function are governed by strict confidentiality with regard to persons outside their operational field and, of course, vis-à-vis other members.

In this case, I note there is no mention of any breach of confidentiality whereby the text of proposed motions of the hon. member or her party has been made known to persons working outside the field of legislative support operations or to other members. Confidential information proprietary to the Bloc Quebecois and several of its members remained completely and absolutely confidential. Consequently, I am unable to find that this constitutes a prima facie question of privilege or a contempt of the House.

I thank the acting House leader of the Bloc Quebecois for bringing this matter to my attention and permitting me to make this clarification to the House.

* * *

[English]

AN ACT TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE REQUIREMENT FOR CLARITY AS SET OUT IN THE OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA IN THE QUEBEC SECESSION REFERENCE

The House resumed from March 3 consideration of Bill C-20, an act to give effect to the requirement for clarity as set out in the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec secession reference, as reported (without amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at this point I will use the three minutes I have remaining to remind the House of why we are here and why we will end up in the position we seem to be inexorably heading toward tonight.

After the 1995 referendum there was a decision to ask the supreme court what we might do in the event of another referendum. The court said very clearly that in a democracy like Canada, should there be a clear expression of the will of a population in a region of Canada on a clear question about the secession of that province, the Government of Canada would be obligated to negotiate. The government has come forward with a piece of legislation that puts that decision into law and nothing more. It adheres very closely to the decision of the supreme court.

From the moment it was even hinted that we might undertake to do that, at every opportunity the Bloc indicated there would be no co-operation, no discussion, no debate and no attempt to work together to improve legislation as is often done in the House. That is the purpose of this Chamber. I note that the New Democratic Party and its House leader, who was a member on the committee, worked hard to review the bill and put forward amendments. I note that even the Reform Party came forward in support of the bill and also looked at ways in which the bill could be improved.

Unfortunately, we end up where we are, responding to the unending stream of statements and actions by members of the Bloc who say “It does not matter what the debate is. It does not matter what the logic is. We are going to do everything we can to stop this.” Therefore, we end up in a very sad place, a place where it is no longer possible to debate. I am sorry that we are here, but we are here. Let me be very clear on this. We are here because of the consistent and continuing actions of one party in the House.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate having the opportunity to speak briefly to Bill C-20.

The clarity bill, as it has been called, is a bill which the official opposition supports in principle. I might say that we support it in principle because we think that confusion is antidemocratic.

However, we disagree with the haste of this process. We disagree with the imposition of time allocation. We disagree with the arbitrary nature that the committee used to decide who would appear as witnesses before the committee. I will not spend a lot of time on those things because that disagreement has been well documented.

We believe that a well informed public is better than a confused public. On an issue as important as the breakup of our country, to be well informed is very sensible.

It is not often that a politician makes a comment about his opposing politician. However, I would like to make a positive comment about the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs across the way. I believe that the minister has been forthright on this issue.
He has been pretty straight-up on this issue. He has not changed his tune since he made up his mind that he was going to look for clarity from the supreme court and carry it through. I give him credit for that. He has been castigated in his home province. He has been called unpleasant things. He has been made fun of in caricatures. I would like him to know personally that I do not agree with any of those things. I think he has been at least honourable on this subject.

We can disagree with him, and I believe that it is fair to do, but in this instance I do not disagree with him. I want him to know personally that I think the characterizations have not been accurate nor proper.

I will spend a moment on the committee hearings to talk about what I found most interesting. I attended all of the meetings and found the old politicians to be the most interesting people who appeared before the committee.

First, two of the witnesses I listened to opposed Bill C-20. Claude Ryan, who is a man with enormous prestige in Quebec, opposes Bill C-20, as well as Joe Clark, a politician who has had many years of constitutional battles. I will not make comments about the reasons they oppose the bill. They have reasons which I think are debatable and arguable. However, those two senior politicians both oppose Bill C-20.

I looked at those who came in support of Bill C-20. I found it interesting that some of them fought those constitutional battles with vigour themselves. I will list four of them: Claude Castonguay, le père de l’assurance-santé, the father of medicare in Quebec, is supportive of Bill C-20; Gil Rémiillard, a senior politician who has had long experience in Quebec, supports Bill C-20 as well; and two politicians from outside Quebec, Ed Broadbent and Bob Rae, both came to the committee and said they support the bill.

I found it interesting when I asked them this question: “Did you ever during your time battling these constitutional battles ever say that a clear question was something that was valuable?” They admitted that they had not. They battled this without ever saying publicly that a clear question was important.

I also want to reflect on what Reformers think of the clarity bill. I had the opportunity to poll Reformers. It was not a poll which would reflect the views of every Canadian. It reflected the views of Reform supporters.

It is fascinating that when asked if a clear question was important, 98.7% of Reformers who responded said yes. When asked the question, “Should the majority level be spelled out?”, 96.2% felt that the majority level should be spelled out. This bill does not do that. That probably reflects my position that the majority level could and should be spelled out.

When asked about the majority level, as to whether 50% plus one was sufficient, especially if it also was to decide what part of Quebec would stay in Canada, the percentage dropped to 77.6%, still a pretty strong number of people saying that the level should be spelled out.

I tried to reflect, all the way through the committee hearings, on whether the question last time was clear. My way of deciding was not to listen to those who on one side or the other have an axe to grind, but to ask those who are experts in asking questions of the public, and to my mind they are the pollsters, those who do polling all the time. The pollsters told me that when asking loaded questions we cannot expect anything but a loaded answer. They ask “yes-no” questions, which of course the referendum did as well.

When I asked the pollsters if the last question asked of Quebecers was unambiguous or confusing, they said no, it was neither; it was both ambiguous and confusing.

I posed to the pollsters what kind of question they would ask. I received some uniformity in their answers, which I will distil by saying that if there are two issues, two separate questions would have to be asked. It would be something like the following: “Do you want Quebec to enter a new economic partnership” or whatever “with Canada?” To that question there would be a response, yes or no.

I think that most Quebecers would probably answer yes, that they would like to enter into a new partnership with Canada. However, if we wanted to go further we would ask: “If that new partnership is unsuccessful within a timeframe, do you want Quebec to separate from Canada and sever all legal ties, yes or no?” On that issue I believe that we would get a different response from that which we had in the last referendum.

My analysis is that there are lots of people within and outside Quebec who would like to have a new relationship with Ottawa, and that relationship with Ottawa could well reflect a country that was advancing, a country that was improving, a country with a vigorous future. However, when asked if that new partnership fails would they want to split up Canada, I think the response might well be different. I know that there is very little appetite for splitting up the country outside Quebec, and certainly not in my part of the country.

Bill C-20 is imperfect. It could have been improved. It is a step in the right direction. In principle it is supportable. The official opposition will be supporting the bill unamended. I think it literally will not be amended, unless there is some surprise awaiting us.

It has been a privilege to represent interests from the western part of the country on the bill.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to say a few words before
this bill clears the House. In that respect, I want to reiterate my view that this bill has been rushed through in a way that has discredited the parliamentary process.

For the record, it has been one of the low points in my parliamentary life, watching the way this bill has been handled, both by the government and in some respects also by the Bloc Québécois, because it has created a situation in which something as important as the legislative framework for the secession of a province from Canada has not been able to be studied in the way that it should have been studied. We were not able to hear from as many people as we should have. We were not able to hear from them in a context that was constructive and open to real change.

I see the minister in the House today and I am glad he is here. I would like to echo the complimentary, positive attitude of the member who just spoke, but I would find that difficult. I do not think the minister and the government have been open, unless I am wrong and I find out later today that they will be open to some amendments. They have not been open to building a consensus around the bill that would enable not just Liberals but others to go forward and claim this very important piece of legislation as their own, so that it would be clear that, with the exception of the Conservaties, there was some measure of federalist unity on this issue.

I have been part of this process before. Even Pierre Trudeau, who was noted for his determination and has been called all kinds of things, including arrogant, tried to do things in the early eighties which the NDP felt were important so that he could bring us on side.

That is related to what is happening today. At that time the NDP would not support the patriation package unless it was amended to recognize the inherent rights of aboriginal people. That had been left out. What did Pierre Trudeau do? On the basis of being urged by the NDP, the patriation package was amended. That is why we have section 35 today.

But nothing was learned. In fact, some things seem to have been unlearned. We have Bill C-20 before us, and we have a bill, insofar as it affects aboriginal people, that is pre the patriation package. It does not recognize them at all.

Then we have something which is pre the patriation package, or worse, because in this context we have made recommendations, in conjunction with the Assembly of First Nations, the Grand Council of the Cree, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and others, and pleaded with the minister to accept some of the amendments we have officially made and which aboriginal organizations have recommended. So far, nothing.

We will be voting later today and the word I get from the government is “no amendments”. So even the wisdom of that time, the early eighties, of Mr. Trudeau and others trying to build something that could bring people together, is not for this minister. No, he knows everything and the rest of us are just chopped liver, including the aboriginal leadership and everyone else.

This is constitution making, as it has to do with the possible breakup of the country or how it could be kept together in the event of a referendum, depending on how one looks at it. It needs to be approached with a far different spirit and a far different frame of mind from the way in which the current minister has approached it. Frankly, he has made it very difficult. Maybe that is what he wanted all along.

He is making it very difficult for myself and others in my caucus who supported the principle of the bill, who supported the idea that there be a legislative implementation or framework established pursuant to the supreme court opinion. We have supported the need for a clear question, which is absolutely fundamental to any referendum, the need for the rest of Canada to be able to pronounce on whether it was a clear question and would justify negotiations on secession, the need for a clear majority, the fact that democracy was more than just a simple majority and that there was a need for a qualitative judgment after the fact. All of these things we have supported.

All we asked was that what the Assembly of First Nations and others have identified as a fundamental flaw, to use the language which they used in a letter released this weekend, be addressed, that aboriginal people be listed as political actors, and that the government be obliged to take their view into account. Those are the two easiest amendments for the government. We have submitted about six or seven amendments having to do with aboriginal concerns, but the two easiest ones for the government were to simply list aboriginal people along with the provinces, territories and the Senate as people whose views the minister would want to take into account in determining whether there was a clear question and subsequently whether there was a clear majority.

The government will not do that. Why not? There is absolutely no good reason for not putting the aboriginal people on that list of people whose views need to be taken into account. There is not a person on the other side of the House who could stand up and give me one good reason why those two amendments could not be accepted, except for the unmitigated, titanic, bloody arrogance of that man over there, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs who thinks he knows everything about this country and that the rest of us do not have anything to say.

Mr. Lynn Myers: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe that is unduly provocative and unparliamentary. I think it is uncalled for and the member should withdraw what he just said.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I believe that the member has gone overboard slightly this time. I will ask him to resume debate but to please choose his words more carefully.
Mr. Bill Blaikie: Madam Speaker, I have no intention of apologizing because I did not say anything unparliamentary. All I did was speak the truth.

Further to what I had to say, the government is revealing an attitude toward this place that should concern the government backbenchers. They themselves should be as concerned as I am. They should be concerned about the way their own government is acting.

The government is bringing into disrepute the parliamentary process. It is bringing into disrepute a piece of legislation that those members say is very important and which we agree is very important. We said from the beginning we would try to take this process seriously, even though it was introduced surreptitiously on a Friday when the government said it would not come in until Monday, then closure was moved on second reading, then closure was moved in committee and we could not hear witnesses we wanted to hear. Now we have this process. All the way along there has been nothing but stonewalling, nothing but a totally closed door and not just to us.

In the end it does not matter what happens to the NDP or our amendments but it matters what happens to the ideas that our amendments embody. That is that there should not be a retreat from Charlottetown. There should not be a retreat from section 35. There should not be a retreat from all the things we have accomplished in the last 15 years to establish aboriginal people as constitutional and political actors in this country. That is what this bill does. That is what makes it so fundamentally unacceptable and regrettable.

I am here not just in sorrow but also in anger. I feel we could have done much better as a parliament. We could have done much better as a committee in spite of the fact that we had to work on the kind of obstacles that were put in our way by the Bloc Quebecois. The government could have taken St. Paul’s advice and tried to overcome evil with good instead of wrong for wrong, arrogance for arrogance, mistake for mistake, contempt for contempt. That is all we got. It is regrettable, truly regrettable.

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Madam Speaker, this is one of the last minutes in which we can speak of this bill. The way things are going at present with the government, this may be one of the last times MPs will be able to speak in this House. Having three gag orders on one bill is absolutely incredible. That is how the present government operates.

I will savour these next 10 minutes, because I am not sure whether the government will allow me to speak on behalf of my party for the rest of the session. That is how things are going at this time.

Government Orders

I would like to make two or three brief comments. First of all, one to my caucus. From the start, four members had decided to support the bill, because everyone agrees that having clarity on the question and on what constitutes a majority might facilitate things.

I am addressing them. I hope that the hon. members are going to see that the way the government is handling this bill is preventing the elected representatives and citizens of this country from being able to really speak out and reflect on this matter. I trust that my colleagues are going to see what is going on.

In a referendum process, after a yes vote of 50% plus one, imagine how we are going to have our cage rattled, how much the few rights remaining to the opposition will be trampled. The way the Liberals are handling things now is not a very good sign for the future.

I trust that our party will be the same as the country on Bill C-20—united.

I heard what the Reform Party critic had to say. Not to be disrespectful of the Reform, but I had a picture in my head. I do not know if hon. members are familiar with the Simpsons, but when people want to make fun of Homer Simpson, they stick a sign on his back.

[English]

The signs says “kick me”. I think the Reform Party has a sign on its back which says “Please kick me. I will love you anyway”. That is the problem with the Reform Party. It is so afraid of losing one vote on this issue in western Canada that it is willing to have a sign on its back which says “Please kick me. I will love you anyway. I am going to support the bill anyway”.

[Translation]

There has been closure three times. The Reformers say they do not agree with the process, but support the bill nevertheless. It makes no sense. The official opposition is going around saying that the government is wrong “No, you should not do that, you Liberals, it is wrong, but we like you all the same and will support you in this”. Such principles are not exactly cast in stone.

There is my NDP colleague as well, who is in fine fettle today and who said “It makes no sense the way they are treating the first nations”. He is right, but his party will support the bill in any case.

The member for Mount Royal, the expert on the committee, said to the first nations “Your message has been clearly heard, we will see there are amendments to have your thoughts taken into account. No more, however. It will be like the provinces. We will look after everything, trust us”.

The member for Winnipeg—Transcona had his show, of course, but according to the member for Mount Royal, the government will
support the first nations amendment. But, what happens if the
government does not support the amendment? There will be
problems with the credibility of the member for Mount Royal, who,
in committee, seemed to be speaking for the government. But, in
addition to that, what is happening with the New Democratic
Party’s opposition?

What I would ask my colleagues in the Reform Party is to take
off the sign that says “kick me” and say it makes no sense.

I say to our NDP colleagues that we will be pleased to support
their first nations amendment. Our amendments were rejected for
the most part, in any case. We wanted clarity amendments. We
proposed clarity amendments and they were rejected in the process.

Do you know what amendments we moved? We proposed
inclusion of the words province of Quebec and National Assembly
in the bill. I base my remarks on what the Minister of Intergovern-
mental Affairs said when he spoke about Bill C-20. In his 16 page
testimony before the legislative committee, the minister did not
mention British Columbia, Prince Edward Island or Cape Breton.
He spoke only of Quebec throughout those 16 pages.

During his whole testimony, he said how evil the sovereignists
and the Progressive Conservatives of Quebec were. The govern-
ment says “This bill is about clarity”. We want to help it make
tings even clearer. The title of the bill refers to Quebec, the
preamble refers to Quebec and the minister, the Prime Minister and
witnesses spoke of Quebec but the bill itself does not mention
Quebec.

The word Quebec does not appear one single time in the text of
the bill. Why? Because they were too afraid. The sensitivities of
Quebecers could put the federal government at risk in the future.
As a principle, it is rather feeble.

What we hope is that all opposition parties will send a very clear
message: this bill is incomplete, it is a plan B bill, B as in baseball
bat.

[English]

One does not run a country with a baseball bat. That is not the
way this country should function. That is a big problem. These
stem from baseball bats or batons.

[Translation]

I believe there should be much more openness. Canadians should
be very concerned about the way this government is dealing with
this bill. The minister, in all his good will—let us give him
that—must be extremely disappointed that his bill had to go
through the parliamentary process. This bill has to be passed. Why?
So that the Prime Minister may say next weekend “We got it. Now,
here is the good news: thanks to the wonderful work of the Minister
of Intergovernmental Affairs, of Cabinet and of the Liberal Party
caucus and thanks to my political instinct, if you want to break the
country, you will need to ask a clear question and to obtain a clear
majority”.

It is a rather feeble excuse. They are happy, the country is saved.
But no. They are being told “Well, now you are going to separate”.
I remember one very interesting comment amongst all the relevant
comments we heard. There were some good witnesses, not enough,
however, because we did not have enough time, but some. This one
was from a witness from British Columbia. In passing, it was not a
Conservative, but a Liberal. He said that no matter what the
question was, for example the question used in 1995 or in 1980,
with a result of 50% plus one—You are now entering a new world.

He said “Whether there is any legislation or not, you are in a
new political, economic and legal world”.

The legislation can be improved as much as they want, what will
happen with a result of 50% plus one on a question like the one
used in 1995 and 1980, will be something new. It is certainly not
Bill C-20 that will solve everything, on the contrary. It prevents us
from finding solutions or alternatives. We are stuck with a table of
contents, a modus operandi. And they call that flexibility.

The ambiguity Mr. Clark was talking about is the same ambigu-
ity that we were faced with when Mr. Trudeau said, back in 1980
“If you vote no, it means yes”. Now that is ambiguity. As far as
flexibility is concerned, it remains to be seen.

I urge all the opposition parties and my colleagues in the
Conservative caucus to stand up and to stand united as we want the
country to be.

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Made-
leine—Pabok, BQ): Madam Speaker, you will appreciate that I
was anxious to take part in this debate. We are not pleased,
however, to have to speak to such an issue, to a bill on clarity
which, I must say, does not provide any.

Instead, the bill before us creates confusion. It is unreasonable
and undemocratic. It fails to respect the letter and the spirit of
the opinion provided by the supreme court at the request of the
Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

The Bloc Quebecois certainly moved many amendments, but
when the government wants to introduce a bill on clarity, it must be
clear.
Let me read an amendment that I moved and which is part of Group No. 1. We were asking, in Motion No. 2, that Bill C-20, in the preamble, be amended by adding, before line 1 on page 1, the following—and this is very important. You will understand later:

Whereas when the Quebec people were consulted by a referendum in 1995, the winning choice was the one that obtained a majority of the votes declared valid, that is, fifty percent of the votes plus one vote;

The people on the other side won last time. If they participated and are still here, it is because we are democrats and we respect the result of the votes. But they are scared of the results, perhaps because the results were tight that time.

What did the government promise to us before the referendum? That it would recognize the distinctiveness of Quebecers. That was in the speech delivered in Verdun. We have already gone further. What about this declaration? The Prime Minister wasted no time in pushing through this House a motion on distinct society.

You are the Chair. A motion is not as powerful as legislation. When they want to tell Quebecers that they love them, they use a motion. It is barely worth the paper it is written on. When they want to clobber Quebecers, they use legislation. I am not inventing this. We have a bill before us.

I would also like to add to the four adjectives I used earlier an explanation on how this bill is confusing. It has to do with the arbitrary criteria the minister is trying to include. He wants to reserve the right to decide whether the question is clear.

You have visited all of Canada and know that some expressions used in eastern Canada are meaningless in western or central Canada. For example, there is one we often use in Quebec when it rains. We say that it is raining nails, whereas in English they say that it is raining cats and dogs.

Maybe the image is too simple, but how can they ask some different provinces to determine the clarity of a question when we have our own way of expressing ourselves in Quebec, as can easily be seen from the ads in Quebec. Sometimes we use a colourful language, but everybody understands.

The last time, the Prime Minister understood, but now he is not quite sure. The day before the referendum he said “To remain Canadian or not, to stay or to leave, that is the issue of the referendum”. If even he could understand the question, it means that the question was clear. Why should we waste the time of the House in a debate like this? During this time, the economic issues in this country are being ignored. In the finance minister’s last budget, we do not find a single word about areas like mine which are hurting.

We are just back from a one week recess. People in Quebec and in the Gaspé peninsula do not need clarity. What they need is money to boost their economy. However, we never talk about that in the House. I would like the House to discuss reasonable initiatives, and give resources to people in our ridings.

This bill is unreasonable because it gives the federal government plenty of reasons to prevent any negotiation from taking place. Let us consider all the steps we have to go through. We have to consult the provinces and the first nations. I like the first nations, but let us not forget that what is at stake is the right of Quebecers to decide their own future.

When we joined confederation, there was no referendum. The fathers of confederation made that decision among themselves. However, the surprising thing is that, when more provinces joined the federation, we were never asked for our permission. We are nice chaps, we did not object in any way.

I know what I am talking about. I am come from the Gaspé peninsula, the eastern tip of Quebec. All the ships carrying settlers travelling to Upper Canada sailed in front of our homes, but today, they are highehanded with our economy and our future. People in my riding are fed up with such a government.

The bill is unreasonable because it also prevents Quebec from offering a partnership to Canada. They want us to look like the bad guys while they take away all the furniture including the kitchen sink. We want to be able to make the decisions concerning our future by ourselves, including the decision to say that we would have a brighter future outside of Canada. Every time we want to improve on things, we are gagged.

The bill is unreasonable also because it is contrary to the position of all political parties in Quebec. Even Jean Charest, the saviour, a former member of this House who was sent to Quebec, does not approve of Bill C-20. Quebec’s consensus should be taken into account.

The bill is undemocratic because it subordinates the democratic will of the Quebec people to the will of the rest of Canada. It is our future. Let us decide by ourselves what we want. The bill is undemocratic also because the federal government is appropriating the right to reject the vote of Quebecers. The bill will give more weight to a federalist vote than to a sovereigntist vote.

The bill does not respect the letter and spirit of the supreme court opinion. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has made up requirements that are not mentioned in that opinion.

The bill does not respect the letter and spirit of the supreme court opinion because the government chose what it liked in that opinion and threw away all other democratic considerations. What this bill
proposes is unilateral action when the supreme court condemned such a course of action.

In its opinion, the court insisted on the need to negotiate when the bill is geared to prevent any negotiation. I move:

That the French text of Motion No. 9 be amended by adding the word “un” after the word “donné”

As many members have said, after being gagged, censured and subjected to time allocation, as the member for Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, I will have had only 10 minutes to speak to a bill that could have an impact on the future of Quebec and of my fellow citizens. It is not normal that we were given only 10 minutes. If they want to claim to be great democrats, they should let people express themselves.

I understand that this is not the Chair’s fault. You are there to apply the rules, but I believe that, for the people opposite, democracy does not mean much. When I see the minister’s smile, I believe that he despises the people of my riding and of Quebec. When he returns to Quebec, he will have to answer for that smile.

I listened with great interest to the Reform Party and the member for Macleod. The one thing with which I agreed was his congratulations to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. The minister has done a tremendous job in this whole process and deserves our congratulations, respect and thanks. Not only is he a great Canadian but he is also a great Quebecker. It bodes well for us as we move confidently into the 21st century to have a person of his calibre leading very positively in the way he is along with the Prime Minister.

The Reform Party really flip-flopped on this issue. It is always disturbing to see how it never stands for Canada when it counts.

I listed too to the NDP and the member for Winnipeg—Transcona. He got a little outraged and put on a little theatre for us in the House. Really what he did was quite trite. I assume he knows his constitutional history but he certainly did not show it today. If he knew his constitutional history he would know that the aboriginal peoples are covered off in the constitution. They will be very much at the table when it comes to making these kinds of decisions not only for themselves and for whom and what they represent, but for Canada as a whole.

I say to him and all Canadians, that process is in place and in hand and we will do it in a manner consistent with the values—

Mr. Peter Stoffer: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member would understand the facts of what the member for Winnipeg—Transcona said—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): That is debate. That is not a point of order.

Mr. Lynn Myers: Madam Speaker, I will tell you what I am saying. It astonished me, and the member reminds me of what the leader of the NDP did when we first brought in the clarity bill. Outside she was quoted as saying that the bill was stupid and provocative. Those were exactly her words. I find it shameful that the NDP would take that kind of attitude on such an important bill, the clarity bill which underpins the very importance of not only who we are but what we represent.

I say to my hon. colleagues in the Progressive Conservative Party opposite, the party of Sir John A. Macdonald and Cartier, imagine how they would be spinning in their graves. Imagine how they are today listening to the Progressive Conservatives not standing up for Canada, not being on the right side of history, being on the wrong side of history, and their leader Joe Clark saying the kind of nonsense he has been saying with respect to this all important bill. It is shameful that the party of Sir John A. and the party of Cartier has come to that. It is absolutely disgraceful.

I had to give my head a shake to really understand what the Bloc member who spoke before me was trying to say. Imagine having to bring in an amendment to an amendment. Imagine threatening, as Bloc members have now done, a thousand amendments on three clauses. Imagine getting up day after day in the House of Commons, in this great place of democracy, and reading 300 press clippings and always caterwauling away. They say they represent the democrats when in fact it is quite the opposite. They are undemocratic. All they are trying to do is stall the business of the House, stall what Canadians want us to do which is to bring clarity to the debate once and for all.

But what do they do? They keep stalling. Even at the committee they went on for five hours to try to talk it out so that the business of the committee could not take place. Imagine the disgrace and the shame. Quebecers and Canadians wherever they live want no part of that kind of nonsense because it is ridiculous. It undermines the very Canada for which we stand.

I cannot believe that they—
The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has at least five minutes left to speak, but it is 2 o'clock and we will now proceed to Statements by Members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

COMMONWEALTH DAY

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I invite Canadians to celebrate Commonwealth Day, remembering our shared heritage and ready to work together to tackle the challenges that lie ahead.

This year’s theme, the communications challenge, is highly appropriate at the start of the new millennium. Recent advances in communications technology bring the challenge of ensuring that the advantages of modern communications are available to all and that they are used to bring us closer together.

Just a few months ago the Commonwealth held its heads of government meeting in a democratic South Africa. There leaders praised the role that the Commonwealth played in bringing an end to apartheid. Nigeria, fresh from its own elections, also expressed its gratitude for the Commonwealth’s efforts to restore democracy there.

Clearly the Commonwealth is making a positive contribution in the world today.

* * *

RELIGION

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last Thursday protesters vandalized the Mary Queen of the World Cathedral in Montreal. They were yelling against religion, spray painting and defacing the cathedral, and overturning the tabernacle and ripping up hymn books.

Seven people have been charged with unlawful assembly, assault against police officers and obstruction. Hate crime charges were not considered because “the elements were not there for charges of that kind”.

Anti-religious vandalism such as this cowardly act is a hate crime regardless of the religion, denomination or location, yet our justice system discriminates between religions. A National Post editorial notes:

What is missing is media and political outrage. Anti-Christian hostility is one of the last acceptable bigotries in Canada. It is observable not only in the bigots and thugs who attacked the cathedral, but in federal bureaucrats, for example, who instructed Swissair crash site mourners to make no mention of Jesus Christ.

We would never accept an attack on other religious groups. We should not remain silent when Catholics are the targets of intolerance. Where is the outrage?

* * *

DAN DOYLE

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on March 6 at 10.30 a.m., Dan Doyle of Woodstock, Ontario demonstrated great generosity and selflessness when he jumped between a car and a baby stroller, saving Brenda Craig and her 22 month old son, Barry. In the resulting collision, Dan Doyle suffered a fractured leg and rib while the mother and her child were unhurt.

Police and public alike are calling Mr. Doyle a hero. Mr. Doyle’s wife commented that his actions did not surprise her as he is always watching out for other people and lending a hand whenever possible.

We are not often faced with life-threatening situations. It is heartening to know that there are some citizens who are not afraid to put themselves in harm’s way to save the life of another.

I am proud to acknowledge the heroism of Dan Doyle. Thank you, Dan, for your heroic example.

* * *

SENIORS

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Kitchener—Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Alliance of Seniors to Protect Canada’s Social Programs represents 25 organizations with a combined membership of over 500,000 seniors.

The alliance has declared Toronto the most diverse city in the world. It has noted that seniors reflect this diversity racially, ethnically and culturally. Many seniors who are immigrants are socially isolated due to limited language skills, cultural inhibitions and discrimination. This makes accessibility to social programs and services more difficult particularly in the areas of health, community care access, housing and education.

The Government of Canada and the Alliance of Seniors to Protect Canada’s Social Programs recognize the importance of funding for health care, the specific needs of seniors, and the special linguistic and cultural requirements of minority communities.

We are committed to working with seniors toward programs and services consistent with cultural backgrounds and needs of our diverse and aging population. Together we will maintain and enhance Canada’s social programs in keeping with Canada’s reputation as the best country in the world in which to live.
[Translation]

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, RSW-Béroma of Val-d’Or will operate the first small scale mine in the Abitibi, with a modular plant for ore concentration.

The unique features of this concept, compared to a conventional plant, are its investment costs, its quick installation and its mobility.

This initiative was made possible thanks to the leadership of Laurent Bérubé and his team at the Val-d’Or plant, Charles Veilleux, Gilbert Rousseau and Roger Jolicoeur, and the involvement of the National Research Council of Canada and of the Secretary of State for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec and Liberal member for Outremont, through his IDEA-SME program.

The project is located at the Granada gold deposit, northwest of Val-d’Or, in the Abitibi.

* * *

TARA SLOAN

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respect to Tara Sloan, one of Canada’s top swimmers. Ms. Sloan passed on two days ago in Calgary after being involved in a tragic car accident.

Tara was a five time Canadian breaststroke champion and set the women’s 100 metre breaststroke national record in the short course pool. She was a great competitor with a passion for life who proudly represented her country at the world championships, the Pan American Games and the Commonwealth Games. She won 17 international medals.

At the national championships this weekend her Calgary teammates dedicated their events to Tara. Her teammates won. They won the men’s and women’s overall team titles.

Today our sympathy and the thoughts and prayers of this House join with those of the family, friends, teammates and competitors of this wonderful young Canadian, Ms. Tara Sloan.

* * *

FIGHT AGAINST RACISM

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the launching of the week against racism is taking place today, at the Cinémathèque québécoise. This year’s theme is about the faces of racism in Quebec.

We must lead the fight against racism on an individual and collective level.

We must always appreciate the opportunity that we have to share our values of support and solidarity with cultural communities.

As individuals, we have a responsibility to apply these values in our daily lives, so that those who settle in Canada feel at home here.

However, the fight against racism is far from over. We must eliminate the resistance that still exists, to ensure that all new Canadians have access to a certain quality of life.

I call on all governments and organizations to work together to ensure the best possible future for those who decide to come to live in Canada.

* * *

BILL C-20

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Chairman, for the past few days, the government House leader has been suffering from proceduritis, and has been trying to change the rules of Parliament through trickery.

Not content to have limited the debates on Bill C-20 in committee, and not content to have rammed Bill C-20 through, the specialist in dirty tricks and double-dealing has added insult to injury with Motions Nos. 8 and 9, in order to change the rules of the game in the midst of the debate.

How shameful, particularly for the Liberal members, who do not want to voice their opinions on Bill C-20. We can understand that the sole intent of the latest trick of the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons was to allow his colleagues to avoid their duty as parliamentarians.

When the voting on Bill C-20 takes place, the people of Quebec will finally know who is prepared to stand up to defend its rights and who is prepared to stand up to defend democracy.

* * *

FARM SAFETY

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with National Farm Safety Week about to end, let us resolve to reduce farm related injuries throughout the year.

Farming is a way of life for over 200,000 farm families from coast to coast to coast. It is also a profession with one of the highest risks of on the job injury and death. Close to 700 Canadians died of farm related injuries between 1990 and 1996. Most of these could have been prevented. Working with tractors and other self-pro-
pelled equipment remains the leading cause of death and injury
with rollovers and runovers a serious concern.

Agriculture Canada and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture
along with other farm safety groups are urging farmers to equip
their tractors with rollover protection structures and seatbelts. That
is what National Farm Safety Week is all about, getting farmers and
their families thinking about how they can protect themselves from
what are often needless injuries on their farms.

* * *

**CURLING**

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of British Columbia I would like to declare that B.C. now stands for “Best Curlers”.

Yesterday skip Greg McAulay of New Westminster completed the trillium of champions by capturing his first Brier championship against the formidable Russ Howard.

British Columbia will be representing Canada at the World Curling Championships in three categories: men’s, featuring Greg McAulay’s rink of Brent Pierce, Brian Miki, Jody Svestrup and Darin Fenton; women’s, featuring Richmond’s Kelley Law’s rink of Julie Skinner, Georgina Wheatcroft, Diane Nelson and Elaine Dagg-Jackson; and junior men’s, featuring Kelowna’s Brad Kuhn’s team of Kevin Folk, Ryan Kuhn and Hugh Bennett.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the people of Saskatoon who organized and supported the Year 2000 Brier, setting a new attendance record.

Curling has long been one of Canada’s favourite sports and now British Columbia leads the way. Congratulations and good luck to all at the world championships.

* * *

**CHIEF JOE MATHIAS**

Mr. Lou Sekora (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Chief Joe Mathias passed away unexpectedly on Friday, March 10. He was a strong advocate and defender of the treaty process.

I knew Chief Mathias personally. He was a man greatly respected by his people, myself and many other people. Our blessings are with him and his family.

* * *

**OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE**

Mr. Dennis Gruending (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the recent federal budget comes as a major

disappointment to Canadians who care about the poorest of the poor in our world.

The Prime Minister talks big when he travels abroad but under his watch, Canadian overseas development assistance has fallen off dramatically. Canada’s target was to provide .7 of 1% of the gross national product to foreign assistance. Under this government we have slipped back to about one-third of that target and the budget does not improve things.

The Canadian Council for International Cooperation tells us that we will be spending a smaller and smaller percentage of GNP on foreign assistance through to the year 2003.

The development needs are enormous in the areas of food, nutrition and agriculture, for basic education and health care, especially for women.

In the budget the government has lost an opportunity to do something really constructive for the poor and the vulnerable in other countries. Canadians are a generous people but the government has not matched their generosity.

* * *

[Translation]

**THE LATE MARCEL PÉPIN**

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on March 6, we lost Marcel Pépin.

Marcel Pépin left his mark on Quebec and on his era, first as President of the CSN from 1965 to 1976, and then of the World Confederation of Labour. After studying under Father Lévesque at Laval University, he went on to contribute greatly to making the CSN, a labour federation that was as combative as it was democratic, the spearhead of the Quiet Revolution.

The “society built for man” which he sought could only come about as the result of a fight to the finish between the workers and all those with power. The union movement needed to unite and open up a second social front in order to constitute a counter-balance to prevent workers from being crushed, dominated and deprived of their voice.

His texts and moral reviews, containing such sayings as “There is no more place for Quebec in the present system” or “Our own means are all we can count on” have marked Quebec in general, but have had far more impact on the public sector coalition, which would never have existed without him. With his great experience as a negotiator, Marcel Pépin had the knack of obtaining the best settlements, always in favour of the little people above all.

Thank you, Marcel Pépin.
JOB CREATION IN CANADA

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on March 9, Statistics Canada released encouraging news about Canada’s employment situation.

Based on its labour force survey, Statistics Canada determined that the unemployment rate was at 6.8% in February 1999, the lowest rate since April 1976.

Moreover, in February, 36,000 new jobs were created, thus continuing a pattern that began three years ago.

Finally, 1.9 million jobs were created since we came to office, in 1993.

In short, all Canadians are benefiting from economic conditions that promote job creation. These conditions were largely created by our Liberal government.

* * *

REFUGEES

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC): Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a refugee camp in the northern part of Kenya. The camp has over 120,000 refugees, mostly Somalians, displaced for over nine years, living in conditions we could not even dream of.

I have to commend the people working in these camps, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and all the NGOs, such as Médecins sans frontières, the World Food Organization and all the dedicated church groups.

I want to thank the Canadian High Commissioner in Nairobi and all of his staff for setting up the details for this very important visit. I want to thank our immigration officers and staff in Kenya and London for letting our group sit in during interviews which included the minister of immigration and the member for Mississauga West.

Last but not least, I want to thank the minister’s staff for setting up this on the ground experience of looking at how we determine refugees, immigrants and visitor visas.

* * *

JUNO AWARDS

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Ahuntsic, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last night we all celebrated with Canada's best at the 29th annual Juno Awards in Toronto. The quality and diversity of Canadian artists nominated at these awards reflects the excellence of our country's musical creators and performers. The awards they won are a prestigious national recognition of their talent.

[Translation]

Congratulations to Bryan Adams and Chantal Kreviazuk, for winning best male and female artists of the year.

[English]

Let me congratulate Paul Brandt for winning best country male artist and Shania Twain for best songwriter. Let me also congratulate SKY for winning best new group and Sarah McLachlan for winning the international achievement award.

* (1415)

[Translation]

I also want to congratulate Diana Krall—she is my favourite—for winning best vocal jazz album, the Quebec group La Chicane, for winning best-selling francophone album, and all the other Juno winners. We cannot name them all today, because we do not have time.

[English]

Canada can be proud of its musical talent and of the recognition it receives from both Canadian and international audiences.

* * *

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in August the human resources department prepared a communication strategy for the minister. The aim was to manage the release of an internal audit that pointed to gross mismanagement of taxpayer dollars by the minister. The document suggested three options for releasing and communicating the results of that audit: a reactive approach, a low key approach, and a proactive approach. Each came with suggested advantages and disadvantages.

Why did the minister choose the reactive approach as outlined in that communication strategy?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear that the communications plan was a draft. It was prepared before the audit was even complete. It is usual for departments, particularly communications officials, to prepare this kind of information. It was not forwarded to me, nor would I have expected it to have been.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. We have a copy finally of this communications brief. It outlines three distinct approaches, going from the most transparent, the proactive approach, to the least transparent,
the reactive approach. The reactive strategy suggests carrying on business as usual and not releasing the results of the audit until forced to do so by an access to information request.

We are talking about an audit dealing with gross mismanagement of taxpayer dollars. Why did the minister choose the least transparent strategy for handling that internal audit?

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again let me say that this was a draft report.

If the hon. member wants to talk about fact, let us look at what we did. It was this side of the House, it was me, as minister, who made this report public. Quite frankly, it had nothing to do with an access to information request by that party.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, let us go over it again. The minister had an internal audit on her desk revealing gross mismanagement of taxpayer dollars. Her departmental spin doctors presented her with three options for releasing the information to the public. The words "demonstrates transparency" were only used in connection with one approach, the proactive approach. The approach the minister chose was described as simply "demonstrating business as usual".

Again, how can the minister claim she is being transparent when she rejected the one communications approach her own departmental people said—

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Human Resources Development.

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we came clean with the Canadian public. We made the internal audit public. We presented to the House 10,000 pages of projects. I wonder when members of that party will come clean with the Canadian public and say that they were wrong when they said $3 billion was missing, that they were wrong when they said $1 billion was missing, that they were wrong when they said it was an access to information request—

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, let me just tell the minister that we are getting close with all of these investigations going on. It will be surprising how much money they actually do come up with.

I would have thought that with a week away from the House she could have come up with a better strategy than that.

In August her officials had a plan to release the internal audit. They chose three strategies: a transparent one, a semi-transparent one and a hide and seek version. The so-called reactive strategy involved the department carrying on business as usual until it got caught.

Why did the minister choose a “let us not get caught” strategy?

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know where that party has been, but it is me and my department that made this internal audit public. It is my department that chose to implement a six point plan that is now making a difference.

From the point of view of the work of the Human Resources Development Department, we are taking this very seriously. We have said that over and over again and I, quite frankly, do not know where these questions are coming from.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I will tell you where this party has been. We have been filing access to information requests because this minister was not forthcoming.

Let me also add that the minister continues to say that she came forward with her little six point plan and everything was going to be all right. The only reason she made this plan public was because she knew she had been caught in the act.

Was the minister gambling that this little plan would be uncovered before the next election?

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me repeat for the umpteenth time that it was an access to information request that made this report public. It is very clear from letters between myself and my deputy that I took this very seriously. It is clear that the approach which we have taken is one of transparency and openness.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, HRDC it will be recalled appointed Mr. Champagne, the lawyer of Claude Gauthier, to be trustee of the $1.2 million grant to be paid to the same Claude Gauthier once the Placeteco purchase had been completed. In the light of these facts, the minister said job creation was important.

Accordingly, how can the Minister of Human Resources Development justify the fact that her department's grant to Placeteco was in fact used by its new owner, Claude Gauthier, to pay off a million dollar loan the company had with the National Bank?

[English]

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me repeat for the umpteth time that
in these transitional jobs fund grants we are but one partner. Over and over again it was the Government of Quebec that also accepted and supported these programs.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Human Resources Development Canada and the Government of Canada are administering and managing the funds. A trust was set up, contrary to the opinion of Treasury Board. The lawyer, Claude Gauthier, acted for the company and for the trust, which seems normal to the minister. He is a friend of the Prime Minister and this must be why. It is also contrary to Treasury Board directives. Using $1 million to not create jobs is irregular and abnormal.

Could the minister tell us if the reason is not because there was pressure from the Prime Minister’s office to help his friends and pay back the National Bank with the money that was supposed to be used to create jobs?

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to continue with the Placeteco affair. When Placeteco had placed itself under the protection of the bankruptcy protection act, Mr. Gauthier purchased the company for one dollar, with a commitment to invest $200,000 in it. Now that we know where the first $1 million went, we are still trying to find out about the other $200,000.

Can the minister tell us whether her department really knows what this $200,000 was used for?

This partnership, which has been agreed to by the local community with the Government of Quebec and with the federal government, is creating jobs for people in a region of high unemployment.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am not all that surprised at the minister’s response. What became of the $200,000 is still not known. Giving that kind of answers seems to be the only thing she knows how to do.

Will the government finally initiate a public and independent inquiry into all of her department’s activities, or will she launch a fourth RCMP investigation in the Prime Minister’s riding?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as part of our undertakings we have implemented a plan that will make a difference.

I want to remind the hon. member that the auditor general will be completing a full review of grants and contributions in the Department of Human Resources Development Canada. As an arm’s length agent of this body, I am sure the hon. member would appreciate that he is the one who can best review and advise in this regard.

* * *

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Federal neglect and the NAFTA mean that Alberta’s retreat into two tier Americanized, privatized health care may soon be forced on all Canadians. Why will the current health minister not stand to be counted, as some previous health ministers are doing? Why will the current health minister not just oppose Alberta’s health privatization law clearly and unequivocally? What is he waiting for?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, we are looking at the legislation—and, indeed, I would like to see the regulations as well—to determine whether it complies with the Canada Health Act.

I was in Alberta last week and took the opportunity to say to Albertans and all Canadians that we do not believe private, for profit hospitals is the way to go. They are no less costly, they have longer waiting lists and there are issues of quality.

We have urged the Alberta government to reconsider. Private, for profit is not the answer to problems facing medicare.
Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is unbelievable. Rome is burning, health is in crisis, and the minister continues to fiddle.

Canadians do not want a two tier health system. Nor do they want Americans to play doctor with their health. That is clear.

Is the minister going to follow the advice of his predecessors? Is he going to clearly oppose privatization in Alberta?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I find puzzling is why the New Democratic Party will not join with us in the work we are doing to renew medicare within the principles of the Canada Health Act.

What the NDP governments of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and B.C. and the federal NDP are doing instead are playing into the hands of the Reform Party, those on the right who do not want the Canada Health Act.

The real enemies of medicare are over there on the right in the Reform Party. If they think those people are bad, wait until they hear the views of Stockwell Day on the subject.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, for months questions concerning the unprecedented mismanagement of millions of taxpayer dollars have gone unanswered in the House. The minister and Prime Minister have taken pains to minimize the enormous case of fiscal irresponsibility.

Almost daily now we have been advised of more RCMP investigations. We know of at least 19 grants now currently under investigation, three in the Prime Minister’s riding, and one where charges have been laid.

Will the minister now restore some faith in her department by disclosing the full number of grants which she is aware of that are under investigation, active, completed or pending?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have been as transparent as is appropriate to the House with regard to this particular issue.

The hon. member knows that these issues are before the police and therefore the question should be addressed to the police.
Why did she stick to the strategy of hiding the audit as long as she could?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I reject everything that the hon. member has said. Her thesis is completely wrong.

I had the pleasure of going to Calgary last week and visiting some very important projects which received grants and contributions in the member’s own backyard: programs to get young prostitutes off the street, programs to help young people who have not had the chance to get a full time job to get a job.

Perhaps since the hon. member will not go to visit those programs she would come to my riding. She would understand then why Mr. Marshall of Duchess Foods said: “I believe the attack of the Reform Party is strictly based on political considerations and not—”

The Speaker: The hon. member for Québec.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Claude Gauthier, the owner of Placeteco, told an official he did not need to account to Human Resources Development Canada on what he did with the $1.2 million grant.

What measures has the minister taken to get Claude Gauthier to account not to the National Bank, not to lawyer Champagne, not to the office of the Prime Minister, but to the Department of Human Resources Development?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have reviewed these projects on a number of occasions in the House.

I reiterate that these projects have created employment for people in areas of high unemployment. I reiterate that the Government of Canada is but one partner in these projects and that it was strongly supported by its kissing cousins in the Government of Quebec.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, under Treasury Board rules, once Placeteco came under the protection of the Bankruptcy Act, the $1.2 million grant should have been returned to Human Resources Development Canada, and not put in trust.

How does the minister justify the grant to Claude Gauthier being considered an inheritance rightly going to the new owner, who bought Placeteco for a dollar?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, speaking of stories, the hon. member ought to get his story straight because he is totally wrong in what he is asserting.

The Prime Minister was talking about 37 cases that had been referred for further inquiry. These arose out of the 459 in the initial audit. He was talking about the information he had at that time when he spoke about money that needed to be recovered. He was totally correct when he spoke of $259, based on the reviews that had been carried out, until that point, of the 37 cases.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, a while ago the Prime Minister said this whole affair was about $251.50. “No big deal” he said.

Now this rot has spread to ACOA, Indian affairs and CIDA. Today there are 19 separate police investigations, three in the Prime Minister’s riding alone, all over a missing $251.50.

That is the government’s story. Is it sticking to it?

Hon. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, rumour has it that the Prime Minister recently got a parrot. The only thing it can say so far is “Open up, it is the police”.

There are now 19—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Monte Solberg: Mr. Speaker, there are now 19 police investigations, three in the Prime Minister’s riding. The minister says she wants to be transparent. Here is her chance. My question for the minister is: How many police investigations are under way, how many have already taken place and how many are pending?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Department of Human Resources Development Canada, I have been forthcoming with this House. Other than the press release that was issued by my department last Monday, things are as they have been.


[Translation]

**CINAR**

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we learned that, following the payment of royalties of close to $1 million to Érika Alexandre, a fictitious name, a repayment agreement was signed by CINAR and the Société des auteurs et compositeurs dramatiques. Quebec authors are not pleased with this agreement, far from it. Now, the revenue minister recently suggested that CINAR might be able to avail itself of the voluntary disclosure program.

Will the Minister of National Revenue, who is surely aware of the sanctity of copyright and will therefore want to prevent this whole matter from being discreetly stifled, pledge to ensure that CINAR cannot avail itself of the voluntary disclosure program?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago, when I was asked about this issue, I said that when we are referring to a specific case, namely CINAR, we must respect the fundamental principle of Canadian taxation. The file at Revenue Canada—and this is important for all taxpayers—is a confidential file.

As for the issue of voluntary disclosure, there is indeed a voluntary disclosure program at Revenue Canada. As suggested by its title, disclosure must be voluntary. I invite opposition members to contact the department for more information on what is a voluntary disclosure program. They will find out.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Revenue seems to be hit by the same virus as his seatmate, the Minister of Human Resources Development. He is hiding behind the argument of confidentiality so as not to answer the questions from the opposition.

I will therefore direct my supplementary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage. Given the scope of incriminating facts that keep accumulating in the CINAR affair, what is the minister waiting for to order a public, independent inquiry?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the very first day that allegations were made, I went straight to the RCMP. They are conducting the investigation.

* * *

[English]

**HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, under access to information we received an extensive communications plan developed by HRDC to handle the release of the internal audit on the billion dollar boondoggle. It includes strategic considerations, story lines, media strategies and timelines. It was dated August 30, 1999.

After a week off to consider the facts, why is the minister still spinning the same story?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, because our story is the truth.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the department-wide action plan in August dealt with the controlled release of the internal audit if an access to information request was received. Communication plans talked about release strategies and the need to equip the minister with questions and answers, question period cards and media lines.

Does the minister honestly expect us to believe that she only learned about this audit on November 17, as she stated in the House?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us review the facts again. This was a draft communications plan. It is normal for the communications officials in a department to prepare communication strategies.

This was being prepared and the audit was not even completed. It was not forwarded to me and, as I have said earlier, I would not have expected it to be.

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on March 3, the Minister of Human Resources Development received the report she had commissioned from a Toronto firm in the matter of the redirecting of a grant from the riding of Rosemont to the riding of the Prime Minister.

How can the minister, who boasts of her clarity in this matter, continue to refuse to make public this investigation, which was paid for by the public and out of the public purse?

* (1440)

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member makes reference to the Rosemont files. As he knows, on Monday last the department issued a press release saying that this had been referred to the RCMP. As such, the questions would be presented to them.

* * *

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.
Oral Questions

The floods in Mozambique have taken their horrific toll in recent weeks and now we have reports that heavy rains and mudslides have displaced land mines in what is already one of the most heavily land mined countries in the world.

What is Canada doing about this threat to the lives of so many distressed people?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore for raising this very crucial issue in the House.

It is absolutely true that added to the enormous suffering which the people of Mozambique have experienced is the new danger caused by the dislodgement of thousands of land mines which had previously been demarcated or carefully mapped. What we now face is an urgent request from the Mozambique Mine Action Centre for help.

I am pleased to announce today, with the co-operation of the Minister of National Defence and the Minister for International Cooperation, that we are the first country to respond by adding half a million dollars to the already $12 million we put into mine action programs in Mozambique.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I quote from a letter from the deputy minister of human resources which says “Since June, when the interim audit report became available, we have devoted intensive and sustained management attention to this file”.

The minister claims that she was completely ignorant about the interim audit, but we have to wonder what she thought everyone in her department was actually doing during this period of “intensive and sustained management attention”. Perhaps there was an extended fire drill. Or, how about a 911 exercise? Maybe there was a crisis management therapy session.

Either the minister did not have a clue what was going on in her department or she has not been telling Canadians the whole story. Which is it?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I received the results of the internal audit, without question I took them seriously. I advised the department to strengthen its management report and when the whole audit was completed we made it public.

The six point plan that we are now implementing, which has had the benefit of advice from the auditor general, from outside third parties, is being implemented. I have had the pleasure of going to talk with departmental officials in Calgary and Toronto and in other parts of the country and they are doing their job.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, they may be doing their job, but it is the minister we are asking about.

The communications plan and the strategy were ready to go in August, but the minister waited until January to release the information on the audit and only after she received an access to information request. We have been giving the minister the benefit of the doubt. We thought she was simply not up to the job, but now we see something even worse. It appears she followed a plan down to a T, which was to hunker down, batten down the hatches and hope that no one asked about the audit until it was old news.

Why did she try to hide the fact that she mismanaged $1 billion in her department?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member cared to pay attention he would know that even the data collection for the audit was not completed until the early part of the fall. He would understand in the course of an internal audit that once the data is collected the management team has to prepare the response. He would understand that as minister, when I received this information, I took it seriously and I said that the management response was not strong enough. It was strengthened and when the whole report was completed we chose to make it public.

* * *

HEALTH CARE

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is now day 10 since Ralph Klein launched the most concerted and comprehensive attack on medicare in the history of this country and the health minister says he is still studying it. He says that they do not know what they are going to do at this point.

One thing we do know is that this government paved the way for privatization by signing a secret 12 point deal with Alberta in 1996, and went so far as to fire a former health minister for trying to stop the deal.

The minister says he does not know what to do, but today he can start by rescinding the deal and saying no to Ralph Klein. Will he do that?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know exactly what to do. It is to work with other governments to renew Medicare. That is exactly what we are doing with the NDP governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia. We are working constructively to do things that will help. We do not believe that private for profit hospitals are going to help. The
experience so far is that they have longer waiting lists and higher costs and there are real questions about quality.

I would like to know why will the NDP not join in the effort to renew medicare instead of aligning itself with those who would destroy it?

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, first of all it is unbelievable that the government after 10 days is in no position yet to say no to Ralph Klein and the destruction of medicare. It is unbelievable that he pretends that a deal his government signed in 1996 does not exist when in fact section 11 of that deal is the forerunner to Bill 11 now before the Alberta legislature.

If the government is serious about doing something about medicare, it would rescind its own deal and say absolutely no to Ralph Klein. Will the minister do it?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is unalloyed nonsense. There is no deal between governments. There are principles that the Alberta government proclaimed. They will not stand in the way of the enforcement of the Canada Health Act.

The real issue is why is the NDP the defender of the status quo? We want to work to renew medicare. It thinks that simply pouring billions into the old system will work. It will not. Why does it not join with us toward constructive change?

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, the slow learners come from that side of the House. Only $500 million has found its way to farmers’ pockets. The crop has to go in this spring.

Of the $500 million that has been distributed, $35 million went to administer the program. Can the minister tell me why bureaucrats and bean counters can get their money that quickly but not our farmers?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, farmers could have applied for an interim application on their 1999 business year as far back as September, last fall. Only about 500 or 600 of the farmers chose to do that. The rest of them obviously have chosen to wait until they finish their business year, their book work and paperwork as a result of the 1999 business year and submit that. I can assure the hon. member that as soon as they do submit those, we will deal with those forms very quickly.

* * *

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in this year’s budget the Government of Canada committed a further $2.5 billion of health care transfers to the provinces. However some of the provincial premiers have suggested that the government is not doing its fair share.

Can the Minister of Health confirm to the House and to all Canadians the actual level of financial support provided to our health care system?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the last four budgets transfers to the provinces for health have increased. The result is that overall transfers are higher today than ever. Of the $60 billion spent every year on health by governments in this country, $20 billion is spent by the Government of Canada either directly or through the transfers to the provinces. Some $20 billion of $60 billion is from Ottawa.

The truth is that of all public health spending in Canada this year, fully one-third is contributed by the Government of Canada.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we have learned that a sock company in Quebec received $8.1 million under the transitional jobs fund in 1997. This is more than what the entire province of Manitoba received, yet the Minister of Human Resources Development stands up in the House and says the program was about creating jobs in a fair manner.

When will the minister stop socking it to the Canadian taxpayers and step down?
Oral Questions

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me again give the hon. member the real facts. Indeed with Bas Iris the original plan was to be worth $8.1 million but because of production losses the moneys that were transferred were $5.9 million. In fact 1,400 jobs were created, not only 1,400 jobs but an additional 40 jobs. This has been an important industrial, economic and social advantage to the area.

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Public Works Canada agreed to transfer a building to Inter-Loge, a community group working in the field of social housing in my riding.

The department was to completely clean up the site and is now demanding that Inter-Loge finish the task at its own expense, which it cannot afford to do. So now, the department is threatening to take back the building and cause the group to lose its deposit of $62,000.

I would ask the Minister of Public Works to tell us what is happening in this matter and whether he has taken steps to protect Inter-Loge from losing its deposit.

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would begin by telling the leader of the Bloc that there is no question of Inter-Loge’s losing its deposit. If the agreement, which has already expired, cannot be renewed, negotiations will continue. Of course, the group will get its deposit.

In the meantime, I have asked my officials to continue negotiations, see if an agreement can be reached and come up with a solution to this problem. The problem is complex because the environmental impact is bigger than we first thought. So the situation needs to be reassessed, but already good—

The Speaker: The member for Acadie—Bathurst.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the price of gasoline is at a ten-year high, and this is bad for Canada’s truckers and for Canadians in general. On Friday, the Minister of Labour asked her colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, to do away with the federal tax on fuel.

Is the Minister of Natural Resources going to heed his colleague and all of the people of Canada and show some leadership in connection with the oil crisis?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the issue of gasoline pricing, obviously any issue related to taxation would need to be referred to the Minister of Finance.

I think it would be important for the petroleum industry to take note of the level of public concern and to be very transparent in its pricing practices including the price of crude oil, the price for refining, processing, wholesaling, retailing and taxes. I think the public is entitled to know when those prices change, exactly by how much and why.

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is not for the RCMP but for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

In 1995, there was an agreement between Alcan, its labour unions, and the provincial and federal governments. In recent months, the federal government has decided to withdraw from the program, while we are well aware that hundreds of jobs have been created and the government is getting its money back in taxes.

I am asking the minister why, since this is a worthwhile investment, she has pulled out of the partnership program with Alcan and its unionized workers.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will take the hon. member’s question under advisement and apprise him of a response.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, twice today the human resources minister told this House that she made the audit public when it was completed. How does this square with the facts?

The interim audit was available in June. The Liberals breathed not a word of its explosive contents. The audit was formally signed off in October. She asked the PCs to destroy that evidence. The minister was briefed in November. She kept telling the House all was well. We asked for the audit in January and finally she becomes transparent. How can she stand and tell Canadians—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Human Resources Development.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again I must categorically reject the assertions of the hon. member. Perhaps if instead of reading interim draft reports members would read the final report, they would see that we have taken this audit seriously. They would see that we
have a plan of action that is working. We are training our
employees. We have got a national auditing structure that is going
office by office and monitoring reports—

(1455)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Davenport.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, from a
recent publication by the Department of Natural Resources we
learn that the fossil fuel industry’s greenhouse gas emissions are
increasing dramatically and will have grown by 64% by the year
2010.

Can the Minister of Natural Resources inform the House when
Canada’s national strategy will be ready and what he intends to do
about the fossil fuel industry’s skyrocketing emissions?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and
Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr.
Speaker, federal, provincial and territorial ministers of energy and
the environment will begin meetings later this month. They will
continue with meetings later this year on a national imple-
mentation strategy with respect to climate change.

We hope by the end of this year to have made very real progress
in getting that strategy into place. What it might include could be
greater measures for energy efficiency, energy conservation, ener-
gy diversification, more alternative and renewable fuels, co-gener-
ation, district energy systems and cleaner industrial processes.
Underlying all of that is new technology. Our budget most recently
put $600 million into that very important effort.

* * *

[Translation]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my
question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Last week, the Prime Minister was in his riding. Since then,
everyone claims that he is as pure as the driven snow, even though
the RCMP is conducting at least three investigations in his riding.

Out of solidarity with the Prime Minister, who seems to be in
deep trouble with this scandal, should the minister not immediately
order an independent public inquiry to protect him from his
political buddies in his riding?

[Translation]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi, PC): Mr. Speaker, I can
understand why the minister would want to pause for a moment
before answering me. Does she realize that she said no to a project
that was profitable to the government, which was recovering its
investment through the creation of tens of jobs?

Does the minister agree with the principle of work sharing in
plants throughout the country, particularly in outlying regions?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Develop-
ment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again as I said earlier, I will look into
this project and provide an undertaking to the member.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speak-
er, I think the human resources minister should have one more
opportunity to explain why an audit which her department had a
whole plan to release at the end of August in fact was not released
until after an opposition access request in January. How does that
square with her claim of transparency? I invite the minister to
explain that.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Develop-
ment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say again
to the hon. member that there was no access to information that
forced us to make the audit public.
Privilege

I want to say that I have resented personally the accusations that the member has made against me, calling me a liar outside of the House, because she is wrong.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

The Speaker: I have notice of a question of privilege from the hon. member for Surrey North. I read what he sent to me today. I know he was busy this morning, but I rendered a decision on a similar case. Did he have occasion to hear what the decision was that I gave this morning?

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.): Yes, I did, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Are you still going to raise a question of privilege?

Mr. Chuck Cadman: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As you know, I provided you with notice on March 3 of this question of privilege. While my notice detailed much of the concern, I believe that it is only appropriate that I outline the issue in the House so that all members will be aware of the present situation, as we are all equally affected by these recent events.

I believe this question of privilege is related to one similar, which was heard by the Speaker in October 1997. I say related because the breach of my privileges as a member of parliament has also arisen over the functions of our legislative drafters.

In 1997 you ruled that the matter be resolved by the Board of Internal Economy. My issue does not concern the administrative matters, such as the number of legislative drafters available to assist us in our work, and it does not concern just who is assigned to assist us in drafting legislation. My question of privilege has solely to do with solicitor-client privilege and breach of confidentiality.

First, I will relate the facts of the case. Over the past number of weeks I have been dealing with our legislative drafters on a number of amendments to legislation presently before the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. The drafting of legislation is one of the most important aspects of this place. It is imperative that confidentiality of information be maintained until each member decides to make his or her work public by introducing it either in committee or here at report stage.

Mr. Speaker, you can imagine my surprise and outrage when I learned from the clerk of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights that he was in possession of my amendments before I had even decided which of them I would be introducing at committee.

I was informed that it has now been decided that solicitor-client privilege does not attach itself to work completed by our legislative drafters and that the material will be made available to the clerks.

I do not know who else will have access to this work. I do know that the clerk did seek my permission to release my proposed amendments to the Department of Justice lawyers. I denied him the permission to release them to anyone.

Let me make it clear that I do not call into question the integrity of the clerk of the committee, but if he was able to gain possession of my amendments, who else has them?

It was my understanding that members of parliament are operating with our legislative drafters in a solicitor-client relationship. These drafters are lawyers who have been tasked by the House as a whole to assist members in their legislative initiatives.

It is a competitive market in this place for political reasons, for representing our constituents and for ensuring that our laws effectively achieve what we as individuals perceive to be in the best interests of the country.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, how concerned members from all political stripes became in October 1997 when the issue was raised over the lack of sufficient and proper resources to provide members with adequate legislative assistance. As I have stated, my concern today is not an administrative function. It goes to the essence of the relationship between our lawyers and ourselves to fulfill our duties as members of parliament. These lawyers work for us both on private members’ legislation and on amendments to government and Senate legislation. Without protection of confidentiality, our parliamentary work is severely impacted. We become disempowered from carrying out our duties.

This work was released to others without my consent, which I believe is necessary under the law. Legislative counsel come under the precinct of the Speaker of the House of Commons. It is my understanding that they have been ordered to release this information contrary to the protection of the solicitor-client privilege.

To sum up, I believe that the release of confidential work in progress to the clerk of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights without my consent is a prima facie case of privilege. It has happened in my case and may well be happening or could happen to almost anyone in this place. It must be addressed. Should you find that a prima facie case of privilege exists, Mr. Speaker, and with your permission, I would be prepared to move the appropriate motion.

The Speaker: If I understand the hon. member correctly, what he is saying is that there has been a breach of confidentiality because the clerk of the committee had the information.
I invite the hon. member to review my ruling of this morning. With all due respect, I would suggest to him that the clerk of the committee is a member of the team that has to work together so that members can be served.

If the hon. member is saying that someone other than a person on the team that I described this morning has access to the information, I would like to know about it. But the team itself, the drafters, the lawyers, the people who put it into the information system, they are all part of that group. As for anyone outside that group, if the hon. member is alleging that someone else had that information, then I would like to hear more about it.

I would like to let this matter sit at this point, unless someone has something to offer which is in addition to what the hon. member has said.

If the clerks are getting this information, then it is on the instructions of someone, Mr. Speaker, and that someone clearly is not us, the members. That someone clearly is directing legislative counsel to give information without our knowledge and consent. In other words, these legislative counsel do not work for us.

This even goes beyond solicitor-client privilege because if legislative counsel are getting instructions and are following orders from someone besides us, then how can we be confident that they are doing their greatest and best work for us if their responsibility is to someone else? This is very serious, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The hon. member reiterates a point that was brought up earlier. The fact is that the legislative counsel, the lawyers who are there, do not have in the traditional sense the client-lawyer relationship only because there are other people involved.

That has been the way. It has been our tradition since the beginning. I would invite the hon. member to please have a look at my ruling of this morning to understand why we arrived at this decision.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, with respect, I think the point is something a bit different from a team and who in the team has access to certain information. The point is solicitor-client privilege. The point is whether we are entitled to rely on legislative counsel to work for us in a privileged way. In other words, nobody else knows what we are discussing, what we are planning or what we are doing because these lawyers are giving us advice solely for our own purposes.

If the clerks are getting this information, then it is on the instructions of someone, Mr. Speaker, and that someone clearly is not us, the members. That someone clearly is directing legislative counsel to give information without our knowledge and consent. In other words, these legislative counsel do not work for us.

This even goes beyond solicitor-client privilege because if legislative counsel are getting instructions and are following orders from someone besides us, then how can we be confident that they are doing their greatest and best work for us if their responsibility is to someone else? This is very serious, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The hon. member reiterates a point that was brought up earlier. The fact is that the legislative counsel, the lawyers who are there, do not have in the traditional sense the client-lawyer relationship only because there are other people involved.

That has been the way. It has been our tradition since the beginning. I would invite the hon. member to please have a look at my ruling of this morning to understand why we arrived at this decision.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, with respect, I think the point is something a bit different from a team and who in the team has access to certain information. The point is solicitor-client privilege. The point is whether we are entitled to rely on legislative counsel to work for us in a privileged way. In other words, nobody else knows what we are discussing, what we are planning or what we are doing because these lawyers are giving us advice solely for our own purposes.

If the clerks are getting this information, then it is on the instructions of someone, Mr. Speaker, and that someone clearly is not us, the members. That someone clearly is directing legislative counsel to give information without our knowledge and consent. In other words, these legislative counsel do not work for us.

This even goes beyond solicitor-client privilege because if legislative counsel are getting instructions and are following orders from someone besides us, then how can we be confident that they are doing their greatest and best work for us if their responsibility is to someone else? This is very serious, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The hon. member reiterates a point that was brought up earlier. The fact is that the legislative counsel, the lawyers who are there, do not have in the traditional sense the client-lawyer relationship only because there are other people involved.

That has been the way. It has been our tradition since the beginning. I would invite the hon. member to please have a look at my ruling of this morning to understand why we arrived at this decision.
in both official languages the fourth report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association which represented Canada at the meetings of the defence and security committee held in Washington, D.C. and southern California from February 1 to 8, 2000.

* * *

PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-450, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present a bill on behalf of constituents and Canadians right across the country. It tries to prevent the merry-go-round that members of parliament do once in a while when they decide to cross the floor and join another political party.

I have never agreed that a member of parliament can just up and leave a party and right in the middle of a term join another political party. That decision should be in the hands of the Canadian people. This legislation says to a member of parliament that if he or she has a falling out with the party and wishes to leave and join another political party, then step down, run in a byelection under the new political banner and let the people in the riding decide whether or not the member is capable of flying under the new political banner.

It is a great privilege to thank the seconder of this wonderful bill. I am sure the bill will sweep across the country and be endorsed by all Canadians of all political stripes.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

YUGOSLAVIA

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present on behalf of my constituents and residents in British Columbia. The first is a dated petition concerning the NATO actions in Yugoslavia calling upon parliament to do what it felt was fair.

HIGHWAYS

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is one that I can wholly support. It calls on parliament to provide more funding for the national highway system in the 2000 budget. Unfortunately they are a little bit late in expressing that sentiment. I certainly think they are going in the right direction in asking the government to provide more funding for the highways program.

PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Lou Sekora (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I present 277 signed ribbons from the annual white ribbon against pornography campaign. This campaign was held from October 24 to October 31, 1999 by the Catholic Women's League of Canada. The use of pornography must be stopped.

The Deputy Speaker: I assumed the hon. member was presenting a petition and not ribbons to the House. I hope it was a slip of words in his description because of course ribbons would not be in order.

ACTION CANADA FOR POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to present four petitions today.

The first one is a very important petition with several hundred signatures from members of my riding. It says that whereas the majority of Canadians consider unborn babies to be worthy of protection and whereas Action Canada for Population—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I know the hon. member will want to comply with the rules and summarize the petition rather than read it. I sense that we are hearing it read.

Mr. Richard M. Harris: Mr. Speaker, the petitioners pray that the federal government will not continue to have ACPD, a non-government organization that came directly out of the Planned Parenthood Federation of Canada play a leading role in future government sponsored forums on the national and international scene.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the second petition the petitioners pray that parliament use the section 33 notwithstanding clause if necessary concerning the child pornography decision that is coming down very shortly from the Supreme Court of Canada.

REFUGEES

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the third petition several hundred petitioners are concerned about mismanagement by the immigration department. They pray that legislation will be enacted requiring refugee claimants to demonstrate through identification and documentation very clearly that they are fleeing general political persecution and failing to do that face immediate deportation without delay.
PENSIONS

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the last petition contains several hundred signatures of people who are really upset with the way the government has scooped the pension plan surpluses from the RCMP, the military and crown corporation agencies. They pray that treasury board halt its unilateral appropriation of the surpluses in the public service, military and RCMP pension plans. It destroys the morale, the work ethic and confidence in the government.

MAMMOGRAPHY

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present a petition duly certified by the clerk of petitions on the subject of breast cancer. The petition is signed by 96 residents of British Columbia. It calls on parliament to enact legislation to establish an independent body to develop and implement mandatory mammography quality assurance and quality control standards in Canada.

BILL C-20

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table one of the petitions given to me in the last couple of days by people of my riding. This petition concerns Bill C-20. The petitioners are calling for the withdrawal of this bill, which violates the rights of the Quebec people to decide their own future. I therefore table this petition.

CHILD POVERTY

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present petitions from the constituents in my riding of Kitchener Centre.

The first set urges parliament to fulfill the 1989 promise to end child poverty by the year 2000. The petitions have been signed by the residents of the Kitchener—Waterloo area and the members of Rockway Mennonite Church. Campaign 2000 has also provided me with a copy of its petition calling on parliament to end child poverty.

IMMIGRATION TAXES

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the final petition is from the Mennonite Coalition for Refugee Support. They call on the House to immediately rescind immigration taxes on refugees and immigrants.

MARRIAGE

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting petitions with approximately 1,000 names of people across the country including from Langley, Winnipeg and Saskatchewan. They are petitioning that the House respect the motion of nine months ago in defence of and to uphold marriage.

Routine Proceedings

They are petitioning that in light of the fact that the Prime Minister has limited debate on Bill C-23 and has not allowed a free vote, that the House withdraw Bill C-23 and instead affirm the opposite sex definition of marriage in legislation and ensure that marriage is recognized as a unique institution both in name and policy.

CHILD PORNOPHARY

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions for you. The first is a petition that asks parliament to take all measures necessary to ensure that the possession of child pornography remains a criminal offence. I think that is a reference to the supreme court debate that is ongoing at this moment.

MAMMOGRAPHY

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition calls upon the government to implement, enforce and develop uniform and mandatory mammography assurance and quality control standards in Canada.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Finally, Mr. Speaker, the last petition urges parliament to uphold section 43 of the criminal code which continues to give parents the right or the opportunity to use appropriate discipline.

FUEL PRICES

Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I have the honour of presenting the following petitions.

The petitioners draw the attention of the House to the fact that Canadian consumers are deeply affected by price hikes. Although gasoline is a Canadian natural resource, Canadians have little control over this important resource. Therefore, the petitioners request that parliament encourage the establishment of a gas pricing review commission to keep the pricing of gasoline and other oil products in check.

IMMIGRATION TAXES

Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I have the honour of presenting these petitions signed by more than 100 concerned Canadians.

The federal government imposes an immigration tax as a condition for obtaining permanent residence in Canada. This tax is in addition to the $500 charged just to open a file. Therefore the petitioners call upon parliament to immediately cancel the immigration tax.
Routine Proceedings

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, the following petition is signed by 46 interested Canadians.

The federal government imposes an immigration tax of $975. This tax is discriminatory with respect to immigrants from developing countries where the annual income is sometimes less than $975. Therefore the petitioners call upon parliament to immediately reduce the rate of the immigration tax.

CHILD POVERTY

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 88 Canadians.

One in five Canadian children live in poverty. On November 14, 1989 the House of Commons resolved to end child poverty in Canada by the year 2000. The petitioners call upon parliament to introduce a multi-year plan to improve the well-being of Canadian children.

MAMMOGRAPHY

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 a dozen Canadians.

Canada has the second highest incidence of risk of cancer in the world. It is second only to the United States. The United States has had mandatory mammography quality assurance standards since October 1994. Canada has no legislation for mandatory mammography quality assurance standard.

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

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Gar Knutson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following question will be answered today: No. 76.

[Text]

Question No. 76—Mr. Leon E. Benoit:

With regard to the groups consulted by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration in the course of the legislative review ministerial consultations from February 27, 1998 through to March 11, 1998: (a) which of the groups received government issued grants and/or subsidies; (b) what was the total grant or subsidy; (c) what was the reason for the grant or subsidy; and (d) which government department issued the grant or subsidy?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): With regard to each of the groups consulted by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration during the period from February 27, 1998 through to March 11, 1998, the following received contribution funds (Citizenship and Immigration Canada CIC does not provide grants or subsidies to organizations) in fiscal year 1997-98* under one or more of CIC’s settlement programs or services: immigrant settlement and adaptation program, ISAP, which provides a variety of settlement services to immigrants, such as orientation, community information, interpretation/translation, para-professional counselling, employment related services; language instruction for newcomers to Canada, LINC, which provides training in one of Canada’s official languages to adult immigrants; the host program which matches immigrants to Canadians who help them with various aspects of life in Canada; and reception house, RH, which provides temporary accommodation to government assisted refugees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution $ by Program</th>
<th>ISAP</th>
<th>LINC</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>RH</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Group for New Canadians</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Association of Immigrant Serving Agencies</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Regional Association of Immigrant Serving Agencies</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary Immigrant Aid Society</td>
<td>199,035</td>
<td>317,202</td>
<td>516,237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary Mennonite Centre for Newcomers</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>352,624</td>
<td>382,624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Arab Federation</td>
<td>206,552</td>
<td>206,552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Centre for Victims of Torture</td>
<td>179,927</td>
<td>78,442</td>
<td>258,369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Council for Refugees</td>
<td>28,070</td>
<td>28,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Ukrainian Immigrant Aid Services</td>
<td>34,510</td>
<td>321,039</td>
<td>357,549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Council of Manitoba</td>
<td>248,139</td>
<td>25,787</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>337,926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTI Immigrant Services</td>
<td>224,946</td>
<td>1,539,037</td>
<td>1,061,078</td>
<td>2,825,061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton Mennonite Centre for Newcomers</td>
<td>184,257</td>
<td>251,059</td>
<td>435,316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Erie Heritage Council</td>
<td>70,187</td>
<td>70,187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba Interfaith Immigration Council</td>
<td>238,751</td>
<td>18,805</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>545,517</td>
<td>867,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro ESL Association</td>
<td>133,231</td>
<td>133,231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Immigrant Settlement Association</td>
<td>314,211</td>
<td>44,705</td>
<td>50,526</td>
<td>409,442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual Orientation Services Association for Immigrant Communities, MOSAIC</td>
<td>178,552</td>
<td>779,809</td>
<td>958,361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Association of Fredericton</td>
<td>64,692</td>
<td>178,396</td>
<td>19,626</td>
<td>262,714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Council of Agencies</td>
<td>90,181</td>
<td>90,181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving Immigrants, OCASI</td>
<td>145,960</td>
<td>470,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>23,295</td>
<td>679,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Open Door Society Inc.</td>
<td>774,816</td>
<td>708,097</td>
<td>39,051</td>
<td>1,521,964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Chinese Community Enrichment Services Society, S.U.C.E.S.S.</td>
<td>224,946</td>
<td>1,539,037</td>
<td>1,061,078</td>
<td>2,825,061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELS, Ontario, Teachers of English as a Second Language</td>
<td>26,279</td>
<td>26,279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizations in Quebec do not receive contribution funds from CIC. As per the Canada-Quebec accord, the province of Quebec assumes responsibility for providing settlement services.

*Contribution agreements are signed for a total amount which covers the duration of the agreement. As the period of time for which the funding information was requested does not coincide with the periods covered by the contribution agreements, we are unable to give dollar figures for the exact period requested by the hon. member.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: The question enumerated by the hon. parliamentary secretary has been answered.

* * *

STARRIED QUESTIONS

Mr. Gar Knutson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Starred Question No. 49, and I ask that it be printed in Hansard as if read.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

*Question No. 49—Mr. Guy St-Julien:

Since 1990 have Natural Resources Canada, Environment Canada or Atomic Energy of Canada Limited have not undertaken any studies, research or visits in the province of Quebec north of the 48th parallel in connection with pluton and/or granitic pluton with the aim of burying nuclear waste and if so: (a) how many studies were done; (b) what are the titles of the studies; (c) how many visits were there; (d) what locations were visited; and (e) which Canadian universities and university institutions were involved?

Mr. Gar Knutson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.): I am informed as follows. Environment Canada, Natural Resources Canada and Atomic Energy Canada Limited have not undertaken any studies, research or visits in the province of Quebec in connection with pluton and/or granitic pluton with the aim of burying nuclear waste.

[English]

Mr. Gar Knutson: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.
Government Orders

On February 8 the hon. member for Roberval said that there was no way whatsoever that the Bloc would co-operate in passing Bill C-20. Again, it is crystal clear where these people opposite are coming from and that is in an undemocratic way to simply tie up the business of the House, using every procedural trick in their arsenal, when Canadians want to talk about other things. They want to talk about jobs. They want to talk about trade issues. They want to talk about global trade. They want to talk about transportation in the west. They want to talk about farmers. They want to talk about health care. They want to talk about education. They do not want to get stalled by those people opposite who want nothing more than to stall the business of the House, to tie it up, to do whatever they can procedurally or any other way to hog-tie the House of Commons.

We on the government side will not allow them to get away with it. Why? Because it is not in the best interests of Canadians, wherever they live in Canada. We on this side of the House will ensure that does not happen.

That is why we are crystal clear when it comes to Group No. 1, which we are debating today, which deals with the preamble. The House should not forget that this is a very simple bill that has three statements to it. It is very simple, very straightforward and very uncomplicated. It is those people opposite who are making it into something far greater than it was ever intended to be, and that is unacceptable.

Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the amendments in Group No. 1, which deal with the preamble, and now the amendments to the amendments which they are proposing, simply go counter to what we have in mind.

The bill closely reflects the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec secession reference. Each of the preambular clauses is drawn from elements of the court’s judgment. Despite the attempts of the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Bouchard, to conveniently ignore certain parts of the judgment, it is all important that all of its elements be reflected in the clarity act preamble.

That is what we on the government side are doing. We are being straightforward. We are being simple. We are being clear in terms of what we are doing, because Canadians expect that kind of common sense approach when it comes to government. Canadians expect that of us. We are here elected from across Canada to represent every region and every area of this country. No matter where we come from, we are here to govern in an appropriate and solid fashion, and we continue to do that. Why? Because it is expected, it is required and it is necessary.

When we brought in as a government the clarity legislation, Bill C-20, we did so with great intent, with great purpose, to ensure that people throughout Canada, and the world for that matter, who are watching this process will know that we come from a very solid and straightforward foundation, knowing that this is a time to act in a meaningful way on behalf of Canada. That is precisely what we on the government side, with the help of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, will do.

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I, too, appreciate the opportunity to speak at least one last time to this bill. It is a bill which attempts to bring clarity, finally, to an issue that has probably been the most confusing issue for Canadians right across the country, not only in the province of Quebec but certainly in my riding and clearly from sea to sea to sea.

Some of the statements made by members opposite I find rather interesting. First, I heard the hyperbole of the member of the New Democratic Party earlier today. In fact he was quite apoplectic, to say the least, shouting and going on about the fact that aboriginal Canadians are not named in the document—

Mr. Peter Stoffer: He is right.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: I am trying to reiterate it fairly and accurately because I want to point out the fallacy of the argument.

The member could not understand and got awfully excited about why we would not include aboriginal Canadians in the list of people who should be consulted. I know the member knows this full well because he is one of the most knowledgeable people in the House. He has been around a long time. I give him credit for his success in this parliament and the length of his stay here, if nothing else. He knows that he could check the supreme court decision with regard to this. I will share this with members opposite.

The final subsection of the bill stipulates that no minister of the crown shall propose a constitutional amendment to effect the secession of a province from Canada unless the Government of Canada has addressed, in its negotiations, the terms of secession expressly mentioned by the court, such as the division of assets and liabilities, any changes to the borders of the province—which the hon. member knows full well deals with aboriginal Canadians—and the protection of minority rights.

That is in the supreme court decision. I read that and I listened to the knowledgeable member of the New Democratic Party going on about the government not mentioning aboriginal Canadians in the bill. I wonder what has happened. I think I know. That member and members of that party are looking for a reason to oppose this bill. They are digging a little deep. They cannot be kidding—

Mr. Peter Stoffer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That is absolute nonsense. The member was pointing out the fact that aboriginal people—and even the minister says that is not true—
The Deputy Speaker: I think we are into a point of debate rather than a point of order.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, the member should seek an opportunity to rise in debate in a normal way instead of jumping up in such child-like fashion and interrupting the flow of someone who is trying to articulate a point which might be contrary to his and might be somewhat more factual. I am not making it up; I am reading from a document that quotes the supreme court.

If the member does not believe that the supreme court decision I am reading is accurate, the member should say so, I suppose. But I do not know where he would be coming from. What is the point of that debate?

It could only be—and not to be unfair because there is really another party I want to talk about a little more—that the NDP has looked at this and said “Darn it, they really have something here. They will put forward a bill that is clear to Canadians; a question that is clear”.

Most of their ridings are in eastern Canada, in the maritimes. I am sure the people in the maritimes are about as fed up with this talk of separation as are the people of Quebec, Ontario, the west and our territories. I am sure they are all sick and tired of this whole debate and would like, once and for all, to put the rules straight on the table.

The members look at it and say “Holy smoke, they might have something here. They have actually put together a bill which says there has to be a clear question, that the appropriate democratically elected people in the country have to be consulted and there has to be a clear majority”. Frankly, I think that is what the majority of Canadians want, including those people in Quebec.

In an attempt to find a way to oppose this bill, they have latched on to the tried and true aboriginal issue. We saw that in Charlottetown and in Meech. We came to recognize as a nation that if we want to try to amend the constitution, which is exactly what would be required under any attempt by a province to secede, the country is not governable in that sense. To amend the constitution of Canada is virtually impossible, to date at least, with perhaps one or two very minor exceptions to do with education, because any one person, as we saw in the Manitoba legislature, can refuse unanimous consent and hold up the entire country.

I do not understand where the responsibility lies for a Canadian parliamentarian to do that. I do not mind that someone disagrees with the bill. In fact I understand the Bloc members disagreeing with it. It is their raison d'être to separate.

I found some of the statements of Bloc members really interesting. Let me share one with the House. One Bloc member said “You cannot judge clarity because there are language differences”. Is that not an interesting situation.

I wrote out what I consider to be, and what I think my constituents would consider to be, a clear question. It is fairly simple and fairly straightforward. It states “Do you wish to separate from Canada and become a sovereign nation, yes or no?”

[Translation]

Here is the question in French: voulez-vous vous séparer du Canada et devenir un pays souverain, oui ou non?

[English]

Where is the language difference? Where is the problem?

Members opposite do not like that question. Maybe they want a question that says “Do you want to maybe separate? We will cut a deal. We will see if we can get more money out of them. We will see what we can do better for you because you voted for us. Maybe we will get you some HRD grants, or maybe we will not. What do you think of that, yes or no?”

If they want to play games because they know they cannot win when it is a clear question, I understand that tactic, but I do not think the rest of Canada appreciates that tactic.

Then I heard the same Bloc member say, and I found this to be astounding, that his constituents do not want clarity, they want money. That is what he said. They want money for economic development and jobs. These are the same opposition members who would stand to castigate the Minister of Human Resources Development for investing in the province of Quebec, in the various ridings of members opposite, and ridings right across this country.

Those investments are investments in people, the people of Quebec. The reason the members do not like them of course is because they are afraid those investments might make, God forbid, the country’s government look good. That is not the reason it is done. Our policies are very clear. We go into economically depressed communities and we try to help them, because we understand as a government that is part of our obligation.

I do not care what party sits on this side of the House, that will always be, and should always be, part of the obligation of a government which tries to run a nation with the disparities and the geographical differences that exist in this country. Members ought...
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to travel this land, go to places in Quebec and Labrador. Anywhere in this country they will see the need for government assistance.

Finally, I heard a member stand to say that Quebecers were not consulted when other people were allowed to join this country. Presumably the member was referring to Newfoundland. I do not understand that. I say to the member, what about the rest of Canada when it comes to the province of Quebec voting on a referendum question that would indeed destroy this country? Does the ROC, the rest of Canada, not have something to say?

Mr. Richard Marceau: No.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: The member says no. I heard that. I think they do and they want a clear answer.

My constituents have said to me that if they really want to go, let them go. I want to make sure that the question is darn clear before we are put in the position where we have to negotiate that kind of deal. That is what this bill does.

I am a little frightened because Reform members support it, but I appreciate the fact that they do so because they have listened to their constituents.

The House should pass this bill, and quickly. It should be passed so that we keep this country together and everyone understands the nature of the game.

● (1545)

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are debating a bill that nobody would have expected a responsible democratic government to come up with.

I have tabled an amendment to delete from the bill a number of the whereas clauses at the bottom of the first page. I would like to say a few words about these clauses and explain why I believe they should not be included in the bill. In fact, I consider that the whole bill should have been withdrawn by the government.

The first whereas that I would like to delete reads, and I quote:

Whereas the Supreme Court of Canada has determined that the result of a referendum on the secession of a province from Canada must be free of ambiguity both in terms of the question asked and in terms of the support it achieves if that result is to be taken as an expression of the democratic will that would give rise to an obligation to enter into negotiations that might lead to secession;

As you will note, the French version of this text is in the negative, as it reads “ne saurait être considéré”. This is not the way the supreme court worded its opinion. On the contrary, it said in the affirmative that the question had to be clear and that there had to be a majority in the qualitative sense of the term, equally clear.

The legislation before us is not a clarity bill but legislation on bad faith. I will explain why I believe this legislation reeks of bad faith.

First, the clarity of a question does not depend on the length of the sentence but on the way people perceive the issues behind the question in relation to their own interests. A question can be short or long, but the way people perceive their interests depends on the conditions in which the debate occurs and on whether each and every party will be allowed to express its concerns in light of the issues behind the question.

In the 1995 referendum, the question was simple. It was this: Do you want Quebec to become a sovereign state and to propose a partnership with the rest of Canada? This is a simple question that was debated not only during the referendum period, which lasted one month, but also long before that, considering that, in April 1995, during the Bloc Quebecois convention, the notion of partnership was introduced. On June 12, 1995, the three parties, the Bloc Quebecois, the Parti Quebecois and the Action democratique, agreed on a basic partnership proposal to be submitted to the rest of Canada, should Quebecers vote for Quebec sovereignty.

Well, no one in this House or elsewhere claimed that the question was not clear. Let me note that most people who claimed that the question was not clear do not read French, and, consequently, they simply repeated what they read in the papers concerning the so-called lack of clarity of the question.

I think that, in Quebec, the question is so clear that the majority of Quebecers would know the question referred to even if all they saw on a sheet of paper was a yes and a no block. The issue was debated even before I was born. Everyone knows what is at stake.

● (1550)

For many Quebecers, it is very clear that Quebec must acquire all the powers needed to ensure the future it deserves.

However, some people think the House has the divine power to judge the clarity of a question better than average Quebecers. I want to point out to my colleagues, in all humility, that members of the House are average citizens coming from their environment of average citizens. On this side or the other side of the House, we do not have supernatural brain power that would place us above and beyond the people in our capacity to judge the clarity of a question.

Average citizens know they are able to judge whether they have understood the question and whether they agree or not with the proposal made to them. Average Quebecers are as intelligent and as capable of judging the clarity of a question as any member of one side of the House or the other. That, through legislation, this parliament should appropriate the almost divine right to decide
whether a question is clear or not, goes beyond the abilities, the competency and the very right of the House to democratically make decisions on behalf of the people.

When we call on the people, the people must have the last word and, in a democracy, they have the last word. When the people elect a member of parliament, they do not ask whether the member is clear or not; they make a value judgment on the man or the woman and take the decision to vote for him, for her or for another person. When people read a question, they assess it in terms of their interests and decide whether the proposal contained in the question suits them or not.

This decision will not be taken by this House in place of the people. We do not have the right to do so. If we did, we would usurp the democratic right of each and every citizen. In that regard, Bill C-20 clearly goes beyond the prerogatives of this House. But there is even worse.

Through this bill, the House also wants to give itself the right. When I say this House, the fact is that there are two sides: the government side and the opposition side. The government side outnumbers the opposition side, that is got to form government in the first place. It always votes the same way as the Prime Minister, because this is the way our Parliament works. This bill enables, not this House, and not the government, but the Prime Minister and him alone to determine the clarity of a question and, worse yet, to determine the majority required to win a vote for sovereignty.

In a democracy—at least this is what I was taught—each person has an equal right to vote. My vote is not more important than the vote of any other person, and nobody’s vote is not more important than mine. This is the basic principle of democracy. Yet, this bill suggests that a vote could have more weight than another one, which is totally unacceptable. That is why I intend to now move a motion to amend Motion No. 2.

I move:

That Motion No. 2 be amended by adding, between the words “were” and “consulted”, the word “democratically”.

Something this bill is seriously lacking. This amendment is seconded by the hon. member for Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is now on the amendment.

[English]

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-20 has been charged by opposition members as being arbitrary, a constitutional voie de fait, goodness knows what other charges. This is very surprising. I will repeat what I had the pleasure of saying in a public forum organized by the member of parliament for Markham and presided over by ex-premier Bob Rae, that the revolutionary aspect of this bill is that the federal government by legislation voluntarily limits its prerogative, executive powers.

There is no question that in 1980 when the first referendum arose there was no right under constitutional law or international law for a province unilaterally to secede. There was no right at all.

The issue of what was a clear question and a clear majority, I could remind the hon. member for Macleod who referred to this earlier, was discussed very fully at that time, and it has been around.

When the supreme court came into the picture it was because there was a plethora of individual suits before individual judges of the Canadian judicial system. The federal government had several options. One was to challenge the constitutional standing to sue of the individual litigants, which I think technically, in legal terms, might have been the better course. The other was to go ahead, and the supreme court has rendered an advisory opinion, which is not of course legally binding on the federal government.

What we have in Bill C-20 therefore is what European Union jurists have rightly hailed as a rather surprising evolution in the rules as to self-determination going well beyond the European Union’s own rules developed in 1992 for the special case of eastern European states and the issue of recognition under international law, which is of course one of the ways in which a new state comes into existence.

What is interesting and surprising in Bill C-20 is that the federal government, so far from imposing its will on other people, is saying “We are prepared to recognize a right of self-determination, to recognize it legally, but here are the basic conditions. We want to be sure this is what people want. What is the objection therefore to saying that we would require a clear question and a clear majority before we go ahead with this?”

In these terms it is very difficult to see what all the fuss is about with this particular law. It takes nothing away from anyone in Quebec or any other province. It is an example of the federal government voluntarily limiting its own response and saying “In the exercise of our prerogative powers in the future, we will consider ourselves bound by the expression clearly given of people of a particular province”.

I do have something to say, though, on a larger issue that has been touched on by some of my colleagues and that is the nature of the parliamentary processes. It is inconceivable that a bill with a handful of sections, covering even in the French and English versions a handful of pages, should be the subject of I am told, originally, 1,540 amendments. Now they are down to 400.
Surely we are entering into an undergraduate game with frivolous, repetitive or otherwise uninteresting and boring propositions. Why should the business of the House be held up by this sort of activity?

It is sometimes said that parliament is controlled by members and that there are no limits on the control members can exercise. People cite the parliament in Great Britain. You yourself, Mr. Speaker, are a student of that parliament and you will know that it has always been a very robust parliament. You will remember that Oliver Cromwell said to parliament, “You gentlemen have been around too long for all the good you have done. Go, for the sake of God, go”. It is recorded that not a dog barked at their departure which was gently assisted by Oliver Cromwell’s friends.

What I am really saying is that it is a necessary part of the parliamentary process that the rules of the game are observed. We can have a tyranny of a majority but we can also have a tyranny of a minority. The British parliament has never hesitated to establish rules that ensure respect by all parties, majority and minority, for the rules of the game and for the ability of parliament to conduct the national business.

In the United States those of us who are old enough will remember Jimmy Stewart, the senator who could speak for 22 hours uselessly on a bill, but the United States congress has now regulated that power. There is a basic criticism of the parliament in Germany in the 1920s, a democratic regime that did nothing about the forces of evil of the right or the left in that situation. The German democracy collapsed as much from the inanition of parliament in exercising its powers to control the abusive use of parliamentary procedures as by the extremist forces outside.

I really am saying to members of the opposition that surely the points have been well established in debate. What is achieved by wasting the time of the people of Canada, wasting the time of citizens who are expecting us to act on important bills? Has the point that opposition members have been trying to make not been made adequately enough in the debate?

I have no doubt therefore that we will be forced as parliamentarians to consider proper rules to engage the orderly conduct of House business.

One of the ideas whose time has certainly come is electronic voting, the United Nations system. I think those of us who like the happy ritual of elevating oneself and sitting down again and think it is a quaint old fashioned custom are having doubts about it. It is an idea that perhaps may go very quickly through the House, as well as the ability to establish new rules that ensure no one will be able to make an abusive use of parliamentary procedures. That is a tyranny of a minority carried out incessantly and carried out without proper respect for parliamentary customs and procedures. It can in my view be dangerous to the constitutional system that we all respect.

Parliament is an ancient institution, but is also an institution of mutual respect that rests on a delicate system of checks and balances respected by all members. I would suggest to the members opposite that the Reform Party made the point with the Nisga’a treaty what can be done with parliamentary procedures.

As a distinguished Reform member said to me yesterday, stated once it is interesting, stated twice it becomes boring. However it does direct attention to the fact that the pre-emptive concern with sovereignty association issues has been at the expense of this parliament’s considering the modernizing and updating of parliamentary procedures. It is long overdue that we bring parliament into the 21st century. Decent rules that assure proper respect for other members’ rights are part of that.

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to say that I do not agree with my colleagues from Waterloo—Wellington and Vancouver Quadra when they say that the members of the Bloc are immobilizing parliament with their amendments. I think that it is very important for the opposition to be able to protest when they do not agree with a bill introduced by the government. If the Bloc members want to see the MP vote like little rabbits, jumping from on amendment to another, that is fine. That is stupid, but that is fine. If that is what they want, I have no problem with that.

I believe most of the amendments moved at this stage of consideration of the bill are futile. I would like to explain why.

Bill C-20 is very simple. There are two fundamental paragraphs that form the basis of this bill. The rest is only cosmetic. The two paragraphs that I consider important are 1(6) and 2(4).

Paragraph 1(6) reads as follows:

(6) The Government of Canada shall not enter into negotiations on the terms on which a province might cease to be part of Canada if the House of Commons determines, that a referendum question is not clear—

The other paragraph says the same thing, and I quote:

(4) The Government of Canada shall not enter into negotiations on the terms on which a province might cease to be part of Canada unless the House of Commons determines, that there has been a clear expression of a will by a clear majority of the population of that province that the province cease to be part of Canada.

This is what is required to start negotiations on the separation or secession of a province.
I am a strong federalist. I think my colleagues from the Bloc defend everything coming from Quebec. I think opposition members believe, as I do, in a civil society.

Consequently, I believe my colleagues opposite are not looking for a situation where Canada would be dismantled by an unclear question. I believe this because I firmly believe in a united Canada. I also believe in the parliamentary process, as other members opposite, Reform and Bloc members. If there were a clear question on the secession of a province, I would have no choice but to accept it.

Mr. Daniel Turp: Fifty per cent plus one, like Mr. Mills.

Mr. John Bryden: No. The situation with this bill is very simple.

I do not think all members of the Bloc are separatists. Most are sovereignists or perhaps indépendantistes, but they are not separatists.

In Quebec, some separatists are looking for winning conditions. I think that two winning conditions are a confusing question and a majority of 50% plus one.

We have two parties in the House that go along with that. The Conservative Party thinks a confusing question is all right, and the Reform Party led by Mr. Manning says that 50% plus one is enough to break up Canada.

The Liberal government will not last forever, and it is unfortunate. Eventually, Reformers or Conservatives may form the government. I think Preston Manning, and perhaps Joe Clark also, could impose party discipline with a great deal of authority. In that case, the Reform leader would be able to impose the majority of 50% plus one. Perhaps the Conservative leader would accept an unclear question to get negotiations underway—

Mr. Richard M. Harris: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know he did not mean to and that he would withdraw it.

The Deputy Speaker: I am sure he would not mind. I am sorry. I missed hearing the name but the hon. member for Wentworth—Burlington will not, I am sure, want to allow that to continue.

Mr. John Bryden: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I was under the impression that the Reform leader had resigned his position.

The winning condition is simply to have a Reform leader, a Canadian Alliance leader, or a Conservative leader as government leader. These are winning conditions for the separatists.

Bill C-20 prevents this possibility by conferring the power to determine if the question is clear, and if the majority is clear on that question. It confers such power to all members of the House of Commons. It creates a sensitive situation with respect to the question initiating negotiations for the break-up of the country. This responsibility is vested in all members, who would participate in some kind of a free vote. I think that most members of this House, including Bloc members, will vote according to their conscience.

For these reasons, I think that this bill is good as it takes the power of the executive and gives it to the members of this House.

I think this is true democracy.
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For instance, and this is one example among many, let us look at the issue of GST harmonization. Not long ago, as members will remember, the government said “We will scrap the GST”. As soon as they were elected, they said “No, we will keep it”. Moreover, they tried to convince all the provinces to harmonize their taxes with the federal GST.

The Atlantic provinces, for example, received $1 billion for the harmonization of their taxes with the GST. Quebec was the first province to say to the federal government “Listen, you are giving compensation to the Atlantic provinces, so, give us compensation too”. We were asking $2.5 billion. And the federal government stubbornly said “No, you are not entitled to this”. They said to themselves “Let us keep Quebecers and Quebec in Canada, because it is to our advantage. We can compensate the other provinces, but let us forget about Quebec”.

I remind the House that it was even suggested that an arbitration board could be set up between representatives of the federal government and Quebec arbitrate on this issue, and the federal government said no.

Other examples come to mind, such as the Canada social transfer. The value scale of the Canada social transfer has always been based mainly on the wealth or poverty of the provinces or the regions. The government changed all that. Now it is just the demographic factor that counts, meaning that Quebecers have lost a lot of money, because Ontario is the largest province in demographic terms. It is the one getting the big chunk of federal money in the Canada social transfer. Another injustice for Quebec. “Let us keep Quebec, it is very important to us. We can limit transfers, give a little more to the others and enclose Quebec in Canada. This is what we want, because it is to our advantage”. The question is always the same: what are the interests and why this bill?

Another example is Public Works Canada. No more than two weeks ago, the statistics came down: Quebecers contribute 25% of the cost of all the departments, including Public Works Canada. Yet 57% of contracts go to Ontario and 13% to Quebec. “We have to keep Quebec in Canada, because it is a cash cow”. Quebecers pay full taxes to Ottawa, 25% of the tax base, but they are not given the equivalent. They have to be imprisoned in Canada.

Some even talk about a shortfall of 5,000 Quebecers in the military. An additional 5,000 Quebecers in the labour force would have a significant impact on the economy. Again, the federal government ignores this because it wants to keep Quebec a prisoner in the Canadian federation.

These days, we hear a lot about the price of gas. I want to tell Quebecers who are listening that, for at least 15 years now, they have been paying 3 to 10 cents more than Ontarians for gas. Why? Because the government of the time decided that no subsidies would be paid to refineries located east of the Borden line. That decision automatically triggered a 3 to 10 cent increase at the pump in Quebec. Incidentally, three refineries in eastern Montreal have since shut down. The hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve is well aware of this. It happened almost in his riding.

Mr. Claude Bachand: Canada wants to create health research institutes. Let us talk about research institutes. Out of 43 research institutes in the national capital region, 42 are located in Ottawa and one is in Hull. And it is Quebecers’ taxes that pay for this. Twenty five per cent of these institutes are paid for by Quebecers who, in return, only get one of them out of 43.

Research institutes are important. Contracts are awarded, well paid jobs are created and subcontracts help generate economic spin-offs. But no “Let us keep Quebec a prisoner within Canada. We want the taxes paid by Quebecers. We are not interested in giving them back services”.

At one point, Quebecers told themselves “Let us try to correct things. Let us make reforms”. In 1982, the Constitution was unilaterally imposed by Ottawa. No Premier of Quebec, either sovereignist or federalist, has ever agreed to sign it as things now stand. It was tried with the Meech Lake agreement, where we put forward five little minimum conditions. We were turned down. As for the Charlottetown accord, the rest of Canada said no and so did we. We considered that we did not have enough power and the rest of Canada considered that it was giving us too much.

Now what is this bill trying to do? It is trying to trap Quebec within the Canadian federation. After accusing the Liberals of diverting money belonging to the Quebec people, I accuse them of hijacking democracy because we have seen closure after closure with this bill, and a bold and unacceptable attempt by the government to restrict the number of amendments that the members could move, allowing ministers to move more.

It is a good thing the opposition held together and managed to thwart these plans, but it will not prevent the government from trying to impose all its wishes on us, like closure to limit debate. We are told that we will be voting like little rabbits; this is what I understood a little earlier from one of my colleagues. What is this?
Are we acting in a undemocratic way when we vote laws in the federal parliament the way we have been doing over the last hundred years?

There is a limit. And it is not a question of money. The only thing we can do is a little bit of parliamentary resistance as far as the votes are concerned, and we are even blamed for that too.

This is to show how the government intends to keep Quebec in the prison of confederation. The bill is quite undemocratic. Since when is 50% plus one acceptable? Canada itself has recognized referendums that took place in Croatia and in Macedonia, where the 50% plus one rule applied.

Furthermore, the question had two components, one of which was on partnership. Now, the government tells us “No, there will not be any partnership. We will examine this in the House of Commons, in our great paternalistic wisdom toward Quebec. We will examine whether your question is clear enough”.

I want to say one thing. There is no single prison that will keep Quebeckers in this federation when they decide enough is enough. There are not enough locks in all the Ottawa region to keep all Quebeckers within the Canadian federation when they decide enough is enough. There is no prison that is tight enough to keep them inside forever.

Quebec sovereignty is the only solution, with a partnership offer, and I hope Quebeckers will understand this. I also hope that Canada will be open to this idea at that time. It is not with bills such as this one that the government can ensure Quebec will stay within the Canadian federation; on the contrary, when it decides to leave, nothing will stop it.

Quebec sovereignty is the only solution, with a partnership offer, and I hope Quebeckers will understand this. I also hope that Canada will be open to this idea at that time. It is not with bills such as this one that the government can ensure Quebec will stay within the Canadian federation; on the contrary, when it decides to leave, nothing will stop it.

[English]

Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this important issue. There is no greater issue that any member would address than the dissolution of his or her country. I am in somewhat of an ironic position because in the riding of Scarborough East, where I come from, this is, frankly, not an issue.

One would have thought or anticipated that the dissolution of one’s country would have been of extreme interest to citizens of my riding, that constituents would have spoken to me, or would have sent e-mails, faxes, letters, et cetera. Quite to the contrary, if I could characterize it as such, this is an issue that has almost fallen off the political map. In some respects my constituents see this as a done deal and they thank goodness that somebody has introduced some sanity into the debate.

There is an irony. This is an enormous issue. It is a very significant issue on which the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs gave probably one of the finest speeches that the House has heard in a number of years, and yet there is no political resonance in my community.

I have just spent a week in my riding, as did all members. What I heard were issues around Bill C-23. I heard about gas prices, as if I am somehow able to deal in some manner with gas prices. Health care is a significant issue to my constituents. I think those are probably the top three issues. I cannot recall anyone in the past week or 10 days writing to me, faxing me or e-mailing me about this issue. It is enormously ironic that arguably the most significant bill which the government will pass in its mandate has almost no response from my own constituents.

When this bill was introduced by the government there was an initial sense of euphoria. Finally the Government of Canada was getting on with it. Finally somebody was going to do something concrete, something decisive, something that will bring closure to this issue, this interminable debate of our national dream.

The message I got from my constituents was pretty vocal. First, they liked it. They thought this was a great bill. Second, get on with it. Just do it. I cannot phrase it any more bluntly than that. The message was, bring clarity to this debate. Finish it. Deal with it and move on.

The tactics in this debate are hugely ironic. Bloc members, for their own reasons, and I am still at a loss to understand them, choose to take tactics of delay and obfuscation, introducing meaningless amendments and reading newspaper articles into the record. It does everything but deal with the issue and is quite reluctant to accept the political judgment of Canadians on this matter.

Instead of dealing with what I perceive to be the political reality of not only my constituency but Canada and all Canadians including Quebec, which is that this is something that needs to be done, the Bloc’s tactic in this matter is to delay and to waste parliamentary time.

I have listened to the members opposite. I have some understanding of their issue. They consider this to be a unilateral decision which is something that is available to Quebeckers and Quebeckers only. That position has been debated and frankly they have lost the debate. After that there has been nothing of substance added to the debate.

I have some expectation given the philosophical position of the Bloc that it would not really care what the constituents of Scarborough East, Ontario or the rest of Canada thought, but I would have thought it had some interest in what other Quebeckers thought. What I understand to be the situation is that the political reality in Quebec is much similar to the political reality of
Scarborough East which is to get on with it, deal with it and finish it off.

The position of the Bloc to my mind is unfathomable. I do not understand. It does seem to me that this has become a discredited political philosophy. Members opposite are unwilling to accept that this has become a discredited political philosophy, that they are in the death throes.

We get ironical statements by members such as the member who spoke previous to me about how Quebec is being ripped off in its relationship to the rest of Canada. He quotes a number of examples where apparently research and development is done on one side of the Ottawa River as opposed to the other side of the river, et cetera. He neatly forgets the equalization payments of something in excess of $4 billion on an annual basis. Any studies I have ever read on the issue have said that Quebec does very well in its relationship with Canada.

I cannot quite fathom what they are against. I looked up the speech of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. I thought it was one of the better speeches given in the House in a long time. He said in his conclusion that the bill is reasonable, that it is in everybody’s interests including those of his fellow Quebecers who desire independence. They can and must acknowledge that their plans for political independence can only be realized in clarity and legality. To act otherwise is to try to reach independence through ambiguity with no legal safety net, is to show disrespect for Quebecers and to doom the independence initiative to failure, to an impasse that would be disappointing and costly for everyone. I adopt the reasoning of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and I think he said it well.

I find the tactics of the Bloc to be quite disappointing. Raising irrelevant amendments and matters of procedure, slowing down the work of the House ending up in endless picayune discussions as to whether a comma should go here or there is a great disservice to the usefulness of Bill C-20. Like the whole of humanity, Quebecers entered the third millennium with a lot of hope and expectations.

The inaugural magic of great moments is difficult to conjure up for the humanity. As a magic date, a mythical passage, the arrival of year 2000 created a lot of hope in all our hearts. Many were disappointed, especially since the introduction in this House of Bill C-20. Like the whole of humanity, Quebecers entered the third millennium with a lot of hope and expectations.

On the eve of year 2000, the people had the feeling, the belief that things could now be better. It was even said “Peace and goodwill to all”.

With the minister’s Bill C-20, the government cast darkness over that environment. This minister could be called the “son of darkness”, it is incredible how poorly he understands Quebec reality. Once in a while, legislation can be considered a comedy, but if I had to describe this one, I would have to say it is a terrible tragedy.

People on the other side should have a hand dog look tonight. But that is not the case; they are smiling and saying this is a good piece of legislation for Quebec. If by their fruits you shall know them, then—

Mr. Réal Ménard: They are rotten.

Mr. René Canuel: Yes, they are poisoned. We must judge a government, and especially the minister, by its legislation. This minister is arrogant and his legislation is provocative. Furthermore, Bill C-20 is an insult to and a crime against intelligence.

It more or less tells the members of the National Assembly “You are not bright enough, not intelligent enough to determine your own destiny. Mr. Bouchard, Mr. Charest, Mr. Dumont, you are three minus habens. You are waterboys, second class politicians or,
as Trudeau told Bourassa, hot dog eaters”. That is what Trudeau said.

Moreover, it is an insult to and a crime against freedom. My adolescent students used to say “We are free”. They were right. I imagine that Quebecers are quite capable of freely making their own choices. Bill C-20 says the question must meet such and such requirements. Any other question will be considered as ambiguous. Is that freedom? Is that the extent to which freedom can be exercised in this Parliament?

The federal government’s judgment can supersede Quebec’s judgment. As my colleagues said earlier, Bill C-20 is undemocratic. In 1980, the federalists won with 50% of the votes plus one; they were happy and they celebrated with champagne. In 1995, the federalists won with 50% plus one, and they really brought out the champagne. However, at the next referendum, if we win with 50% plus one, that would not be enough. According to the Prime Minister, such a result could not be recognized. The rules have changed somehow.

I have always admired Mr. Ryan who, many years ago, was the editor in chief of Le Devoir and has also been the Leader of the Opposition in Quebec. He is a remarkable man. He said he would recognize these rules. Joe Clark, a former Prime Minister, said the same thing in this House.

What is going on here is that they are using their strength to crush a whole people, the Quebec people. Never will the people of my riding, the people of the riding of my colleague from Charlevoix, whom I had the honour to meet twice, and the Quebec people as a whole go for such legislation.

Ottawa’s bill is not only abusive, it is unjust. Its proponents are acting with the arrogance of conquerors. Those who support them are serving a cause or purpose. What cause or purpose? To eradicate anything that makes possible the existence and the expression of a people that the constitutional order of the Canadian society obstinately refuses to recognize.

We, in the regions, are fed up with a government, which, instead of trying to settle real problems and create jobs, is attacking our government, the government of Quebec and those who are truly elected by the people.

This government dares to dictate our conduct. That is something that no one can or will accept. We find the dirty tricks of the present Liberal government pretty tiring. Even the Liberal MPs from Quebec, and that is what is sad and unacceptable, fail to understand and are not attuned to their constituents. I can understand this in the case of those representing anglophone ridings, but the member representing Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L’Islet should have ears to hear what his fellow citizens are saying.

After the next election, he will no longer be around. It is perfectly clear, because people with freedom at heart, people who understand what Quebec wants, will definitely show their MP the door, minister or not. And they will not be ushering him out an emergency exit for his safety, but booting him out the front door.

Moreover, it is an insult to and a crime against freedom. My adolescent students used to say “We are free”. They were right. I imagine that Quebecers are quite capable of freely making their own choices. Bill C-20 says the question must meet such and such requirements. Any other question will be considered as ambiguous. Is that freedom? Is that the extent to which freedom can be exercised in this Parliament?

The federal government’s judgment can supersede Quebec’s judgment. As my colleagues said earlier, Bill C-20 is undemocratic. In 1980, the federalists won with 50% of the votes plus one; they were happy and they celebrated with champagne. In 1995, the federalists won with 50% plus one, and they really brought out the champagne. However, at the next referendum, if we win with 50% plus one, that would not be enough. According to the Prime Minister, such a result could not be recognized. The rules have changed somehow.

I have always admired Mr. Ryan who, many years ago, was the editor in chief of Le Devoir and has also been the Leader of the Opposition in Quebec. He is a remarkable man. He said he would recognize these rules. Joe Clark, a former Prime Minister, said the same thing in this House.

What is going on here is that they are using their strength to crush a whole people, the Quebec people. Never will the people of my riding, the people of the riding of my colleague from Charlevoix, whom I had the honour to meet twice, and the Quebec people as a whole go for such legislation.

Ottawa’s bill is not only abusive, it is unjust. Its proponents are acting with the arrogance of conquerors. Those who support them are serving a cause or purpose. What cause or purpose? To eradicate anything that makes possible the existence and the expression of a people that the constitutional order of the Canadian society obstinately refuses to recognize.

We, in the regions, are fed up with a government, which, instead of trying to settle real problems and create jobs, is attacking our government, the government of Quebec and those who are truly elected by the people.

This government dares to dictate our conduct. That is something that no one can or will accept. We find the dirty tricks of the present Liberal government pretty tiring. Even the Liberal MPs from Quebec, and that is what is sad and unacceptable, fail to understand and are not attuned to their constituents. I can understand this in the case of those representing anglophone ridings, but the member representing Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L’Islet should have ears to hear what his fellow citizens are saying.

There is no way to ignore the sour note on which this past century and this past millennium came to an end. If the Quebec people were to bow to the yoke of Bill C-20, it would be a sign that we had been tamed. We would be just like the domestic animals on the farm to serve humans. I trust that my friends across the floor will understand, and I will offer a quick summary.

If the people across the way want to put up fences, if they want to impose a yoke on us, if they insist so much on keeping us, this must be, I should think, because our values are superior to theirs.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: We are worthwhile from the financial point of view.

Mr. René Canuel: We must be very much worthwhile financially. I have been fighting for sovereignty for the past thirty years at least. I have federalist friends who, fortunately, are realizing more and more that Quebec must become sovereign, not to stir up trouble but to put an end to the squabbles, not to be an enemy but to be more of a friend, because they are going to live in one beautiful country and we in the other. We will then be able to reach out the hand of brotherhood and all will be well.

[English]

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to follow the last three speakers.

I have a small comment before I approach the clarity bill from the point of view of my constituents. I must say to my colleague from Matapédia—Matane that he appears to have forgotten that although we talk about two founding nations there are others. We also have aboriginal people who have been here for more than 11,000 years. We have just established Nunavut within Canada, an Inuit territory. We have just passed the Nisga’a treaty in B.C., an Indian nation. In fact, many Newfoundlanders consider themselves to be part of a fairly unique group. We have the Acadians in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

My friend says that we have the nerve to tell the French Canadians, the Quebecers, what to do. That is not so. The government has the responsibility to maintain the federation, if possible, and to see that it is not broken apart on a vague question because some people feel disadvantaged. Lots of people feel disadvantaged.

The member for Saint-John, with whom I have worked very hard on a couple of committee, said that Quebec tax money is coming into Ottawa in undue amounts. That is not so. I do not know why
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we have to argue about figures which have been the same for a great many years.

Ontario is a have province. Quebec has been termed a have not province. That is not out of disrespect of course; it is due to the equalization payments of the provinces.

Just this year the cash paid to Ontario was raised to equal the per capita rate that is paid to Quebec. Ontario people knew that and they were very pleased. Finally they were being paid at the same rate as Quebeckers.

My friend also said that we will stand up and sit down like rabbits to vote tonight, or soon. There is an easy way to cure that. They could withdraw the unnecessary amendments. Then we could all get on with the nation’s business and discuss a lot of other important things that we need to do.

Twice this afternoon speakers from the Bloc talked about sovereignty with a partnership. That is what a federation is. It is a partnership among equal partners. That is what we have in this country and we want to maintain it.

I agree also with the member for Scarborough East. My constituents support this bill. They think it is long overdue. They are fed up with the uncertainty and the instability which the spectre of sovereignty raises every other year or so over industry, exports and farm products.

The bill follows the supreme court decision on the Quebec secession reference and it asks for a clear majority on a clear question. My friends in the Bloc are upset about 50% plus one. I would ask the question that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs asked: If 50% plus one is a clear majority, what is an unclear majority?

In my experience on organizations, hospital boards, school boards, unions, Liberal associations and other associations, at an open meeting on a matter that goes to a vote, if there are six votes for and five against it passes. However, that does not hold for constitutional amendments. Most of the organizations I belong to require 66% or a two-thirds majority for a constitutional amendment, and even that is only following notice and discussion which has probably taken six months or a year. To make a constitutional amendment any faster than that would require 90%, not 66%. Why is that? Because it makes awfully good sense.

It means that a rump group or a group of zealots cannot change the constitution of a well respected association, of a government, a country or a company by marching into the annual meeting and taking over. It is to preserve the policies, the methods, the rules by which we live, the rules by which we conduct our business. It is not to get around anything, it is to protect us from undue change and unlawful takeovers.

Canada is unique. We have two founding nations. We have two official languages. In the schools in my county French language instruction begins in grade 3. We have French immersion in our public schools. We have French immersion in a high school. Students take all of their courses in French, and this is in the heart of southwestern Ontario. Our children know the value of the federation and their Canada includes Quebec.

Since the 1995 referendum I have co-operated with my colleague from Brome—Missisquoi in Quebec on a student summer work and exchange program between my riding and his. I am glad to say that this program has now spread across the country and literally hundreds of students each summer go to Quebec, New Brunswick or other parts of Canada on a work exchange, to live within the community, learn about that community and return home better people. They have no trouble understanding, working with or playing with students from Quebec. They find themselves and their parents to be very much alike.

Our young people know that Canada is respected around the globe. Canadians who travel abroad are always happiest when they return to Canada’s shores and set foot again on Canadian soil. They display the Canadian flag wherever they go because it is sine qua non. It is an entry to every country in the world, and yet here we are trying to establish a bit of a rule and clarity on how long we will keep this country going. We will not have it broken up by frivolous and unworthy claims.

The last clause in the bill states:

No Minister of the Crown shall propose a constitutional amendment to effect the secession of a province from Canada unless the Government of Canada has addressed, in its negotiations, the terms of secession that are relevant in the circumstances, including the division of assets and liabilities—

This sounds like a divorce to me. It continues:

—any changes to the borders of the province, the rights, interests and territorial claims of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada, and the protection of minority rights.

I wonder how many people have thought about what that would comprise and how long it would take, a possible change in the borders of the province.

Most of the people I discussed the matter with are concerned about four changes. First, the Inuit of northern Quebec would obviously have to be given some territory because they would not stay with Quebec if they could stay with Canada.

Second, the Cree of James Bay in northern Quebec would have to have a large chunk.

Third, maybe the Outaouais-Hull area would want to become part of Ontario because its citizens do a lot of work here. They have been freely interchanging for years.
Fourth, in my thinking about this I look at the independence of India and the partition between Pakistan and India. Eventually the two parts of Pakistan, thousands of miles apart, ended up as Pakistan, India and Bangladesh. There has not been peace between India and Pakistan since they were established. I think that if Quebec were to go, then we would have to talk about a land connection between Ontario and New Brunswick.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this debate. I listened to many members of the Bloc Quebecois talk this afternoon to this bill. Listening to them, I have the feeling that they feel that unless people are from Quebec they cannot really relate to their vision of where Quebec should go, and unless people totally support their view of this bill, then those people have had no association with or understanding of their province.

It was 20 years ago this month that I was invited to Ottawa to work, and that invitation came from a Quebecer. That Quebecer was sitting in the House of Commons with 74 out of 75 members coming from Quebec. That member of parliament, the then prime minister of Canada, went on in May of 1980 to decisively win the first referendum in the province of Quebec with a vote of almost 60-40.

In 1984, after Mr. Trudeau resigned, I decided to support another Quebecer who had served the parliament of Canada for many years. The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien did not win the leadership of the party then, but—

The Deputy Speaker: I know the hon. member meant to say the Prime Minister and I know he will want to comply with the rules in every respect.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills: You are right, Mr. Speaker. The Right Hon. Prime Minister, who of course is now in his eighth year, has put this bill before the Parliament of Canada. Quite frankly this bill is a crafted jewel. I think this bill will go down in history as one of the best things the Prime Minister has ever done.

I say that because I listen to my constituents. Not just in my community in Toronto but right across Canada there is a general feeling that the debate on Quebec’s separation has gone on long enough. One of the reasons the debate has gone on so long is that the separatists, the sovereignists, the indépendantistes, whatever we want to call them, have constantly used clouded questions, shall I say every trick in the book, to try to confuse their own communities.

The beautiful thing about this legislation is that for the first time we have the rules that will actually decide Quebec’s right to sovereignty. No one will deny that right, but some basic rules will have to be respected: one, a clear question; two, a majority; and three, we have to make sure if those conditions are met that the political actors are put together to make that secession possible.

I have not met anyone yet who is against the notion of a clear question. Why the Bloc Quebecois would argue the point with hundreds and hundreds of amendments on a simple clause is really beyond me.

It was very interesting when we listened to witnesses. Some of the most respected leaders from the province of Quebec came before us and said that this bill is in order. Some members said that maybe they would challenge the process. Maybe they would like us to take a little longer and debate it. That is a fair comment but we are elected to lead. We are elected to govern. The leadership that is in charge right now has said that we have debated this bill long enough. It has three clauses. Let us get on with it and we will be accountable for it.

One of the leaders who appeared before us was the former prime minister of Canada, the Right Hon. Joe Clark. He did not support the legislation. He felt if a situation ever did arise where a group of sovereignists were so effective and so passionate that there should be an environment where ambiguity could buy the Government of Canada some time so as to delay the process of negotiating the secession.

I thought Mr. Clark’s point was a good one. However he failed to realize that in this bill, in the third clause, we have actually enshrined a structure whereby lots of time can be taken before a secession would be possible. In other words, we could argue that clause 3 creates an environment of debate and ambiguity. The reality is that it will take us years before we can decide on the ground rules. Maybe in that period of time people in Quebec will have had the opportunity to assess if they really do want to leave this great country.

That is one of the special features of this bill. Even if there was a clear question and even if there was a clear majority, it would literally take years and years. There are people who essentially at the moment are focused on ripping this country apart. It would give us time and it would give the political actors in Canada the time to possibly drag this out until we put the right type of people in place through the electoral process.

That is one of the genius components of the bill. One could argue it actually enshrines ambiguity. That is the irony of it: the clarity bill that enshrines ambiguity.

I want my friends in the Bloc Quebecois to know that I have spent most of my political life working with people not just from my province and other provinces across Canada, but men and women from Quebec. There is a lot more to achieve by their constituents being part of this great Chamber and being part of this great country rather than continuing to knock on the door of separating them from this great nation.
Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Madam Speaker, I have mixed feelings.

First, I have a feeling of gratitude towards our colleague from Beauce—Salaberry and our colleague from Beauce—Montmagny—Orléans for their excellent work in committee, where they truly tirelessly defended the rights of Quebec.

I have mixed feelings because despite this gratitude, I believe that all who speak out in support of democracy are in a sort of mourning today.

I listened to our colleague, deliciously pompous as usual, remind us that the rule of 50% plus one suffered no exception. Spiritual son of Pierre Elliot Trudeau that he is, he should be covered in shame, because he must know that his mentor was a true supporter of the rule of 50% plus one.

In committee, a witness by the name of Guy Lachapelle, an eminent political scientist—and I will seek consent to table the document after reading it and I dedicate a single quote to my colleague—quoted former Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, who made the following statement:

Democracy genuinely demonstrates its faith in man by letting itself be guided by the rule of fifty-one per cent. For if all men are equal, each one the possessor of a special dignity, it follows inevitably that the happiness of fifty-one people is more important than that of forty-nine; it is normal, then, that—ceteris paribus—taking account of the inviolable rights of the minority—the decisions preferred by the fifty-one should prevail.

It is signed Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Approaches to Politics, Montreal, Editions du Jour, 1970.

One cannot speak out of both sides of one’s mouth. The reality is that no politician, except the Liberals, is saying that the Quebec referendum should not be decided by the National Assembly and that the 50% plus one rule should not apply.

I challenge any government member to give us one example, and political expert Guy Lachapelle clearly said “It is important to remember that no western democracy worthy of that name makes mention of a specific majority for a referendum”.

I remind hon. members that the sovereignist movement is very comfortable with the notion of democracy. Do you know why? It is because three leaders of the sovereignist movement founded political parties to periodically submit the option to the public.

three sovereignist leaders historically known and appreciated have created political parties. We know these leaders; they are Pierre Bourgault, René Lévesque and Lucien Bouchard.

From time to time, we have had the courage to submit our option to voters. Periodically, we have had referendums too. We have submitted our option to the referendum test. They took part in the 1980 campaign, and the one in 1995. The rule was 50% plus one.

What was the first reaction the next day by that great Quebecer Lucien Bouchard, at the Mirabel Airport press conference, after we lost the 1985 referendum? What did the Premier of Quebec say? His behaviour was that of a democrat. It was not that of a partisan. It was not that of a party leader, but of a democrat at the head of seven million Quebeckers. The day after the referendum, what he told Quebeckers was this “A no is a no, but when the day comes that the answer is yes, then that will be yes, and that will mean yes”.

We accept that rule. We are not saying that the 1995 outcome was too tight, that its validity is not recognized. We acknowledge that we lost the 1995 referendum, if only by 50,000 votes. A victory is a victory, if lost by 50,000 votes.

Here in the House of Commons something rather dramatic is going on. I would like to share with the House just how much indignation is being stirred up in quarters where none is usually expected.

Claude Ryan, that intellectual respected by those of all political stripes, he who was there during the discussions of the Fulton-Favreau formula, who was there for Victoria, who was there when the Parti Quebecois took power, who was there in 1995, who has been a minister, leader of the Liberal party, leader of the no faction, is a federalist. He is a self-confessed devout federalist, a militant federalist. He is a man of great discipline and no one can deny the discipline of Claude Ryan.

He appeared before the parliamentary committee. If it would not be abusing your kindness, Madam Speaker, we should circulate his brief.

I quote what he said:

In the third “whereas” of the bill, the federal government, in accordance with this principle, recognizes that “the government of any province of Canada is entitled to consult its population by referendum on any issue and is entitled to formulate the wording of its referendum question”. However, it contradicts this statement by including in the bill a clause giving the Parliament of Canada the power to interfere directly in the referendum process—

If the National Assembly has the right to consult its population on a proposal to secede, it must be able to do so free from any constraint or interference from another parliament.

That is what is bad about the bill. We accept that there is a split in Quebec between federalists and sovereignists. We wanted to
include in the referendum act provision for the ability to express one’s viewpoint, on equal terms.

We are not in a situation where one option is more amply funded than another. In democracy, everyone is entitled to his viewpoint. The best way in a democracy to oppose an idea is to propose a better one.

We sovereignists think that our idea, our viewpoint, our option are better than the federalist option. But this is not what we should be talking about today.

Bill C-20 says to Quebeckers “Whatever choice you make, no matter how you read the constitutional future, there are people outside Quebec, in the federal parliament, who will retain a veto”. And that is unacceptable.

Who are the allies of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs? I could say that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is not a democrat. I will refrain from passing personal judgement on the minister. I will put an objective question and ask his parliamentary secretary to reply. Who are the minister’s allies in Quebec?

When we think about the major central labour bodies, Claude Ryan and the student federations, we realize that the minister is a lonely man. The Bloc Quebecois does not find it easy to witness what is going on right now. It is never easy for democrats, for elected representatives to watch such wrongdoings.

I will conclude by saying that we are convinced that, in the short and the long term, Quebeckers will opt for democracy and, when they are consulted at the next federal election, they will fire this government, which has constantly bullied the National Assembly and trampled the democratic principles of which we on this side are so proud.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Given the quality of the speech delivered by the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve and given our interest in Bill C-20, I request the unanimous consent of the House to allow the member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve to have the floor for an indefinite period of time.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The hon. member is asking for unanimous consent to allow the member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve to speak for an indefinite period of time. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Madam Speaker, what you have just heard and the debate by the member across the way does not deserve any continuation. I will join in the debate and say at the outset that Bill C-20 addresses the concerns of all Canadians.

For years the people in my riding of Etobicoke—Lakeshore and, I am sure, all across the country, have wrestled with the fundamental question of keeping our country together. They have wrestled with such questions as how will legislators deal with the possible secession of a Canadian province.

This bill gives answers to Canadians. This bill, rightfully named the clarity act, gives clarity to the question. Bill C-20 is squarely in line with the Supreme Court of Canada’s opinion in the Quebec secession reference which states clearly that it is for the political actors to determine what constitutes a clear majority on a clear question.

With Bill C-20, the federal government is delivering on its responsibility to all Canadians, giving Canadians an opportunity to make an informed decision about the breakup of our country. The clarity act is about good governance and democracy, values that we cherish in our political system.

Madam Speaker, I want you to keep in mind those three words, good governance and democracy, as I proceed. What is happening here today in this debate does not speak to good governance and democracy as we hear from the members across the way; those values that we cherish in our political system, those values that are amplified in this clarity act which sets out principles and procedures under which the Government of Canada and the House of Commons must proceed if ever some day we are to decide on the clarity of the will to secede. It is a framework for the Government of Canada and it has the support of my constituents and Canadians across the country.

There was a recent poll done around December 9 to 17. It was a CROP poll conducted for the Centre for Research and Information on Canada. Some 58% of respondents agreed with the government’s intention to clarify the conditions under which secession could be negotiated. It is democracy and good governance.

The numerous amendments by the Bloc Quebecois to the bill lack substance and are clearly an obstruction of the process. When we introduce amendments in the House we do so as members of parliament with the intention of improving the legislation and improving the ideas expressed.

Motions Nos. 1, 3, 6, 8, 10 and 12 as put forward by the Bloc do not have that intention. These motions propose removing the title of the bill, deleting the existing clauses in the preamble, gutting the bill and putting us back into a position whereby Canadians would not be able to get resolution to this thorny issue of national unity.
The Bloc motions proposing the deletion of the bill title is aimed solely at stalling the procedures in the House, during the committee hearings, and are not intended to improve the bill.

On February 15, appearing before the committee studying Bill 99 in the national assembly, the Bloc’s intergovernmental affairs critic was already saying, and I quote:

The difficulty we have, is that the bill is so blatantly unacceptable that to propose substantive amendments does not seem to us to be in the order of the day. Proposing amendments to stall the passage of the bill...is something that is in the realm of possibility.

Those who say that they want democracy and that the bill is undemocratic would not at the outset let the process take its course.

My constituents want us to get clarity on the issue and to know that we can get over this difficult question that seems to come around almost in circles. They want us, as members of parliament, to do their bidding, to stand for a clear question and decisions so that however we move we will move with clarity.

The title of the bill speaks to that clarity. Any discussion from across the way that would somehow say that this is undemocratic does not really speak to the intent of the bill.

I have joined in the debate because I want to see clarity on the issue. I want my constituents to know that there are members on this side of the House who want to bring this question to a close, who want to see this legislation pass this House and who want to see us go forward into the 21st century with clarity so that whatever happens, all sides know exactly what the terms are.

I call on my colleagues and those of the opposition, the Bloc Quebecois especially who are opposing this, that they allow the democratic process to take place and let the will of Canadians be heard through this clarity act. I call on everyone of us to join in ensuring that the bill is passed.

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ): Madam Speaker, 18 months ago tomorrow, a year and a half to the day, I was elected by the people of the riding of Sherbrooke.

At that time, I was proud to represent the people of Sherbrooke, and I still am. At that time too, I was convinced that I would find the purest expression of democracy in this House. How naive I was.

I realized that more and more once I had read some excerpts from the works of political scientist Léon Dion. One of them says, in substance, that Quebec creates its own worst enemies. At the time, he did not realize that he was going to become the spiritual father of the person we can now describe as one of the worst of Quebec’s worst enemies.

We of the Bloc Quebecois have tried on numerous occasions to enlighten the 26 Quebec Liberals, who are the worst enemies of Quebec, as well as the House as a whole, by asking repeatedly for unanimous consent to table documents, and the government refused. It refused to be enlightened.

This past February 7, Parliament began its first sitting in this new millennium. Everyone thought the millennium bug was a thing of the past, but we now know this was not the case. The government is contaminated with a virus. In fact, we are pretty well certain that the millennium bug is the federal Liberal government itself.

We are all aware of several viruses affecting the Liberal government. Of course, earlier in the year, there was the Minister of Industry’s attempt to subsidize sports millionaires by giving direct favours to some helpful friends.

At the moment, there is a scandal at the Department of Human Resources Development arising from political meddling intended to help friends or buy votes.

The biggest virus, however, the most destructive, the vilest, is Bill C-20, the produce of a sort of germ or rather a two headed mite eating away at our democratic net like a sort of rat.

So, on December 13, 1999, the duo of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs tabled in the House of Commons an act to give effect to the requirement for clarity as set out in the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada. Since then, the federal government has brought out its work boots to ram through a bill that disregards the political institutions Quebec has created and acts as if there had never been three referendums.

Ideally, we would have Bill C-20 withdrawn. There are three good reasons for this.

First, it gives the House of Commons power to disallow legislation passed by the National Assembly and a choice expressed by the Quebec people.

The bill also denies Quebecers the freedom to choose their own political destiny and to include in a referendum question, should they so wish, a proposal of partnership with Canada.

Bill C-20 denies the universally accepted rule of 50% plus one for the majority and the fundamental rule of the equality of votes. And the reason for this is clear. It is because the government knows that the next Quebec referendum will be a winner for the Quebec people. So, with this bill, the government thinks it can get out of its obligation to negotiate. It is supremely wrong.
Not only does it want to get out of future negotiations, it does not even want to debate its bill in the House with the members. It proved it by imposing a gag on hon. members as early as second reading, then at the legislative committee stage and again, today, at third reading.

A few years ago, in an interview on Quebec television, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, a former Prime Minister, stated that the people were sovereign and that a country could only be founded on the will of its people to be governed, and a free people must decide its own destiny and chose democratically its leaders.

If we are free, no yoke or shackles must be put on us, nobody outside Quebec should dictate to us what to think or what to do? With Bill C-20, the federal government wants to force Quebec to do things its way, to impose the procedure and determine the rules of the game.

If, as a Quebecker, I wanted to tell Ontario or another province how to manage itself, I would be told to mind my own business. That is exactly what the majority of the members from Quebec in this House, the National Assembly as a whole and many major organizations representing thousands of Quebeckers are saying to the Liberal government in Ottawa: “Mind your own business and get off our backs. We have the sacred right to make our own decisions”.

Quebec is not a child, it is big enough to take care of itself without federal government interference. It can very well make enlightened decisions without Ottawa taking it by the hand or telling it what is good for Quebeckers.

With Bill C-20, the Liberal government is telling us, like one does with a child, how to define a fair majority, a majority that suits its needs. All over the world, the 50% plus one rule is the accepted majority. Here in Canada, which claims to be a cradle of democracy, the Liberals want to change this universally accepted rule, according to their mood. Will it be 60%, 65% or 70%? Will it depend on whether it snows or rains on that day? This is called controlling democracy.

Some major Quebec organizations have condemned Bill C-20. The CSN, the FTQ and the CEQ formed a united front to condemn this unprecedented show of force against Quebec, and so have various other associations, including student federations, women’s groups and community and social groups.

Twice, for the 1980 and 1995 referenda on the future of Quebec, it was the National Assembly that set the rules of the game and no one in Quebec, whether in the federalist or sovereignist camp, challenged the legitimacy and democratic character of these two public consultations. We had the right to do it then, but not any more. We can do it one day, but not the next day. The Liberal government is playing with democracy as if it were a yoyo.

On October 30, 1995, the no side won by a few tens of thousands of votes. The universal majority rule, 50% plus one, applied. Not one of those Quebeckers who voted yes and who lost the referendum challenged the validity of that rule. We respected the public’s decision.

Incidentally, I remind hon. members that all the referendums held in Canada so far were based on the universal rule of 50% plus one. Canada has also recognized many countries created after referendums held according to the same rule. This is also the rule used by the United Nations when it supervises referendums on sovereignty. Why should the federal government not ask the United Nations to change its democratic rule and set an arbitrary percentage to dictate the procedure to other countries?

If Quebec were sovereign, nobody would tell us what to do or what to think. We would not be in a federal yoke. The federal government was caught in its own trap when the Supreme Court of Canada recognized the legitimacy of the sovereignist option and the obligation to negotiate on equal terms. Even if Canada does not recognize a yes at the next referendum, the other counties of the international community will if everything is done democratically.

I am proud to be a Quebecker, even more so when people from Quebec are successful internationally. With sovereignty, it is Quebec as a whole that will be successful internationally.

The federal government tricked us when it repatriated the Constitution of Canada without Quebec’s consent. Enough is enough. The time when they played tricks on us and decided for us is over. We are a great people capable of taking its destiny into its own hands. We want to be autonomous and sovereign. That, at least, is clear.

[English]

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am truly pleased to stand in the House today as a member of the legislative committee that worked on the clarity bill. In a word I would describe the bill as brilliant.

The separation of Quebec would have profound effects on the whole of Canada and its citizens, including Quebeckers wishing to remain in Quebec.

While I agree with this sentiment these are not my words. These are the words of Claude Castonguay, a former Quebec cabinet minister from the Bourassa government.

The clarity bill is a reasonable bill. It is made up of three clauses. It is brief and it is straightforward unlike the 411 motions brought forward by the Bloc Quebecois with which the House will deal later today.
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In Motions Nos. 13 to 68 in Group No. 2 there are frivolous changes to the 30 day suggestion put out in the clarity bill. They range from 50 days to 250 days. They are not constructive and they do not improve this piece of legislation.

The message we all took from the 1995 referendum was that we came dangerously close to losing our country on a vague question and a dubious vote. In 1995 the referendum question asked by the Quebec government was confusing. It read:

Do you agree that Quebec should become sovereign, after having made a formal offer to Canada for a new economic and political partnership, within the scope of the Bill respecting the future of Quebec and of the agreement signed on June 12th?

Quebecers who voted on this question felt they understood, but when they were polled there was a great disparity as to what they thought they were voting on. While individuals were clear within their minds it was not a shared vision that they were voting on.

The results of the referendum saw the yes side receive 49.6% of the vote and the no side receive 50.4%. Support fluctuated by 15 percentage points depending on whether sovereignty would be accompanied by economic partnership with the rest of Canada. Voter turnout for the referendum was high because Quebecers realized the stakes were high. Individuals, while convinced their interpretations were clear, did not share the common view.

The clarity bill states that within 30 days of a provincial government officially releasing a referendum question on secession, the House of Commons would express its opinion by resolution as to whether or not the question is clear. If the House found that the vote on the question could not result in a clear expression of will by the population of that province on whether or not it would cease to be part of Canada, it would no longer deal with the question.

In reaching its assessment the House would take into account the views of other political actors, political parties in the legislative assembly of the province whose government was proposing secession, other provincial or territorial governments and other legislatures.

Soliciting a direct expression of will of the population of a province as to whether the province would cease to be part of Canada is a huge question. This has results that could not go back four years and be reversed. The Government of Canada would enter into negotiations only if the House had concluded that there had been a clear expression of will by a clear majority of the population of that province.

In reaching the assessment the House would take into account matters it considered relevant. These kinds of issues need to be dealt with in context. The clarity bill spells out the qualitative aspect of both the question and the majority.

Secession would require an amendment to our constitution. It would involve at least the governments of all the provinces as well as the Government of Canada. We would have to discuss such things as division of assets and liabilities, perhaps border changes from the province and of course the rights, interests and territorial claims of aboriginal peoples as well as the protection of the rights of minorities.

Another issue that came up very many times when we were discussing this bill—and we heard from many expert witnesses during this process—was whether or not 50% plus one was an indication of a clear majority, a majority that would be irreversible. One does not break up a country with 50% plus one.

Quebecers have already said no twice to secession but the question keeps coming up. How many times is enough? Is it three out of five? Is it five out of seven? Is it seven out of twelve? How many times will we deal with this issue?

Members opposite would have us believe that 50% plus one is a telling majority, and yet they have received that from the no side and they continue to ask the question. No means no but yes means maybe later. Yes is forever. Only a yes vote will give rise to irreversible change that will bind future generations of the country.

The supreme court requires political actors to assess the clarity of any future majority in favour of secession. It uses the expression clear majority 13 times in its ruling to underline how much it feels this is an issue to be dealt with.

The hon. member for Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok in Motion No. 2 states that the acceptable majority in the 1995 referendum was 50% plus one and therefore this is the threshold that should be used in any future referendum.

Quebec’s own referendum laws set no threshold for an acceptable majority precisely because referendums in Canada are consultative. This was recognized by the PQ government in its white paper leading to its referendum law which stated:

The fact that referenda are consultative makes it unnecessary to include provisions about a required majority or a level of voter participation.

The supreme court’s opinion made clear that there was no precise numerical threshold which would trigger negotiations but that:

It will be for political actors to determine what constitutes a clear majority on a clear question... in the circumstances under which a future referendum vote may be taken.

When we ask Quebecers what they think, on October 30, 1999, the Government of Canada released a poll that was conducted of 4,992 Quebecers. It is one of the most important and precise polls, with a margin of 1.6% error, ever conducted on the question of national unity. The will of Quebecers was never again to undergo a confused referendum process such as those that we saw in 1980 and
1995. Quebecers want the process for any future referendums to be based on the principle of clarity. Most say it is reasonable to require a clear referendum question; 93% versus 4% agreed with this statement and on a clear majority 72% agreed versus 24% before Quebec can become independent.

The majority of Quebecers say that the 1995 referendum question was not clear at a support level of 61% versus 36%. Quebecers are opposed to a unilateral declaration of independence if the yes side won in a referendum. The majority says it is reasonable that the Government of Quebec would have to reach an agreement with the rest of Canada before declaring independence.

Quebecers say there is also majority support for the supreme court’s decision that the Government of Quebec does not have the right to unilaterally declare independence. That was supported 55% versus 36%.

During our two week consultation process when we again heard from many expert witnesses, many former colleagues at different levels of government came to talk to us. Ed Broadbent commented, following:

When I read what Quebec voted on, it talked about sovereignty and then all these other things. As far as the people of western Canada are concerned—and let me say that it is very clear as I
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Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wish to designate Thursday, March 16, an opposition day.
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AN ACT TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE REQUIREMENT FOR CLARITY AS SET OUT IN THE OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA IN THE QUEBEC SECESSION REFERENCE

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-20, an act to give effect to the requirement for clarity as set out in the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec Secession Reference, as reported (without amendment) from the legislative committee, and of the amendments in Group No. 1.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate, but having been here this afternoon it may seem to people watching that this is a dispute between Ontario and Quebec.

I know that hon. members opposite do not mean it that way, but because they are the closest to Quebec it sometimes comes across that way. Indeed, people from western Canada, particularly in my area, look upon this more as a debate down east that does not make reference to them.

In my province the largest ethnic group is comprised of Anglo-Saxons, followed by the Ukrainians, the Germans and then the French. I was born in a French town. I refereed hockey in a dozen French communities, so I know very well what it is like and I am very proud to have lived in those French communities. My son-in-law’s name is Tetreau and I am proud of that as well.

Having said that, I am not about to leave the west out of this picture. As westerners are looking at this debate this afternoon, many of the people in my constituency are asking what we are arguing about. They are losing their farms. To them this is not an
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Having said that, I am not about to leave the west out of this picture. As westerners are looking at this debate this afternoon, many of the people in my constituency are asking what we are arguing about. They are losing their farms. To them this is not an important issue over their individual issues because of what has happened.

Let us take a look at what was handed to Quebec with confederation. It was guaranteed 24 senators. That is the same as the four western provinces. It was also guaranteed so many members of parliament, regardless of what happens to its population. The only other province which got that guarantee of course was Prince Edward Island.

What we do not understand about this is, when people talk about a sovereign nation, nobody explains to the people west of Ontario what they mean by that. To westerners a sovereign nation is a separate entity unto itself. It has its own laws, its own money system, its own trade and commerce, all of that. It is indeed a separate nation.

When I read what Quebec voted on, it talked about sovereignty but—and then all these other things. As far as the people of western Canada are concerned—and let me say that it is very clear as I
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travel in western Canada—if my hon. friends in the Bloc want a sovereign nation, it will have to be the total meaning of sovereignty. It will not be some sort of association. It is one or the other. They cannot have it both ways.

At the present time Quebec is part of an association, the federal government, and so is Saskatchewan an associate of this government. We do not ask for separate identities. The Europeans are coming together for particular reasons, because they are bound by international agreements or monetary agreements. Quebec would have to have a separate agreement entirely. Otherwise, B.C. would want to go. Not too long ago it was the four western provinces. Some of my friends from the west will remember the WCC, the Western Canada Concept Party. That is what it actually wanted. Its separation was based on a financial barrier, for obvious purposes.

While my people are floundering around trying to understand how they are going to live for another year, we have people here whose reasons to become separate and totally apart from Canada are not based on economics. That could be proven.

It has never been quite clear to the people of western Canada why these people are attempting to separate. To be honest with you, Madam Speaker, in all of my reading and following of this issue, that issue has never become fundamentally clear to me and it has never been fundamentally clear to the people beyond Ontario in western Canada.

● (1750)

[Translation]

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Madam Speaker, this is indeed a very sad day in the parliamentary history of Canada, because we have before us a bill that is misleading even in its title, an act to give effect to the requirement for clarity as set out in the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec Secession Reference. Many observers have commented that this requirement is nowhere to be found in the opinion of the court.

This bill deals with clarity, but the bill itself does not provide for conditions, except one, to which I will come back later on. At all of its stages, exceptional rules have been applied to this bill. This bill, supposedly on clarity, will be passed through a process that can hardly be considered democratic.

This bill has been very well understood by David Jones, a former minister-counsellor to the U.S. embassy from 1992 to 1996. In an article published in a publication available to all diplomats in Ottawa and elsewhere, he wrote “In any case, this bill on clarity is a masterpiece of political ambiguity. It allows the Quebec government to hold a referendum on any question it wishes, but Ottawa reserves the right to evaluate afterwards whether the question was clear, and, by way of consequence, whether the federal government will negotiate or not on the basis of that question”.

This is still David Jones talking, a former minister-counsellor to the U.S. embassy from 1992 to 1996. He said “Without saying it in so many words, Ottawa rejects the questions of the 1980 and 1995 referendums”. We are not the ones saying that. He goes on “Surely, a majority government could declare unclear any question but this one: Quebec will secede immediately from Canada”. This is what David Jones said.

He also talks about the 50% plus one majority. Nowhere is it said in the bill that it is not enough, but the bill provides enough latitude to state, once it is over, that it is not enough and that any other majority would not be enough either.

What else does Mr. Jones say? He says “When it moves away from the basic political rule of 50% plus one, without proposing another percentage, any democracy is moving in uncharted waters”.

This bill only contains one clear provision and it is the one that says that what will not be considered as a clear question, and will consequently not commit the government to negotiate, is a referendum question that:

(a)—merely focuses on a mandate to negotiate without soliciting a direct expression of the will of the population of that province on whether the province should cease to be part of Canada

This is very serious. It comes back to the explanation given by David Jones. Moreover, a question will not be considered clear if it:

(b)—envisages other possibilities in addition to the secession of the province from Canada, such as economic or political arrangements with Canada—

● (1755)

With these two paragraphs, as the former political adviser of the United States embassy says once again, the government is retroactively stating that both referendum questions were not clear.

If, in the historic progress of the Quebec people, there is one thing that is clear, with respect to the movement that appeared with several small parties, but flourished with the Parti Quebecois and later with the Bloc Quebecois, it is that this movement is part of the ever-changing modern model that everyone here is applauding, that is the model of the European Union.

I again quote from a text written by René Lévesque that he presented to activist members in his riding of Laurier, before submitting it to the Liberal Party, which rejected it. He said “We believe that it is possible to avoid this joint stalemate of the Canadian federation”—joint stalemate where the government
introduced Bill C-20 instead of talking about the situation of Western farmers—“by adapting to our situation the two major tendencies that dominate our era, one of which is the freedom of peoples and the other is political and economic groups freely negotiated”. This was in 1967.

How is it that no colleague from the other side tried to respond to our repeated claims that this bill is deceptive because it gives English Canadians the illusion that it will make the sovereign independent movement disappear in a jiffy?

This is an illusion and a danger because it implies that the process is an easy one, that they only have to say no and to pass a bill for the sovereignist movement to disappear. This is not so.

It is amazing, but no one talked about the will to negotiate. Having met an angel on his way, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs wrote “No, sovereignty partnership is not moderate because, between sovereignty partnership, the referendum and its conclusion, secession occurs”. That is it.

Instead of being an agent of what could be a renewal of the relations between Quebec and Canada, he says “No, no, no. The only possibility for you, my friends, is to vote for secession, period. We will decide if we will agree to negotiate with you”. He does not say that he will not have the means to object.

For example, in a referendum where the question is on the partnership option, if the results are 53.5%, given a strong vote like the last time, you will not be able to initiate any negotiation because those who pay down the debt will pressure you. You will not be able to resist the people’s pressure. We are not the ones who are creating confusion, you are.

I sincerely regret all the time spent to try to thwart the sovereigntist movement, or to convince Canadians that there is nothing to worry about, that the government will rid them of that gang, as the government House leader has said, speaking about us. Well, I have got news for you because there is a good chance that the Bloc will be even stronger next time.

In spite of this vote, in spite of this charade, this travesty of democracy that is the exceptional procedure used throughout consideration of this bill, I hope that our colleagues opposite will seriously think about the relations between Quebec and Canada. We have no choice because we are neighbours and we will remain neighbours for a very long time.

**Government Orders**

Today and this evening at 6.30 the House will be voting on 411 motions or amendments by the opposition parties. Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(5) the Speaker has grouped the motions for debate into five groups. I would like to speak to the motions in Group No. 1.

Group No. 1 deals with the preamble of the bill. The preamble itself contains eight clauses. In addition to the preamble the clarity bill itself is actually very clear and straightforward. It contains three operating clauses.

There is a reason I have chosen to speak on the preamble and on the motions within Group No. 1. I ask the Canadian people to decide for themselves tonight as they watch the House of Commons start to vote at 6.30 p.m. whether in fact what they are experiencing here is democracy at work, as my friends in the Bloc have said a number of times today, or is it really an abuse of the parliamentary process and parliamentary rules and procedure.

I do so by looking specifically at Motions Nos. 5 and 9 and talking a bit about the preamble. The bill closely reflects the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec secession reference. Each of the preamble clauses is drawn from elements of the court’s judgment. Despite Premier Bouchard’s attempt to conveniently ignore certain parts of the judgment, it is important that all the elements be reflected in the clarity act preamble.

When we look at Motions Nos. 5 and 9 which are the motions I would like to start with, we will note that Motion No. 5 seeks to delete a word from the first clause of the preamble. So that Canadians know what we are talking about, clause 1 of the preamble states:

Whereas the Supreme Court of Canada has confirmed that there is no right, under international law or under the Constitution of Canada, for the National Assembly, legislature or government of Quebec to effect the secession of Quebec from Canada unilaterally;

Instead of a motion being brought forward by my friends in the Bloc to question or to amend this, because I have heard time and again the amendments are here to make the bill better, what does Motion No. 5 say? Motion No. 5 states that Bill C-20 in the preamble be amended by replacing lines 1 and 2 on page 1 with the following, and it deletes the words that the Supreme Court of Canada “has confirmed” and replaces them with the words the Supreme Court of Canada “is of the opinion”.

Are we talking substantive amendments or are we talking as in my days as a lawyer of what we would call frivolous and vexatious motions? Let us look at that.
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Let us move to Motion No. 9 which again is a substantive amendment with so much rhetoric across the way saying that they are trying to make this bill so much better. What does Motion No. 9 say? Let us look at clause 4 of the preamble. It is important for Canadians to know what we are talking about. We are not talking about the government abusing democracy or wanting to invoke closure so that we do not have the ability to debate or make substantive comments. We are talking about proposing frivolous and vexatious motions.

Do the people of Canada know that today in the House of Commons when we start voting at 6:30 we will be potentially voting continuously until 2.30 a.m. on Thursday morning? Is that democracy at work or is it again an abuse of parliamentary procedure at best?

Let us look at what clause 4 says:

Whereas the Supreme Court of Canada has determined that the result of a referendum on the secession of a province from Canada must be free from ambiguity both in terms of the question asked and in terms of the support it achieves and that result is to be taken as an expression of the democratic will that would give rise to an obligation to enter into negotiations that might lead to secession;

What part of that section of the preamble has been moved to be changed? Are we amending ambiguity? Are we amending that there is an obligation that negotiations be entered into? Are we amending anything substantial?

Let us look at what Motion No. 9 says. It is a funny thing. It sounds like Motion No. 5 because again they want to delete a word. The word this time is not “confirmed”. It is the word “determined”, whereas the Supreme Court of Canada has given an opinion, instead of using the word “determined”.

Those are the substantial democratic amendments the members of the Bloc have proposed. Is it so substantive that we change the word “confirmed” to “determined”? What is wrong with those words?

I remind members of the House of Commons that certainly as a lawyer who practised 18 years and as a member of the Ontario bar, I knew that when the supreme court made a pronouncement it was regarded as highly persuasive and binding on all lower courts.

Governments in Canada have always acted as though reference opinions were binding on them. Governments not acting in accordance with reference opinions risk legal challenges on any aspect of opinions dealing with legal issues. Is this a question of semantics or is this a question of substance?

I would also like to quote what the supreme court noted in the reference regarding remuneration of judges of the provincial court. The court stated: “The fact that this court’s opinion is only advisory does not leave the parties without a remedy. They can seek a declaration. This court’s opinion will be of highly persuasive weight”.

Opinion, determination, confirmation; is it truly necessary that for this first group of amendments, Motions Nos. 1 to 12, that we sit here for two or three hours to determine on the preamble? What in substance is talked about in the preamble?

Motion No. 2 did address the fact that whereas when the Quebec people were consulted by referendum in 1995, the winning choice was the one that obtained the majority of the votes declared valid, that is 50% of the votes plus one.

That could possibly be a substantive amendment, but what is intended and what does that accomplish by putting that amendment in? We could also go into the history of Canada from the date of confederation and the British North America Act and what powers were given to the provinces and Quebec’s special status in Canada. We could do that as well.

Sometimes people just say things for the sake of saying things. I would submit that Motion No. 2 is exactly that.

If my friends in the Bloc were actually true to their substantive amendments, why is it that they propose in Motion Nos. 5 and 9 that the words “confirmed” and “determined” be substituted by the words “of the opinion”, but at the same time in previous Motion Nos. 4 and 8, they seek to delete both paragraph one of the preamble and number four? And if they do not get away with that, then in Motion No. 3 they completely seek to strike out the entire amount of the preamble.

I say to all Canadians, is what we are seeing here substantive amendments? Is this how we try to make our lives better? Is this what the Canadian taxpayers are paying us to do, to sit here for 55 hours to vote on, with all due respect to some who may claim in the House of Commons, substantive amendments?

I would submit that that is not the case. In fact this is not a case of democracy at work, but it is truly a case of parliamentary procedure being abused at best.

Why is the federal government taking this action in the face of such strong opposition? I would submit that the government has taken this decision because Quebecers have a right not to lose their country unless it is clearly expressed in their will and unless negotiations are concluded that respect the rights and interests of all Canadians.

As the only government representing all Canadians and as one of the parties in possible negotiations, it is important that the Government of Canada signal the circumstances under which it would enter into negotiations that could lead to the breakup of this
country. Given the dramatic consequences of secession, it is in the interests of Quebecers and all other Canadians that such negotiations only be undertaken if it is the clear will of Quebecers that they no longer wish to remain in Canada.

When we talk again about substance or frivolity, when we talk about democracy or abuse of process, I would ask all Canadians as they watch tonight and for the next 54 hours that they determine what truly is happening here.

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is sad that we even have to debate this bill. In my view it is quite simple and straightforward. It should have gone through the House without any debate at all.

This is a straightforward bill that acknowledges the right of the people to decide. All this bill does is to say that in this partnership that we are in, if one of the partners wants to leave and go on its own, it is important to at least discuss the partnership. That is what this bill is all about.

There has been more than one occasion of this so far. Two or three times in a row when asked to vote on the whole question of whether or not they want to remain a part of Canada, the people have decided they want to remain as part of Canada. The question is when is this debate going to end?

None of my colleagues in the Bloc Quebecois have stood up to tell us when enough is enough. When would the separatists say enough is enough? They lost the first time. They lost the second time. They lost the third time. And they will lose again for as long as we have a country and a nation. We will continue to have a nation for the next 10,000 years, just as we have had for the past 10,000 years.

The bottom line is that the Supreme Court of Canada has rendered a ruling. Even the premier of Quebec, Mr. Bouchard, and others have clearly applauded and clearly stated that they want the federal government to obey the decision of the court. We are responding to what Mr. Bouchard stated in the early days of when the judgment came down. That is that we have to have clear rules and everybody has a right to play as long as we know what the rules of the game are.

We are saying that at the federal level in order for us to decide whether or not we are going to participate in the breakup of this partnership, two things are absolutely unequivocal.

First, there should be a clear question that is straightforward with no monkeying around and no ups and downs. The people have to be asked a very clear question. That is fair and none of my colleagues will dispute that.

Second, there has to be an absolute majority, a clear majority. I do not think any one of my colleagues would object to that. If we were to ask a question of the people and have a clear answer to it, then let us sit down and talk. That is what the government is doing, unlike my colleagues opposite who are trying to break up one of the best countries on earth. It is the best country on earth. It is not just me and my colleagues in the House of Commons who say that. Every single person in the country knows that this is the greatest country on earth.
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AN ACT TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE REQUIREMENT FOR CLARITY AS SET OUT IN THE OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA IN THE QUEBEC SECESSION REFERENCE

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being 6:15 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the amendment stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 3. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 3 stands deferred.

I will now put the motions in Group No. 2 to the House.

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing lines 34 and 35 on page 2 with the following:

1. (1) The House of Commons shall, not before 50 days after the government of a province

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing lines 34 and 35 on page 2 with the following:

“1. (1) The House of Commons shall, not before 200 days after the government of a province”

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing lines 34 and 35 on page 2 with the following:

“1. (1) The House of Commons shall, not before 100 days after the government of a province”
Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 18
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“30 to 52 days after the government of a province”

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 19
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“40 to 66 days after the government of a province”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 21
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“38 to 60 days after the government of a province”

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 22
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“30 to 53 days after the government of a province”

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 23
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“40 to 67 days after the government of a province”

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 24
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“30 to 59 days after the government of a province”

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 25
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“40 to 60 days after the government of a province”

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 26
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“30 to 50 days after the government of a province”

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 27
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“32 to 60 days after the government of a province”

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 28
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“40 to 69 days after the government of a province”

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 29
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“30 to 60 days after the government of a province”

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 30
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“30 to 58 days after the government of a province”

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 31
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“37 to 60 days after the government of a province”

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 32
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“30 to 60 days after the government of a province”

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 33
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:
“40 to 68 days after the government of a province”

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ) moved:
Commons Debates
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Motion No. 39
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:

“30 to 57 days after the government of a province”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 40
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:

“39 to 60 days after the government of a province.”

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 41
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:

“40 to 70 days after the government of a province.”

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 42
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:

“35 to 60 days after the government of a province”

Motion No. 43
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:

“33 to 60 days after the government of a province”

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 44
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:

“34 to 60 days after the government of a province”

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 45
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:

“31 to 60 days after the government of a province”

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 46
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 41 on page 2 with the following:

“1 (1) For the purposes of subsection (1), “resolution” means a resolution adopted by a majority of the members present in the House of Commons, which majority shall consist of not less than fifty percent plus one member of the members elected for the province in which the referendum will be held.”

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 47
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 5 on page 3.

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 48
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 37 days.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 49
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 36 days.”

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 50
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 33 days”

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 51
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 39 days.”

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 52
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 30 days.”

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 53
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 32 days.”

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 54
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 35 days.”

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 55
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 34 days.”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 56
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 33 days.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 57
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 33 days.”

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 58
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 34 days.”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 59
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 34 days.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 60
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 33 days.”

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 61
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 34 days.”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 62
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 33 days.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 63
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 34 days.”

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 64
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 34 days.”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 65
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 33 days.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 66
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 34 days.”

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 67
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 33 days.”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 68
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 32 days.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 69
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 31 days.”

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:

Government Orders

Motion No. 50
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 5 on page 3.
Government Orders

That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 38 days.”

(1830)

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 60
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 3 with the following:

“be extended by an additional 31 days.”

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 61
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by deleting lines 6 to 12 on page 3.

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 62
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by deleting lines 13 to 30 on page 3.

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 63
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by deleting lines 17 to 22 on page 3.

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 64
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by deleting lines 23 to 30 on page 3.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 65
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by deleting lines 31 to 41 on page 3.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP) moved:
Motion No. 66
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing lines 39 and 40 on page 3 with the following:

“territory of Canada and any other views”

Motion No. 67
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 40 on page 3 with the following:

“resolutions by the Senate, any formal statements or resolutions by the representatives of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada, especially those in the province whose government is proposing the referendum on secession, and any other views”

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d’Orléans, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 68
That Bill C-20, in Clause 1, be amended by deleting lines 42 to 47 on page 3 and lines 1 to 3 on page 4.

[English]

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 13. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: A recorded division on Motion No. 13 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 18. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: A recorded division on Motion No. 18 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 48.

(1835)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: A recorded division on Motion No. 48 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 49.
The next question is on Motion No. 50. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: A recorded division on Motion No. 50 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 61. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: A recorded division on Motion No. 61 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 62. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: A recorded division on Motion No. 62 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 65. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: A recorded division on Motion No. 65 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 68. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: A recorded division on Motion No. 68 stands deferred.

[Translation]

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 69
That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 4 to 17 on page 4.

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 70
That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 12 on page 4 with the following:

“consider and, by resolution, adopted by a majority of the members present in the House of Commons, which majority shall consist of not less than fifty percent plus one member of the members elected for the province in which the referendum has been held, set out its deter-

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 71
That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by adding after line 17 on page 4 the following:

“(1.1) For the purposes of subsection (1), “resolution” means a resolution adopted by a majority of the members present in the House of Commons, which majority shall consist of not less than fifty percent plus one member of the members elected for the province in which the referendum has been held.”
Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 72

That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 18 to 28 on page 4.

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 73

That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 23 and 24 on page 4.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 74

That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 23 and 24 on page 4 with the following:

“(a) whether fifty percent plus one of the valid votes cast in the referendum were cast in favour of the secessionist option;”

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 75

That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 25 and 26 on page 4.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 76

That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 25 and 26 on page 4 with the following:

“(b) whether there were significant irregularities in the referendum process that would call into question the validity of the vote; and”

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 77

That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 27 and 28 on page 4.

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 78

That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 29 to 42 on page 4.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 39 to 41 on page 4 with the following:

“any province or territory of Canada and any other views it considers to be”

Motion No. 80

That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 41 on page 4 with the following:

“any formal statements or resolutions by the representatives of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada, especially those in the province whose government proposed the referendum on secession, and any other views it considers to be”

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 81

That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 8 on page 5.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 82

That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by adding after line 8 on page 5 the following:

“(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Government of Canada shall not enter into negotiations with the government of a province that has submitted a clear question to its voters in a referendum on the proposed secession of the province from Canada unless the population of the province has indicated that it wants the province to cease to be part of Canada by casting fifty percent plus one vote of the votes cast in the referendum.”

Motion No. 83

That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by adding after line 8 on page 5 the following:

“(5) Where the House of Commons determines pursuant to this section that there has been a clear expression of a will by a clear majority of the population of a province that the province cease to be part of Canada, the Government of Canada shall invite the governments of the other provinces each to name a Minister of the Crown to represent the province in the negotiations and the Ministers of the Crown so named shall participate fully in all discussions and meetings relevant to negotiating the terms of secession.”

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 81

That Bill C-20, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 8 on page 5.
And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 72 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 78. 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 will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 78 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 81. 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 will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 81 stands deferred.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 82. 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 will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 82 stands deferred.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 85

That Bill C-20, in Clause 3, be amended by replacing line 17 on page 5 with the following:

"and the Government of Canada and the representatives of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada, especially those in the province whose government proposed a referendum on secession."

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 86

That Bill C-20, in Clause 3, be amended by deleting lines 18 to 28 on page 5.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 87

(a) by replacing line 25 on page 5 with the following:

"to the borders of the province and, subject to subsection (3), the rights,"

(b) by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following:

"(3) The Government of Canada shall not negotiate terms of secession that will alter, erode or jeopardize the rights of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada unless those peoples have explicitly consented to the negotiation of such terms."

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 88

That Bill C-20, in Clause 3, be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following:

"(3) No Minister of the Crown shall propose a constitutional amendment to effect the secession of a province from Canada unless the amendment provides that, where
there has been a clear expression of a will by the population of a municipality in the province, who have cast fifty percent plus one vote of the votes cast in a referendum in the municipality, that the province not cease to be part of Canada, and the territory of that municipality shall continue to be part of Canada if (i) the territory of the municipality is immediately adjacent to the territory of another province; or (ii) the territory of the municipality is part of an unbroken chain of municipal territories in each of which there has been a clear expression of a will by the population of each municipality, who have cast fifty percent plus one vote of the votes cast in a referendum in the municipality, that the province not cease to be part of Canada, and the territory of at least one of the municipalities is immediately adjacent to the territory of another province.

Motion No. 89

That Bill C-20, in Clause 3, be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following:

“(4) For the purposes of subsection (3) “municipality” includes a village and a reserve as defined in the Indian Act.”

[English]

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 85. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: A recorded division on Motion No. 85 stands deferred.

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I apologize for intervening, but I would just like to get some clarity. As I have it in this guide, it says the question would be put on Motion No. 85 only if Motion No. 84 is negatived. You called the question on Motion No. 85, but the same situation exists with respect to Motions Nos. 87 and 86 where Motion No. 87 is put only if Motion No. 86 is negatived. Yet you did not put that question.

We have two identical situations, Motion No. 85 only being put if Motion No. 84 is negatived and Motion No. 87 only being put if Motion No. 86 is negatived. Yet you put the question on Motion No. 85 and did not put the question on Motion No. 87. I am not sure exactly what should have happened.

The Speaker: What happened was that the member who was to move Motion No. 84 was not here.

Mr. Bill Blaikie: So Motion No. 84 was not grouped apart.

The Speaker: The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 89.

[Translation]

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from the ordinary political obligations of the House of Commons to give serious consideration to the outcome of a referendum held in a province on a question concerning proposals to renew federalism through non-secessionist constitutional amendments.”

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. (1) On the expiration of 9 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of 9 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

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

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of 9 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of 18 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of 18 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of 18 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within four years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mrs. Maud Debién (Laval East, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of 18 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within five years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of 18 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of 2 years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”
Government Orders

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 100

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within ten months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 101

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within 14 months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 102

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within 14 months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 103

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 104

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4) On the expiration of two years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within four years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 105

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4) On the expiration of 27 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 106

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4) On the expiration of 27 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 107

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4) On the expiration of 27 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within four years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 108

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4) On the expiration of 27 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within four years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”
Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of 27 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Ms. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mr. Ghislain Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Government Orders
Government Orders

“4. (1) On the expiration of three years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within four years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within eight months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within ten months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within 14 months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of four years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within four years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”
“4. (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 125

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within eight months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 126

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within ten months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 127

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within 14 months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 128

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beaupré—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beauport—Île-d’Orléans, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 129

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 130

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within four years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivières-des-Mille-Îles, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 131

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 132

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of five years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”
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"4. (1) On the expiration of six years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within ten months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 133

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of six years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within eight months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 134

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of six years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within ten months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 135

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of six years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 136

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of six years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 137

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of six years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within four years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mr. Randy White: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not sure whether I got that last statement right. Was it to undertake a comprehensive review? I think I missed the last couple of words.

The Speaker: You are right, that is what it was.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 138

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 139

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose."
(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within eight months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 140

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within ten months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 141

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within fifteen months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 142

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 143

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within three years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 144

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within four years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 145

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 146

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within four years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 147

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.
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(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within two years after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 148

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of eight years after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within 14 months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 149

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4.(1) On the expiration of 9 months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within 14 months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 150

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is one year after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 151

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act comes into force two years after it is assented to.”

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 152

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council which day shall not be earlier than March 31, 2005.”

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 153

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act comes into force three years after it is assented to.”

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 154

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act comes into force four years after it is assented to.”

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d’Orléans, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 155

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act comes into force five years after it is assented to.”

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 156

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council which day shall not be earlier than March 31, 2006.”

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 157

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act comes into force six years after it is assented to.”

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 158

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council which day shall not be earlier than March 31, 2007.”

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 159

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act comes into force seven years after it is assented to.”

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 160

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act comes into force eight years after it is assented to.”

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 161
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council which day shall not be earlier than March 31, 2008.”

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 162
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act comes into force nine years after it is assented to.”

(2000)

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 163
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council which day shall not be earlier than March 31, 2009.”

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 164
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act comes into force ten years after it is assented to.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 166
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council which day shall not be earlier than March 31, 2011.”

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 167
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council which day shall not be earlier than March 31, 2012.”

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 168
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council which day shall not be earlier than March 31, 2013.”

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 169
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act comes into force twelve years after it is assented to.”

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 170
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. (1) Two years after this Act comes into force, and every two years thereafter, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall cause a review to be made of the provisions and the administration of this Act.

(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 171
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. (1) Two years after this Act comes into force, and every three years thereafter, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall cause a review to be made of the provisions and the administration of this Act.

(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 172
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. Section 1 comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Minister of Justice which day shall be after January 1, 2006, and sections 2 and 3 come into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council which day shall be after January 1, 2007.”

(2005)

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ) moved:
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Motion No. 173

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) Two years after this Act comes into force, and every four years thereafter, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall cause a review to be made of the provisions and the administration of this Act.

(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 174

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 1 comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Minister of Justice which day shall be after January 1, 2006, and sections 2 and 3 come into force on a day to be fixed by order of the President of the Privy Council which day shall be after January 1, 2006.”

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 175

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) Two years after this Act comes into force, and every five years thereafter, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall cause a review to be made of the provisions and the administration of this Act.

(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 176

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Minister of Justice which day shall be after January 1, 2007, and sections 1 and 3 come into force on a day to be fixed by order of the President of the Privy Council which day shall be after January 1, 2007.”

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 177

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) Two years after this Act comes into force, and every year thereafter, the Minister of Justice shall cause a review to be made of the provisions and the administration of this Act.

(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Justice shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 178

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 3 comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Minister of Justice which day shall be after January 1, 2006, and sections 1 and 2 come into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council which day shall be after January 2, 2006.”

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 179

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) One year after this Act comes into force, and every year thereafter, the Minister of Justice shall cause a review to be made of the provisions and the administration of this Act.

(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Justice shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 180

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 3 comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Minister of Justice which day shall be after January 1, 2006, and sections 1 and 2 come into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council which day shall be after January 1, 2007.”

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 181

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) One year after this Act comes into force, and every two years thereafter, the Minister of Justice shall cause a review to be made of the provisions and the administration of this Act.

(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Justice shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 182

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 3 comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Minister of Justice which day shall be after January 1, 2006, and sections 1 and 2 come into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council which day shall be after January 1, 2007.”
Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 183

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 184

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Justice shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 185

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4) Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the date on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 188

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4. Section 1 comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council which day shall be after January 1, 2006, and sections 2 and 3 come into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Minister of Justice which day shall be after January 1, 2006.”

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

Motion No. 189

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is one year after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the date on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 190

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4. Section 1 comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the President of the Privy Council which day shall be after January 1, 2006, and sections 2 and 3 come into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Minister of Justice which day shall be after January 1, 2007.”

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 191

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(4. (1) One year after this Act comes into force, and every five years thereafter, the Minister of Justice shall cause a review to be made of the provisions and the administration of this Act.

(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Justice shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mrs. Monique Guay ( Laurentides, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 192

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
Government Orders

“4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is one year after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the date on which this Act is assented to.”

(2020)

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 193

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Justice shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

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

Motion No. 194

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Justice shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 195

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 196

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 197

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 198

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Justice shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 199

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Justice shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 200

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Justice shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

(2025)

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 201

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Justice shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.
(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 202

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the date on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 203

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the date on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 204

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) One year after this Act comes into force, and every two years thereafter, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall cause a review to be made of the provisions and the administration of this Act.

(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 205

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the date on which this Act is assented to.”

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 206

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is one year after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 207

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ)

Motion No. 208

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 209

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ)

Motion No. 210

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ)

Motion No. 211

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) One year after this Act comes into force, and every two years thereafter, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall cause a review to be made of the provisions and the administration of this Act.

(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 212

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is one year after the day on which this Act is assented to.”
Government Orders

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 213

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 214

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

(2035)

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 215

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 218

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beaupré—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d’Orléans, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 219

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) One year after this Act comes into force, and every four years thereafter, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall cause a review to be made of the provisions and the administration of this Act.

(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.

(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 220

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 221

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 222

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) One year after this Act comes into force, and every five years thereafter, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall cause a review to be made of the provisions and the administration of this Act.

(2) Within one year after the review is undertaken, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs shall submit to Parliament a report on the review.
(3) The report shall be reviewed by a committee of the House of Commons that may be designated or established for the purpose of reviewing the report.”

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 223
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. (1) Every three years, after the coming into force of this Act, a comprehensive review and assessment of the provisions and operation of this Act must be undertaken by the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers justice matters.
(2) The committee must submit a report to Parliament within a reasonable time after the completion of its review and assessment.”

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 228
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. (1) Every five years, after the coming into force of this Act, a comprehensive review and assessment of the provisions and operation of this Act must be undertaken by the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers justice matters.
(2) The committee must submit a report to Parliament within a reasonable time after the completion of its review and assessment.”

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 230
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. (1) Every five years, after the coming into force of this Act, a comprehensive review and assessment of the provisions and operation of this Act must be undertaken by the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers justice matters.
(2) The committee must submit a report to Parliament within a reasonable time after the completion of its review and assessment.”

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 225
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. (1) Every two years, after the coming into force of this Act, a comprehensive review and assessment of the provisions and operation of this Act must be undertaken by the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers justice matters.
(2) The committee must submit a report to Parliament within a reasonable time after the completion of its review and assessment.”

Mr. René Laurin (Jolliette, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 226
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 227
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is one year after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”
Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Every year, after the coming into force of this Act, a comprehensive review and assessment of the provisions and operation of this Act must be undertaken by the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to procedure and House affairs.

(2) The committee must submit a report to Parliament within a reasonable time after the completion of its review and assessment.”

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Every two years, after the coming into force of this Act, a comprehensive review and assessment of the provisions and operation of this Act must be undertaken by the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to procedure and House affairs.

(2) The committee must submit a report to Parliament within a reasonable time after the completion of its review and assessment.”

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We greatly appreciate your reading the various motions, but would it be possible for you to indicate motion numbers so that we could follow along more easily?

The Deputy Speaker: If I change the order, I will, but I am at Motion No. 236 and I am going to continue to follow the order for a few more minutes.

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Every three years, after the coming into force of this Act, a comprehensive review and assessment of the provisions and operation of this Act must be undertaken by the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to procedure and House affairs.

(2) The committee must submit a report to Parliament within a reasonable time after the completion of its review and assessment.”

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Every four years, after the coming into force of this Act, a comprehensive review and assessment of the provisions and operation of this Act must be undertaken by the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to procedure and House affairs.

(2) The committee must submit a report to Parliament within a reasonable time after the completion of its review and assessment.”

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Every five years, after the coming into force of this Act, a comprehensive review and assessment of the provisions and operation of this Act must be undertaken by the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to procedure and House affairs.

(2) The committee must submit a report to Parliament within a reasonable time after the completion of its review and assessment.”

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Every six years, after the coming into force of this Act, a comprehensive review and assessment of the provisions and operation of this Act must be undertaken by the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to procedure and House affairs.

(2) The committee must submit a report to Parliament within a reasonable time after the completion of its review and assessment.”

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Every seven years, after the coming into force of this Act, a comprehensive review and assessment of the provisions and operation of this Act must be undertaken by the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to procedure and House affairs.

(2) The committee must submit a report to Parliament within a reasonable time after the completion of its review and assessment.”

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mrs. Maud Debién (Laval East, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 243

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 244

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 245

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is one year after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 246

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 247

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is one year after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 248

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 249

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 1 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which it is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on a day that is ten years after the day on which it is assented to.”

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 250

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 2 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 252

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is one year after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 253

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 254

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 255

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 256

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 257

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 258

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Michel Guindon (Beaupré—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d’Orléans, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 259

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is one year after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Pierre de Savoie (Portneuf, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 260

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Michel Guindon (Beaupré—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d’Orléans, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 261

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”
Motion No. 267

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 268

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 269

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Two years after the coming into force of this Act, the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to intergovernmental affairs shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend."

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 270

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 2 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 3 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 271

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Three years after the coming into force of this Act, the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to intergovernmental affairs shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend."

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 272

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to intergovernmental affairs shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend."

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 273

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Five years after the coming into force of this Act, the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to intergovernmental affairs shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend."

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 274

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is one year after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 275

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Seven years after the coming into force of this Act, the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to intergovernmental affairs shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend."

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 276

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 277

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
Government Orders

“4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is one year after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 278

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 280

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Not later than March 31, 2001, the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to intergovernmental affairs shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.”

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 281

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 282

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Not later than January 1, 2002, the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to intergovernmental affairs shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.”

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 283

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. One year after the coming into force of this Act, a committee established or designated by the House of Commons shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.”

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 285

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Not later than January 1, 2004, the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to intergovernmental affairs shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.”

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 286

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. One year after the coming into force of this Act, a committee established or designated by the House of Commons shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.”

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 287

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Not later than January 1, 2005, the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to intergovernmental affairs shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.”

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 288

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Not later than January 1, 2005, the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to intergovernmental affairs shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 289

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

‘‘4. Not later than March 31, 2001, the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers justice matters shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.’’

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 290

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

‘‘4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to.’’

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 291

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

‘‘4. Two years after the coming into force of this Act, a committee established or designated by the House of Commons shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.’’

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 292

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

‘‘4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to.’’

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 293

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

‘‘4. Three years after the coming into force of this Act, a committee established or designated by the House of Commons shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.’’

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ) moved:

Government Orders

Motion No. 294

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

‘‘4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to.’’

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 295

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

‘‘4. Five years after the coming into force of this Act, a committee established or designated by the House of Commons shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.’’

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 296

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

‘‘4. Ten years after the coming into force of this Act, a committee established or designated by the House of Commons shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.’’

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 297

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

‘‘4. Not later than January 1, 2004, the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers justice matters shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.’’

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 298

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

‘‘4. Not later than January 1, 2005, the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers justice matters shall undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act, and shall within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report to Parliament thereon including a statement of any changes the committee would recommend.’’
Government Orders

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 299

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is one year after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

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

Motion No. 300

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 301

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 302

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 303

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 304

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 305

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 306

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 307

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 308

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 309

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

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

Motion No. 310

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the day on which this Act is assented to."

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 311

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is two years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 312
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 313
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 314
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is three years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 315
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is five years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is seven years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 316
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. Section 3 shall come into force on the day that is ten years after the day on which this Act is assented to, and sections 1 and 2 shall come into force on the day that is four years after the day on which this Act is assented to.”

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 317
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on February 1, 2005.”

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 318
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on March 1, 2005.”

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 319
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on April 1, 2005.”

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 320
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on May 1, 2005.”

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 321
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on June 1, 2005.”

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 322
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on July 1, 2005.”

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 323
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on August 1, 2005.”

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 324
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on September 1, 2005.”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 325
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on October 1, 2005.”

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 326
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
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“4. This Act shall come into force on November 1, 2005.”

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 327
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on December 1, 2005.”

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 328
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on February 1, 2006.”

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 329
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on March 1, 2006.”

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 330
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on April 1, 2006.”

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 331
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on May 1, 2006.”

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 332
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on June 1, 2006.”

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 333
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on July 1, 2006.”

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 334
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on August 1, 2006.”

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 335
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on September 1, 2006.”

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 336
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on October 1, 2006.”

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 337
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on November 1, 2006.”

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 338
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on December 1, 2006.”

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 339
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on January 1, 2007.”

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles) moved:
Motion No. 340
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on February 1, 2007.”

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 341
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on March 1, 2007.”

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 342
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on April 1, 2007.”

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d’Orléans, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 343
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
“4. This Act shall come into force on May 1, 2007.”

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ) moved:
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on June 1, 2007."

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on July 1, 2007."

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on August 1, 2007."

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on September 1, 2007."

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on October 1, 2007."

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on November 1, 2007."

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on December 1, 2007."

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on January 1, 2008."

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on February 1, 2008."

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on November 1, 2008."

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on February 1, 2008."

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on December 1, 2008."

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on March 1, 2008."

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

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on January 1, 2009."

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on February 1, 2009."

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on March 1, 2009."

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ) moved:

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on March 1, 2009."

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Made- leine—Pabok, BQ) moved:
Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 362
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on May 1, 2008.”

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 363
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on May 1, 2009.”

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 364
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on June 1, 2009.”

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 365
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on July 1, 2009.”

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 366
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on July 1, 2008.”

He said: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am asking for the unanimous consent of the House to withdraw Bill C-20.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Folco): Is there unanimous consent in the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 367
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on August 1, 2009.”

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 368
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on September 1, 2009.”

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 369
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on August 1, 2008.”

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 370
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on October 1, 2009.”

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 371
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on November 1, 2009.”

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 372
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on September 1, 2008.”

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 373
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on December 1, 2009.”

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 374
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on January 1, 2010.”

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beaupré—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d’Orléans, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 375
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on February 1, 2010.”

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 376
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on March 1, 2010.”

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 377
That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:
4. This Act shall come into force on April 1, 2010.

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 378

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on January 1, 2011.”

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 379

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on May 1, 2010.”

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 380

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on February 1, 2011.”

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 381

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on March 1, 2011.”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 382

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on June 1, 2010.”

Mr. Régal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 383

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on April 1, 2011.”

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 384

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on July 1, 2010.”

Motion No. 385

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on May 1, 2011.”

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 386

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on November 1, 2011.”

“4. This Act shall come into force on June 1, 2011.”

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 387

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on July 1, 2011.”

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 388

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on August 1, 2010.”

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d’Orléans, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 389

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on August 1, 2011.”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 390

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on September 1, 2011.”

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 391

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on September 1, 2010.”

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 392

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on October 1, 2011.”

Mr. Régal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 393

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on October 1, 2010.”

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 394

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. This Act shall come into force on November 1, 2011.”
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Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 395

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on November 1, 2010."

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 396

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on December 1, 2011."

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 397

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. This Act shall come into force on December 1, 2010."

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 398

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. Notwithstanding sections 1, 2 and 3, where the population of Quebec is consulted by a referendum, the winning option is the one that obtains a majority of the votes found to be valid, or fifty percent plus one vote."

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 399

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of nine months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 401

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of nine months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 402

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of three months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 403

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

"4. (1) On the expiration of nine months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within six months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon."

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ) moved:
Motion No. 405

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of six months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within eight months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

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

Motion No. 406

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of three months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within ten months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 407

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of six months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within ten months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 408

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of three months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within eight months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC) moved:

Motion No. 409

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of three months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within ten months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 410

That Bill C-20 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 5 the following new clause:

“4. (1) On the expiration of five months after the coming into force of this Act, the provisions contained herein shall be referred to such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

(2) The committee designated or established for the purpose of subsection (1) shall, as soon as practicable, undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act and shall, within 14 months after the review is undertaken submit a report to the House of Commons thereon.”

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The question is on Motion No. 90. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on the Motion No. 90 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion. No. 91.
Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division on Motion No. 398 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 411. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The House will now proceed to the taking of the recorded divisions deferred at the report stage of Bill C-20.

Call in the members.

(Motion No. 411 negatived)

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I seek unanimous consent to have all the motions in amendment carried on division.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is there unanimous consent in the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The House will now proceed to the taking of the recorded divisions deferred at the report stage of Bill C-20.

Call in the members.

[English]

And the bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The first question is on Motion No. 1.

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

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Bigras
Bernier (Bonaventure—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Deschênes
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Marceau
Ménard
Marchand
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assaad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blais
Bonin
Borotnik
Breton (Yorkton—Melville)
Bryden
Caccia
Canning
Casey
Caschon
Charbonneau
Chouinard
Collette
Corps
Cullen
Desjardins
Dhaliwal
Dospeha
Drouin
Earle
Eggleton
Fontana
Gagliano
Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Harley
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Ianno
Jackson
Johnston
Karatek-Lindell
Keyes
Knutson
Lastenka
Lemieux
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McKay (Scarborough East)

Mcague
Mifflin
Minnia
Murray
Naft
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pattakhan
Parish
Perreault
Poupot
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekerci
Shepherd
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julie

McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Pardy
Phiney
Proctor
Protsch
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Sgro
Solberg
St. Denis
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Torsney
Valeri
Volpé
Wasylcyck-Leis
Willet

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 1 lost.

The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 2.

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

(Division No. 762)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Bigras
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Bights)
de Savoye
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Marceau
Ménard
Marchand
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp

Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Pardy
Phiney
Proctor
Protsch
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Sgro
Solberg
St. Denis
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Torsney
Valeri
Volpé
Wasylcyck-Leis
Willet

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Heepen
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 1 lost.

The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 2.

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

(Division No. 762)
Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare the amendment to Motion No. 2 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

(2255)

(Division No. 763)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergen
Bédard (Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Blais
Bien
Cardin
Côté
de Savoye
Detajfaj
Dubé
Earle
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Girouard
Guay
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Mayfield
Mercier
Perron
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Solberg
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turr

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Belanger
Belliveau
Bélair
Beloque
Bonin
Borowski
Brown
Bulte
Bon
Boroverski

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare the amendment to Motion No. 2 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

(2255 )

(Division No. 763)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergen
Bédard (Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Blais
Bien
Cardin
Côté
de Savoye
Detajfaj
Dubé
Earle
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Girouard
Guay
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Mayfield
Mercier
Perron
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Solberg
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turr

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Belanger
Belliveau
Bélair
Beloque
Bélanger
Belanger
Benoit
Bélanger
Belanger
Benoit
Belanger
Belanger
Belanger

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare the amendment to Motion No. 2 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

(2255 )

(Division No. 763)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergen
Bédard (Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Blais
Bien
Cardin
Côté
de Savoye
Detajfaj
Dubé
Earle
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Girouard
Guay
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Mayfield
Mercier
Perron
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Solberg
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turr

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Belanger
Belliveau
Bélair
Belanger
Belanger
Belanger
Belanger
Belanger
Belanger
Belanger
Belanger
Belanger
Belanger

Duhamel 
Eggleton 
Folco 
Fry 
Gallaway 
Goodale 
Harvey 
Ianno 
Jackson 
Jordan 
Karygiannis 
Keyes 
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh) 
Kraft Sloan Lastewka 
Leung 
Lincoln 
MacAulay 
Mahoney 
Maloney 
Marleau 
Matthews 
McKay (Scarborough East) 
McLaugh 
Millin 
Mina 
Murray 
Nault 
O'Brien (Labrador) 
O'Reilly 
Paradis 
Paty 
Phinney 
Pratt 
Proulx 
Redman 
Richardson 
Rock 
Scott (Fredericton) 
Sgro 
Speller 
St-Julien 
Stewart (Brant) 
Stabo 
Torrey 
Valeri 
Volpé 
Whelan 
Wood—143

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson 
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) 

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 2 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

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

(Division No. 764)

YEAS

Members

Alarie 
Bachand (Saint-Jean) 
Bergeron 
Bess-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok 
Brien 
Cardin 
Crête 
Debien 
Dube (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) 
Fournier 
Girard-Bujold 
Guy 
Lalonde 

Lebel 
Marchand 
Ménard 
Perreault 
Plamondon 
Sauveau 
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) 
Turb

Loubier 
Mercier 
Picard (Drummond) 
Rocheleau 
St-Hilaire 
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matane) 
Venne—41

NAYS

Members

Adams 
Assadourian 
Axworthy 
Baker 
Beard 
Bevilacqua 
Boudreau—Andrew 
Brethke (Yorkton—Melfort) 
Caplan 
Cauci 
Chap 
Charest (Saint-Maurice) 
Codere 
Comuzzi 
Cullen 
Desjardins 
Dion 
Duhamel 
Eggleston 
Foy 
Goddard 
Greenval 
Hanger 
Hardy 
Harvard 
Hill (Mackay) 
Hill (Prince George—Peace River) 
Ianno 
Karygiannis 
Knottson 
MacAulay 
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough) 
Mark 
Martin (Laval—Ébable) 
McGibbon (Edmonton West) 
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) 
Mitchell 
Nault 
Normand 
Pagliakhan 
Piragis 
Piragis 
Polier 
Scott (Fredericton) 
Speller 
St-Julien 
Stewart (Brant) 
Volpé 
WaylyInc—Lesi

Assad 
Augustine 
Buchard (Richmond—Athabaska) 
Bakopanos 
Bertrand 
Blais 
Brudshaw 
Caccia 
Casey 
Chan 
Chétic (Saint-Maurice) 
Collette 
Copp 
Davies 
Dhillon 
Dromski 
Earle 
Fontana 
Gibson (Acadie—Bathurst) 
Gouk 
Guarnieri 
Hart 
Hart 
Harvey 
Hill (Prince George—Peace River) 
Ianno 
Johnston 
Keyes 
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) 
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) 

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 3 lost.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson 
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) 

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 3 lost.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.
Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (2310 )

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

(Division No. 765)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Brien
Charron (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dumas
Gagnon
Gédin (Charlevoix)
Guindon
Laurin
Marcel
Ménard
Peronn
Plamondon
Sauvé
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bigras
Calin
Delbée (Lévis—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Drouin
Fonseca
Lafond
Loubier
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheslaw
St-Hilaire
Venne
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mallin
Mantle
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Murray
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Paradis
Peric
Proctor
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Speller
Stewart (Northumberland)
Torsey
Wood
Longfield
MacKay (Picton—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney
Marie-François
McConnell
McTeague
Miller
Nystrom
O’Reilly
Parish
Phinney
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Siberg
Stewart (Brant)
Teleghy
Wasylcyw-Leis

NAYS

Members
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Beaumier
Belanger
Benot
Blake
Brown
Caccia
Calder
Casey
Charbonneau
Cullen
Cupps
Davies
DeVillers
Dromisky
Easter
Finlay
Gallaway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Harper
Harvard
Hill (Macleod)
Hubbard
Ithod
Johnson
Kraft Sloan
Asselain
Bellehumeur
Bérubé
Bigras
Calin
Charron (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dumas
Gagnon

PAIRED MEMBERS

*Nil/aucun

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 4 lost.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (2320 )

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

(Division No. 766)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Brien
Bélanger
Brown
Bryn
Calin
Cassidy
Charron (Saint-Maurice)
Copp
DeSousa
Dijon
Donnelly
Dowd
Durnan
Elgido
Finlay
Fostey
Gallaway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gournier
Hardy
Hardy
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jackson
Krasnow
Lastiwka
Asselin
Bélanger
Bérubé
Bigras
Calin
Charron (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dumas
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold Girard-Bujold
Guay Guay
Lalonde Lalonde
Label Label
Marceau Marceau
Ménard Ménard
Perron Perron
Plamondon Plamondon
Sauvageau Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis) Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Alcock Alcock
Axworthy Axworthy
Brébier Brébier
Bellemare Bellemare
Bégin Bégin
Bordeau Borodeau
Cadam Cadam
Casey Casey
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Colleau Colleau
Copps Copps
Davies Davies
Eairs Eairs
Elliot Elliot
Folco Folco
Gallaway Gallaway
Goldin (Acadie—Bathurst) Goldin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal Grewal
Guarnieri Guarnieri
Hardy Hardy
Harvey Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River) Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jackson Jackson
Johnston Johnston
Karetak-Lindell Karetak-Lindell
Lastewka Lastewka
Limoges Limoges
Lunn Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough) MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maheu Maheu
Malhi Malhi
Manley Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard) Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West) McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney McWhinney
Murray Murray
Nystrom Nystrom
O’Reilly O’Reilly
Perron Perron
Proctor Proctor
Redman Redman
Richardson Richardson
Rock Rock
 Sekora Sekora
Shepherd Shepherd
Siabao Siabao
Valeri Valeri
Whelan Whelan

YEAS

Members

Adams Adams
Assadurian Assadurian
Axworthy Axworthy
Baker Baker
Brébier Brébier
Bertrand Bertrand
Bordeau Borodeau
Caplan Caplan
Caugheen Caugheen
Charbonneau Charbonneau
Codere Codere
Comuzzi Comuzzi
Desjardins Desjardins
Duhamel Duhamel
Egletton Egletton
Fry Fry
Goodale Goodale
Guarnieri Guarnieri
Harb Harb
Harvey Harvey
Hill (Macleod) Hill (Macleod)
Johnston Johnston
Keyes Keyes
MacAulay MacAulay
Mancini Mancini
Marleau Marleau
Martin (Minnepag Centre) Martin (Minnepag Centre)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare the amendment to Motion No. 5 lost.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(Division No. 767)

NAYS

Members

Adams Adams
Assad Assad
Axworthy Axworthy
Baker Baker
Brébier Brébier
Bertrand Bertrand
Bordeau Borodeau
Caplan Caplan
Caugheen Caugheen
Charbonneau Charbonneau
Codere Codere
Comuzzi Comuzzi
Desjardins Desjardins
Duhamel Duhamel
Egletton Egletton
Fry Fry
Goodale Goodale
Guarnieri Guarnieri
Harb Harb
Harvey Harvey
Hill (Macleod) Hill (Macleod)
Johnston Johnston
Keyes Keyes
MacAulay MacAulay
Mancini Mancini
Marleau Marleau
Martin (Minnepag Centre) Martin (Minnepag Centre)

Yeas

Members

Alarie Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean) Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Begeman Begeman
Béliveau (Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok) Béliveau (Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Brien Brien
Cardin Cardin
Côté Côté
Dubeau Dubeau
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Fournier Fournier
Girard-Bujold Girard-Bujold
Guy Guy
Lalonde Lalonde
Lébel Lébel
Marceau Marceau
Ménard Ménard
Perron Perron
Plamondon Plamondon
Sauvageau Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis) Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

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

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): (2325)

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

(Division No. 767)
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 5 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 6. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(2330)

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

(Division No. 768)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur

Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)

Bérubé
Biggar

Blais
Bigras

Bouchard (Richmond—Arthabaska)

Bruneau
Brodeur

Bélanger
Boulanger

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
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Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
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Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa
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Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bourassa

Bouchard
Bou
Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(2335 )

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

(Division No. 769)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean) Bellemare
Bergeron Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Biggar)
Béland Camus
Bertrand Charette (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Bélanger Crête de Savoie
Bélisle Deschênes
Béliveau Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Bernier Gagnon
Bérubé Girard-Bujold
Bigras Godin (Châteauguay)
Bourassa Guay
Boulet Lalonde
Boule Laurin
Bourque Lebel
Bourassa Loubier
Brassard Marceau
Bruneau Ménard
Buies Marchand
Bucarey Mercier
Buquet Perron
Cadieux Picard (Drummond)
Caldwell Plamondon
Carrington Rocheleau
Chabot Sauvageau
Champagne Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Charbonneau Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Chartrand Turpin

NAI YS

Members

Adams Assadourian
Augustine Axworthy
Bakopanos Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bell Aiken
Bélair Bakopanos
Bellemare Bellemare
Belzile Béliveau
Blais Blondin-Andrew
Blais Bélanger
Borotnik Cadman
Casey Cachon
Chauveau Chartier
Châteauguay Côté
Cliche Comuzzi
Cliche Copps
Collins Cullen
Dagenais Don
Dahan Dalton
Eggleston Earle
Grey (Edmonton North) Fry
Harper Harvey
Hind Johnston
Kerry Keesey
Knuth MacKay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough) MacPhee
Manley MacPherson
Martin (LaSalle—Émard) Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McLellan (Edmonton West) Milliken
McMillan Mitchell
Melnyk Normand
Meneghetti Norland
Morin Peric
Munro Pimentel
Marsden Proctor
Proulx Robichaud
Provencher Scott (Fredericton)
Proulx St. Denis
St-Julien Watts
Williams —69

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nussnata

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 7 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(2345 )

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

(Division No. 770)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean) Bellemare
Bergeron Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Biggar)
Béland Camus
Bertrand Charette (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Bélanger Crête de Savoie
Bélisle Deschênes
Béliveau Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Bernier Gagnon
Bérubé Girard-Bujold
Bigras Godin (Châteauguay)
Bourassa Guay
Boulet Lalonde
Boule Laurin
Bourque Loubier
Brassard Marceau
Bruneau Ménard
Buies Marchand
Bucarey Mercier
Buquet Perron
Cadieux Picard (Drummond)
Caldwell Plamondon
Carrington Rocheleau
Chabot Sauvageau
Champagne Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Charbonneau Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Chartrand Turpin

NAI YS

Members

Assad Assad
Axworthy Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos Bellemare
Bell Aiken
Bélair Béliveau
Beloit Béliveau
Blais Blondin-Andrew
Blais Bélanger
Borotnik Cadman
Casey Copps
Chan Cullen
Châteauguay Comuzzi
Cliche Copps
Collins Cullen
Dagenais Don
Dahan Dalton
Eggleston Earle
Grey (Edmonton North) Fry
Guarnieri Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale Godin (Châteauguay)
Grey (Edmonton North) Guarnieri
Harper Harvey
Harvard Johnston
Hind Johnston
Kerry Keesey
Knuth MacKay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough) MacPhee
Manley MacPherson
Martin (LaSalle—Émard) Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McLellan (Edmonton West) Milliken
McMillan Mitchell
Melnyk Normand
Meneghetti Norland
Morin Peric
Munro Pimentel
Marsden Proctor
Proulx Robichaud
Provencher Scott (Fredericton)
Proulx St. Denis
St-Julien Watts
Williams —69

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The next question is on Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(2345 )

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

(Division No. 770)
Government Orders

Calder
Casey
Charbonneau
Collenette
Copps
Desjardins
Discoula
Earle
Eggleton
Gallaway
Godin
(Godin—Bathurst)
Grey
(Hardy)
Harvey
Harvey
Hill
Hubbard
Johnston
MacAulay
Maloney
Manley
Martin
(Martin—Edmonton West)
Nystrom
Phinney
Robillard
Saada
Speller
Torsney
Williams—71

Cannis
Cauilhon
Christien (Saint-Maurice)
Comuzzi
Cullen
De Villers
Dromskey
East
Finlay
Godbey
Goodale
Hanger
Harvard
Jackson
Knutson
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini
Marleau
Martin
(Winnipeg Centre)
Mifflin
Picard
(The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:)

YEAS

Members

Alarie (Saint-Jean)
Asselin
Bacheletteur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)

Biggar
Brien
Cardin
Christien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
De Groot
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Fournier
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Chateauguay)
Guay
LaPierre
Laforest
Label
Marcoux
Ménard
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay
(Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assad
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bennett
Blakie
Bonin
Borotnik
Brown
Bryan
Cadman
Canns
Caucilhon
Chrieten (Saint-Maurice)
Collette
Copp
Desjardins
Dion
Dumont
Earle
Fry
Goobide
Harper
Harvey
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Jackson
Karygiannis
MacAulay
Maloney
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McLellan
(Edmonton West)
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nault
Nystrom
Phinney
Proctor
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)

And more than five members having risen:

● (2350)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 8 lost.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare the amendment to Motion No. 9 lost.

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

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

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (2355 )

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

(Division No. 772)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Cardin
Côté
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Marchand
Marceau
Ménard
Person
Plamondon
Sauvé
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tyr

Asselin
Béliveau
Bérubé (Bonaventure—Gaspe)
Bigras
Chérif (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Dumas
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guindon
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Limouski—Matin)
Venne

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bouchier
Bélanger
Bertrand
Bourin
Brown
Caldwell
Casson
Charbonneau
Collinette
Copp
Dejaures
Doré
Easter
Finlay
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gray (Edmonton North)
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Jackson
Kraft-Shan

Assaad
Axworthy
Bakspanos
Belanger
Benoit
Blakie
Boron
Bryden
Casey
Charbonneau
Collette
Copp
Dejaures
Earle
Eggleton
Godfrey
Godque
Hardy
Hubbard
Jackson
Kraft-Shan

Government Orders

Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini
Martin
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Martin
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McLeish (Edmonton West)
Nystrom
Plamondon
Robillard
Saada
Speller
Torsney
Williams

MacAulay
Maloney
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Paradis
Prentice
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
St. Denis
Wasylcy-Les

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoegger
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 9 lost.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

● (2400 )

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (2405 )

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

(Division No. 773)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Cardin
Côté
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guindon
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Marceau
Ménard
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Limouski—Matin)
Venne

Asselin
Béliveau
Bérubé (Bonaventure—Gaspe)
Bigras
Chérif (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Dumas
Gagnon
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Godque
Hardy
Hubbard
Jackson
Kraft-Shan

MacAulay
Maloney
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Paradis
Prentice
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
St. Denis
Wasylcy-Les

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 10 lost.
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 11. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 lost.
The next question is on Motion No. 12. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (2415)

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

(Division No. 775)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
<td>Biggar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
<td>Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charron (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
<td>Deschênes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Savoie</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Assad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assadourian</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
<td>Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
<td>Benoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrand</td>
<td>Bevilacqua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blondin-Andrew</td>
<td>Bortnik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadman</td>
<td>Casey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauchon</td>
<td>Chan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codere</td>
<td>Collette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumuzzi</td>
<td>Copps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullen</td>
<td>Désjardins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>Drozdzky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducharme</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggleton</td>
<td>Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fy</td>
<td>Gédin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North)</td>
<td>Gruending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri</td>
<td>Hanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacAulay</td>
<td>Karygiannis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancini</td>
<td>Labrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (LaSalle—Édouard)</td>
<td>MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLellan (Edmonton West)</td>
<td>Mancini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)</td>
<td>Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
<td>Martin (Edmonton Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nault</td>
<td>Millian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasit</td>
<td>Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robillard</td>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoffer</td>
<td>Torsney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wappel</td>
<td>Wasylycia-Leis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

| Anderson | Hoeppner |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) | Nunziata |

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 12 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 13.

● (2420)

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

(Division No. 776)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
<td>Biggar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
<td>Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charron (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
<td>Deschênes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Savoie</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ménard</td>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Assad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assadourian</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
<td>Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
<td>Benoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrand</td>
<td>Bevilacqua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blondin-Andrew</td>
<td>Bortnik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadman</td>
<td>Casey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauchon</td>
<td>Chan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codere</td>
<td>Collette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumuzzi</td>
<td>Copps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullen</td>
<td>Désjardins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>Drozdzky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducharme</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggleton</td>
<td>Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fy</td>
<td>Gédin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North)</td>
<td>Gruending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri</td>
<td>Hanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karygiannis</td>
<td>Labrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacAulay</td>
<td>MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancini</td>
<td>Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (LaSalle—Édouard)</td>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLaren (Edmonton West)</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
<td>Phinnery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickup</td>
<td>Robillard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Julien</td>
<td>Stoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torsney</td>
<td>Williams—73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Government Orders
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 13 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 14.

(2425)

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

(Division No. 777)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Béliveau
Bergeron
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Bougie
Cardin
Charbonneau (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Côté
de Savoie
Deschênes
Dumas
Fournier
Guay
Guay
Lalonde
Loubier
Marchand
Ménard
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—26

NAYS

Members

Adams
Augustine
Baker
Belair
Bélanger
Benoit
Bertrand
Bourque
Bougie
Bourque
Boutin
Bryan
Côté
DeVillers
Dumesnil
Duhamel
Dyck
Earle
Eggerton
Fry
Goddard
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Guérin
Guimond
Hardy
Harvey
Hubbard
Hubbard
Jackson
Johnston
Karygiannis
Keyes
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mackey
Maloney
Mancini
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Emard)
McKay (Scarborough East)
McKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney
McKnight
McKnight (Edmonton West)
McLean
McLean (Edmonton West)
McWhirter
Mitchell
Mitchell
Norman
Paradis
Parr
Proulx
Reed
Reed
Shepherd
Siffer
St-Julien
St-Amand
Ur
Whelan
Williams—65

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 14 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 15.

(2430)

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

(Division No. 778)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Béliveau
Bergeron
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Bougie
Cardin
Charbonneau (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Côté
de Savoie
Deschênes
Dumas
Fournier
Guay
Guay
Lalonde
Loubier
Marchand
Ménard
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS

Members

Adams
Augustine
Baker
Belair
Bélanger
Benoit
Bertrand
Bourque
Bougie
Bourque
Boutin
Bryan
Côté
DeVillers
Dumesnil
Duhamel
Dyck
Earle
Eggerton
Fry
Goddard
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Guérin
Guimond
Hardy
Harvey
Hubbard
Hubbard
Jackson
Johnston
Karygiannis
Keyes
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mackey
Maloney
Mancini
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Emard)
McKay (Scarborough East)
McKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney
McKnight
McKnight (Edmonton West)
McLean
McLean (Edmonton West)
McWhirter
Mitchell
Mitchell
Norman
Paradis
Parr
Proulx
Reed
Reed
Shepherd
Siffer
St-Julien
St-Amand
Ur
Whelan
Williams—67
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 15 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 18.

(The House divided on Motion No. 18, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 779)

**YEAS**

Members

Asselin
Belkheimour
Bigras
Cahel
Chétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Dumas
Guay
Laflède
Leduc
Marcoux
Ménard
St-Hilaire

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Biron
Canuel
Crette
Deschênes
Fournier
Guimond
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—26

**NAYS**

Members

Adams
Augustine
Axworthy
Baker
Bennett
Bélanger
Benoit
Bertrand
Blanke
Borotusk
Cadman
Canuel
Catherine
Collette
Collenette
Colonne
Cullen
DeVellès
Discalopoli
Earle
Eggleton
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Guarnieri
Hardy
Harvey
Hubbard
Jackson
Keratok-Lindell
MacKay (Picton—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
MacKay (Edmonton West)
Mefflin
Mitchell
Moloney
Manley
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McLellan
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Muir
Newfoundland
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
St. Denis
Stoffer
Telegdi
Wappel
Wasylycia-Leis
Williams—63

**NAYS**

Members

Akcock
Axworthy
Bélair
Bélanger
Bennett
Benoit
Blanke
Borotusk
Cadman
Canuel
Catherine
Collette
Collenette
Colonne
Cullen
DeVellès
Discalopoli
Earle
Eggleton
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Guarnieri
Hardy
Harvey
Hubbard
Jackson
Keratok-Lindell
MacKay (Picton—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mefflin
Mitchell
Moloney
Manley
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McLellan
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Muir
Newfoundland
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
St. Denis
Stoffer
Telegdi
Ur
Valeri
Wasylycia-Leis
Wasylycia-Leis
Williams—66
The next question is on Motion No. 22. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was negatived on the following division:

**Division No. 782**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggar</td>
<td>Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauvin</td>
<td>Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crête</td>
<td>de Savoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>Guay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimond</td>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
<td>Lebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Ménard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaikie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borysiuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comuzzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dejaureguis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Acadia—Bathurst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karygiannis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mifflin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wappel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams—57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson | Hooper |
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) | Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 21 lost.
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Stoffer
Ur
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert

Szabo
Valeri
Whelan
Williams—64

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 22 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 23. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(2455)

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

(Division No. 783)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Belhumeur
Biggar
Cassel
Chétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Dumas
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Maceau
Ménard
St-Hilaire

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Brien
Cardin
Ciré
Deschênes
Fournier
Guimond
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Savard
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—26

NAYS

Members
Augustine
Baker
Beaumier
Blake
Cadman
Casey
Chan
Collechette
De Villiers
Dumaresq
Eggerton
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Harvard
Johnston

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakun
Benoit
Boninek
Calder
Cauvain
Côté
Cullen
Dion
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grégoire
Hardy
Hill (Mackay)
Jones

Government Orders

Karygiannis
MacAskill
Maloney
Manley
McLeish (Edmonton West)
Mitchell
Normand
Saada
St-Julien
Wappel
Wasylycia-Leis

Laliberte
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mifflin
Nault
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Spéiler
Stoffer
Wasylycia-Leis

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 23 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 24. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(2500)

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

(Division No. 784)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Belhumeur
Biggar
Cassel
Chétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Dumas
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Marchand
Savard
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—25

NAYS

Members
Alcock
Bennett
Blakie
Butt
Casey
Cleghorn
Côté

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Benoit
Boninek
Cauvain
Cullen
Collechette
Earle

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 24 lost.
Government Orders

Easter
Folco
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Harvard
Johnston
Jordan
Kraft Sloan
Langlefield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Provenzano
Sekora
Steckle
Szabo
Wasylycia-Leis
Williams—53

Eggleton
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending
Harvey
Jones
Kearak-Lindell
Laliberte
MacAulay
Manley
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McWhinney
Proulx
Redman
Shepherd
Stuffer
Ur

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 24 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 26. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 26, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 785)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Béliveau
Bigras
Caulier
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Dumas
Guay
Laflamme
Lebel
Marcoux
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—25

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergen
Brien
Cardin
Côté
Deschênes
Fournier
Guimond
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
St-Hilaire

NAYS

Members

Adams
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bevilacqua
Boulet
Bryden
Calder
Casey
Chant
Coffin
DeVillers
Duhamel
Eggleton
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending
Harvey
Hill (Mackay)
Jones
Laliberte
MacAulay
Manley
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mitchell
Nault
Normand
Saada
St-Julien
Wappel
Williams—57

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 26 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 27. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 27, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 786)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Béliveau
Bigras
Caulier
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergen
Brien
Cardin
Côté
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Desrochers  Dumas
Fournier  Guay
Guimond  Lalonde
Laurin  Loubier
Marceau  Marchand
Ménard  Sauvageau
St-Hilaire

NAYS
Members

Alcock  Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Belanger  Belanger
Benoit  Benoit
Bousquet  Cadman
Cauchon  Cauchon
Collenette  Earle
Folco

Some hon. members:

Agreed.

Some hon. members:

No.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 28, which was negatived on the following division:)

YEAS
Members

Asselin  Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Beliveau  Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Brien  Biggar
Cardin  Côté
de Savoie  Desrochers
Dumas  Fournier
Guay  Guimond
Lalonde  Laurin
Lebel  Loubier
Marceau  Marchand
Ménard  Sauvageau
St-Hilaire

The House divided on Motion No. 28, which was negatived on the following division:

Division No. 787

YEAS
Members

Adams  Augustin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)  Baker
Bakuponos  Bélair
Benoit  Blaikie
Bouin  Bour四十
Brown  Bryden
Cadman  Calder
Cannis  Casey
Couchon  Chan
Cudmore  Collette
Cullen  DeVillers
Dion  Drouin
Earle  Drouin
Grey (Edmonton North)  Gruending
Hanger  Hardy
Harvard  Hill (Macleod)
Johnston  Jones
Keys  Laiberte
MacAulay  MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney  Manley
Mitchell  Mifflin
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  Normand
Scott (Fredericton)  Saada
St-Julien  St Denis
Wappel  St Julien
Williams—53

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 27 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 28. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 28, which was negatived on the following division:)

NAI YS
Members

Anderson  Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 28 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 29. Is it the pleasure for the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 29, which was negatived on the following division:)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson  Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 27 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 28. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 28, which was negatived on the following division:)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson  Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 28 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 29. Is it the pleasure for the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.
Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(2515)

(The House divided on Motion No. 29, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 788)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Berner (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar
Brien
Canuel
Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Dumas
Fournier
Guay
Guimond
Lalonde
Loubier
Marceau
Ménard
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Bélanger
Bennett
Benoit
Blake
Borowski
Casey
Cauchon
Char
Codette
Collinette
Codier
Earle
Easter
Folco
Fry
Grey (Edmonton North)
Harvard
Hanger
Harvard
Hill (Macleod)
Jones
Jordan
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft
Laliberte
MacAskill
Mancini
Malhi
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McKinstry
Melfi
Myers
Normand
Percy
Pickard
Proud
Provenzano
Scott (Fredericton)
Sekera
Shepherd
St-Julien
Steckle
Stoffer
Szabo
Ur
Vaillancourt
Wappel
Williams—62

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoppe
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The next question is on Motion No. 30.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We are going through difficult times, but I think we must take the time to do things the right way. I am sure all my colleagues from all sides of the House will want to join me and thank our pages who are working here tonight. I will name them—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

[English]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

(2520)

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(Division No. 789)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Berner (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar
Brien
Canuel
Cardin
de Savoye
Dumas
Fournier
Guay
Guimond
Lalonde
Loubier
Marceau
Ménard
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Bélair

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 29 lost.
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Bélanger
Bouin
Bryden
Calder
Casey
Chat
Colliette
Cullen
Earle
Fry
Ginette
Hill (Macleod)
Jones
Labire
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Maloney
Manley
Mifflin
Proulx
Scott (Fredericton)
St Denis
Stoffer
Wayllycia-Leis

Benoit
Boumuk
Cannis
Caudron
Cotier
Dion
Easter
Harvard
Johnson
MacAulay
Malhi
Mancini
Normand
Saada
Shepherd
St Julien
Wappel

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Kunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 30 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 32. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

● (2525)

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(Division No. 790)

YEAS

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Belheurneur
Bérgeron

Bélanger (Hauterive—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bétien

Bigras
Bigras

Cannon
Cardin

Chartier (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cyber

de Savoye
Deschênes

Dumas
Frenier

Guindon
Lafon

Lebel
Lougher

Marchand
Marchand

Ménard
Ménard

St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—25

Members

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Kunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 32 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 33. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

● (2530)

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 33, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 791)

YEAS

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Belheurneur
Bérgeron

Members
**Government Orders**

Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Biggar  
Chretien (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
de Savoye  
Dumas  
Guay  
Lafon de Savoie  
Loupier  
Marchand  
Sauvageau  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  

---

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auguste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaikie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borotnick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauchon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gé (Edmonton North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Sloan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laberge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacAulay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallié</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mifflin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proulx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (Fredericton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Denis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wappel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasylycia-Leis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams—48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anderson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoepner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 33 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 34. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

---

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borotnick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauchon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouthier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Sloan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laliante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacAulay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mifflin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proulx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Denis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasylycia-Leis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anderson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoepner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 34 lost.

---

**Mr. Réal Ménard:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to ask how many votes are left before the end of the proceedings. Could you tell us for the benefit of all members?
The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry, I have no idea because some motions could go without a recorded division. However, the Speaker remains at the service of the House.

(2540)

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 35. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(2545)

(The House divided on Motion No. 35, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 793)

YEAS

Members

Asselin                                           Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellemare                                         Bergeron
Bertrand (Jonquière—Laurentian)—Lévis—Les-Saintes
Bigras                                           Canuel
Charron (Frontenac—Mégantic)                     Côté
de Savoie                                        Desrosiers
Dumas                                             Fournier
Guy                                               Guimond
Lafrance                                         Laurin
Lebel                                             Loubier
Marceau                                          Marchand
Ménard                                            Savoie
St-Hilaire                                        Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS

Members

Alocak                                            Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)                    Bakur
Beaumier                                          Belair
Belanger                                          Bennett
Benoit                                            Blaikie
Bonin                                             Boucher
Borossak                                          Boulé
Cadman                                            Calder
Cachon                                             Codére
Cullen                                            Dion
Duhamel                                            Finlay
Goodale                                            Grey (Edmonton North)

Government Orders

Gruending
Hardy
Hill (Mackay)                                      Jones
Kraft Sloan                                        MacAulay
Maloney                                           Mantey
McClellan (Edmonton West)                         Normand
Reed                                              Scott (Fredericton)
Shepherd                                          Stockwell
Stobie                                            Valeri
Wheelan                                            Williams—58

Hanger                                           Harvard
Johnston                                          Keyes
Lablèbe                                          MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini                                          Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mifflin                                           Redman
Saada                                             Sekora
St Denis                                           Stoffer
Uy                                               Wasylciw-Leis

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 35 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to welcome the hon. member for Edmonton North in her new role as leader of the opposition.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 36.

(2550)

(The House divided on Motion No. 36, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 794)

YEAS

Members

Asselin                                           Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellemare                                         Bergeron
Biggar                                            Canuel
Charron (Frontenac—Mégantic)                     Côté
de Savoie                                        Desrosiers
Dumas                                             Fournier
Guimond                                          Laurin
Loubier                                           Marchand
Savoie                                            Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—25

NAYS

Members

Adams                                             Assaadourian
Augustine                                         Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker                                             Beaumier
Bennett                                           Benoit
Blaikie                                           Bonin
Government Orders

Bonwick
Bryden
Calder
Clouthier
Colter
Dion
Folco
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Harvard
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Laliberte
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Myers
Redman
Scott (Fredericton)
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stoffer
Ur
Wasylycia-Leis
Williams—61

Bozonik
Cadman
Cauchon
Codere
Cullen
Dromisky
Goudie
Gruending
Hally (Macleod)
Jones
Keyes
MacAulay
MacKay (Scarborough East)
Mifflin
Provenzano
Saada
Sekata
Spellie
Steckle
Saabo
Valeri
Whelan

I cannot recognize the member for Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok for the moment.

● (2555)

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 37.

● (2600)

(The House divided on Motion No. 37, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 795)

YEAS

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar
Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Damas
Guay
Lalonde
Label
Marceau
Ménard
St-Hilaire

Members

Adams
Augustine
Baker
Benoit
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Butt
Cauchon
Codere
Dion
Easter
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Harvard
Johnston
Karetak-Lindell
Laliberte
Maloney
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Myers
Saada
Sokora
Spellie
St-Julien
Stoffer
Ur
Whelan

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeon
Brien
Cardin
Côté
Desrochers
Fournier
Guimond
Launin
Loubier
Marchand
Savary
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS

Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Belanger
Blais
Bouin
Bryden
Cadman
Clouthier
Cullen
Dromisky
Goudie
Gruending
Hardy
Hally (Macleod)
Jones
Keyes
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mifflin
Redman
Scott (Fredericton)
Shepherd
St. Denis
Steckle
Szabo
Wasylycia-Leis
Williams—56

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 36 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think it would be a good idea for you to enlighten the House at this time. I have heard a number of Liberal members wondering whether one of our colleagues wearing a turtle neck is entitled to vote.

I tell them he is entitled to vote, but they stubbornly insist—

The Deputy Speaker: All members in the House are always entitled to vote. I have heard no mention of this. We will therefore continue with the votes.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, in order to enlighten this House I raise a point of order. I ask you whether a colleague in this House wearing a turtle neck is entitled to vote.

The Deputy Speaker: I am well aware that it is late, but if I remember what the Speaker said the last time we discussed this matter, we decided that a tie is not required for a member to vote in the House.

I think this is how we decided. It is fairly late and perhaps a little too late to look at all the precedents on this. Perhaps tomorrow we can no doubt look at this.
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 37 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 38.

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

(Division No. 796)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Bouchette—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camelin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charbonneau (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Savoie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marceau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ménard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blondin-Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blondin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauchon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coderre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drouin-Drouin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Mackled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karetak-Lindell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Sloan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laliarte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McArthur (Scarborough East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoffler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired Members—57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson                       |
| Heeppner                      |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  |
| Nunziata                      |

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 38 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 39.

(The House divided on Motion No. 39, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 797)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Bouchette—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camelin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charbonneau (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Savoie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marceau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ménard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blondin-Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blondin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauchon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coderre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drouin-Drouin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Mackled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karetak-Lindell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Sloan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laliarte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McArthur (Scarborough East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoffler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired Members—48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson                       |
| Heeppner                      |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  |
| Nunziata                      |

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 39 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 40.

(The House divided on Motion No. 40, which was negatived on the following division:)

(The next question is on Motion No. 40.)
Government Orders

(Division No. 798)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Béliveau
Bérégovoy
Bernier (Boulevard-Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigourdan
Cardin
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Dumas
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Marceau
Menard
St-Hilaire

Commons Debates
March 13, 2000

NAYS

Members
Adams
Augustine
Baker
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Craigen
Codere
Dion
Easter
Goodale
Hardy
Hill (Macleod)
Jordan
Laliberte
Malhi
Mancini
Mifflin
Peric
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Scott (Fredericton)
St. Denis
Steckle
Szabo
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 41 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 42.

(2625)

(The House divided on Motion No. 42, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 800)

YEAS

Members
Bérégovoy

NAYS

Members
Adams
Baker
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Craigen
Codere
Dion
Easter
Goodale
Hardy
Hill (Macleod)
Jordan
Laliberte
Malhi
Mancini
Mifflin
Peric
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Scott (Fredericton)
St. Denis
Steckle
Szabo
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 41 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 41.

(2620)

(The House divided on Motion No. 41, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 799)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Béliveau
Bérégovoy
Bernier (Boulevard-Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigourdan
Cardin
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Dumas
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Marceau
Menard
St-Hilaire

Commons Debates
March 13, 2000

NAYS

Members
Adams
Augustine
Baker
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Craigen
Codere
Dion
Easter
Goodale
Hardy
Hill (Macleod)
Jordan
Laliberte
Malhi
Mancini
Mifflin
Peric
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Scott (Fredericton)
St. Denis
Steckle
Szabo
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 41 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 42.

(2625)

(The House divided on Motion No. 42, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 800)

YEAS

Members
Bérégovoy

NAYS

Members
Adams
Baker
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Craigen
Codere
Dion
Easter
Goodale
Hardy
Hill (Macleod)
Jordan
Laliberte
Malhi
Mancini
Mifflin
Peric
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Scott (Fredericton)
St. Denis
Steckle
Szabo
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 41 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 42.

(2625)

(The House divided on Motion No. 42, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 799)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Béliveau
Bérégovoy
Bernier (Boulevard-Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigourdan
Cardin
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Dumas
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Marceau
Menard
St-Hilaire

Commons Debates
March 13, 2000

NAYS

Members
Adams
Augustine
Baker
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Craigen
Codere
Dion
Easter
Goodale
Hardy
Hill (Macleod)
Jordan
Laliberte
Malhi
Mancini
Mifflin
Peric
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Scott (Fredericton)
St. Denis
Steckle
Szabo
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 41 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 42.

(2625)

(The House divided on Motion No. 42, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 800)

YEAS

Members
Bérégovoy

NAYS

Members
Adams
Baker
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Craigen
Codere
Dion
Easter
Goodale
Hardy
Hill (Macleod)
Jordan
Laliberte
Malhi
Mancini
Mifflin
Peric
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Scott (Fredericton)
St. Denis
Steckle
Szabo
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 42 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If you had been a bit more quick to act and had given me the time to vote, I would have supported this amendment.

The Deputy Speaker: Undoubtedly.

Mr. Richard Marceau: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If you had been, as usual, kind enough to give me the time to vote, I would have voted like the whip of the Bloc Quebecois.

I ask that my vote be recorded in favour of the amendment.

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to be recorded as having voted the same way as the whip did. I think your decision makes you unworthy of sitting in the chair.

Mr. Paul Crête: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With your hasty decision, you prevented me from voting and I believe I should have had the right to vote on this motion. I ask that my vote be recorded in favour of the motion.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As you know, members vote from the front to the back rows. At one point, you asked what members were against the amendment. We were penalized and we ask that our vote be recorded.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Speaker rose and when he does, honourable members have to sit down.

[English]

It is obvious that some members wished to vote on the last vote but did not rise when the vote was taking place. There is some obligation on members to move when the clerk at the table is calling the vote.

[Translation]

The Speaker has an obligation before the House to continue with the work of the House. If members want to vote, I can solve this problem immediately.

Is there unanimous consent for the members of the Bloc Quebecois who did not vote on the last question to be recorded as having voted like on the previous question?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I will not hear any more points of order.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau: Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me, and since you prevented me from voting earlier, I would like my vote recorded with that of the Bloc Quebecois and would like to ask you where in the Montpetit-Marleau the time limit for voting is defined? Do you decide on the time limit? That is my question.

The Deputy Speaker: I decided and that is the end of the discussion. We can continue.

[English]

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 43.

(2635 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 43, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 801)

YEAS

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Canuel
Chretien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Dumas
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Marceau
Ménard
St-Hilaire

NAYS

Adams
Augustine
Baker
Belanger
Bertrand
Brison
Cadam
Cachon
Cedere
Cutler
Drominsky
Finlay
Gruending

Alcock
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bélair
Benoît
Blais
Bryden
Calder
Chan
Colletette
Dion
Easter
Goudie
Hanger
Government Orders

Harvey
Hill (MacLeod)
Keyes
LaBonte
MacAulay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney
Maulay
Phinney
Scott (Fredericton)
St. Denis
Stoffer
Waywicky-Leis — 49

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunnia

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 43 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I must tell you that something of some concern happened a few minutes ago. Simply because a colleague took too long, in your opinion, to rise, you deprived the members in the subsequent rows, that is, the second, third, fourth and fifth rows, of their right to vote.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: How can you assume, simply because a colleague delayed too long to vote, in your opinion, and knowingly—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, could you tell our colleagues opposite to stop bellowing for a few minutes, so I can finish making my point?

How, simply because a colleague—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I want to hear the point of order of the hon. whip of the Bloc Quebecois and I hope we may all hear him.

(2640)

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, once again, how could you, simply because in your view a colleague took too long to vote, decide out of hand that no other colleague in this House could vote for or against a motion? On the basis of what precedent, what jurisprudence or what Standing Order do you decide you can deprive members of their right to vote simply because one member apparently took too long to vote, in your opinion?

The Deputy Speaker: I know that the hon. member has read the new book on procedure. The Chair has a duty to the House to continue proceedings. No one rose at that point to support the motion. There were two votes in favour, and no one—neither the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm nor any other member of the House—rose.

I thought that everyone who wanted to vote for the motion had already done so and so I called for those who wished to vote against it. I obviously made a decision that was not exactly shared by the other members. That is too bad, but the decision has been made, and we can continue to vote. Clearly, if members wish to vote, they must rise. This is always the rule in the House. We can now continue, because I believe I have answered the question of the hon. whip of the Bloc Quebecois.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, according to the procedure generally recognized in this House, so long as the members in the first row have not finished voting, the members in the second row do not begin voting.

How do you expect my colleague from Joliette to rise in support of the motion when our colleague from Berthier—Montcalm had not yet risen? There has been a sort of procedural error, and I would like you to tell me exactly—for the gallery, you referred to Montpetit-Marleau—what allows you to do what you did a few minutes ago?

The Deputy Speaker: As I have already indicated, I gave my reasons. Members are required to rise quickly in a vote. This is perfectly reasonable in a vote, and it is in keeping with House precedents in this regard. I will find a quote later to answer the request by the hon. member, but I repeat once again what I said.

[English]

The Speaker has an obligation to continue with the work of the House. If members in one row or another choose not to vote, it is not for the Chair to look to the next row. Members must rise if they wish to vote and that is what I have decided.

The next question is on Motion No. 44.

(2645 )

(2645)

The House divided on Motion No. 44, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 802)

YEAS

Asselin
Bellemare
Bigras
Camel
Charette (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Dumais
Gauy
Lalonde

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Brien
Cardin
Côté
Drouhard
Fournier
Guindon
Laurin
Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I call on the co-operation we must have in this House to again ask for unanimous consent so that the members of the Bloc Québécois who were present in the House during this vote may be recorded as voting in support of this motion in amendment.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 44. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 49.

The House divided on Motion No. 44, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 803)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliveau</td>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrand</td>
<td>Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breton</td>
<td>Crête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>Desrochers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>Lebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 44 lost. I therefore declare Motion No. 49 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 50.

The House divided on Motion No. 50, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 804)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliveau</td>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrand</td>
<td>Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breton</td>
<td>Crête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>Desrochers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 48 lost. I therefore declare Motion No. 49 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 50.
Government Orders

Lebel Loubier
Marcoux Marchand
Ménard Sauvageau
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS

Members

Adams Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska) Baker
Beaumier Bélair
Belanger Bertrand
Benot Blanc
Blaikie Bonin
Brisson Bryden
Bulte Cadman
Calder Chan
Clouthier Codere
Collette Cotler
Dion Easter
Fry Grey (Edmonton North)
Gruending Hanger
Hardy Harvard
Hill (Macleod) Johnston
Jordan Karetak-Lindell
Keyes Kraft Sloan
Lafontaine Lastewka
Longfield MacAskill
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough) Malhi
Maloney Mansini
Manley Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West) Mifflin
McLellan (Edmonton West) Mifflin
Myers Nault
O’Reilly Parrish
Peric Phaneuf
Proud Proulx
Provost Redman
Reed Saada
Scott (Fredericton) Sekota
Shepherd Spéclier
Steckle Stolffer
Szafran Teleldé
Torsney Ur
Valeri Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan Wolfert
Williams—77

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

And more than five members having risen:

● (2700)

[Translation]

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to know if you did register my vote when I rose previously.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The answer is yes.

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

(Division No. 805)

YEAS

Members

Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok) Brien
Bigras Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Côté de Savoye
Desrochers Dumas
Fournier Guay
Guindon Lalonde
Laurin Loubier
Marceau Marchand
Ménard Sauvageau
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—25

NAYS

Members

Abbott Adams
Augustine Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker Beaumier
Bélair Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bonin Brisson
Bryden Cauchon
Chan Codere
Clouthier Cotler
Dion Lozzi
Dion Mifflin
Easter Fry
Gruending
Hardy Harvard
Hill (Macleod) Johnston
Johnston Lastewka
Keyes Longfield
Laurin MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mancini Mifflin
Manley Nault
Marceau Parish
Ménard Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
St-Hilaire Saada
St. Denis Torsney
Sauvageau—47

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 50 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 51. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 51 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 52. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(2705)

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

(Division No. 806)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellhumeur
Bergevin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Canuel
Cardin
Chétiién (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête
de Savoie
Deschênes
Dumas
Fournier
Guay
Guimond
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Loubier
Marchand
Marchand
Ménard
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Beaumier
Belair
Belanger
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie
Bouin
Boulton
Brisson
Bryden
Buie
Cauchon
Chan
Coulombe
Codere
Collinette
Collenette
Cullen
Dion
Drouin
Duncan
Easter
Eggerton
Fry
Grey (Edmonton North)
Grumbling
Hardy
Harvard
Heller
Johnston
Kent
Keyes
Kievre
Lafontaine
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini
Manley
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)

Government Orders

McComick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Myers
O'Reilly
Perron
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proulx
Sekora
Speller
Steele
Sturla
Tossey
Touhey
Valeri
Whelan

McKay (Scarborough East)
Mifflin
Nault
Parish
Phinney
Proud
Saada
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stoffer
Szabo
Us
Wasylycia-Leis
Wilfert—76

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Heeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 52 lost.

(2710)

The next question is on Motion No. 53. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(2715)

(The House divided on Motion No. 53, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 807)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergevin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Canuel
Cardin
Chétiien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête
de Savoie
Deschênes
Dumas
Fournier
Guay
Guimond
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Marchand
Ménard
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 53 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 54. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 54, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 808)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Augustine

Beaumier
Bélair

Bennet
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

Blaikie
Bonwick

Bryden
Bulte

Coulter
Colleen

Dunham
Duminy

Eggleton
Gruending

Hardy
Harris

Karetak-Lindell
Histrom

Laliberte
MacAulay

Marchand
Ménard

Sauvageau
Séguin

St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—25

Whelan

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Augustine

Beaumier
Bélair

Bennet
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

Blaikie
Bonwick

Bryden
Bulte

Coulter
Colleen

Dunham
Duminy

Eggleton
Gruending

Hardy
Harris

Karetak-Lindell
Histrom

Laliberte
MacAulay

Marchand
Ménard

Sauvageau
Séguin

St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—25

Whelan

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 54 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 55. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed to the motion 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 House divided on Motion No. 55, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 808)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Bellemare
Bergeron

Biggar
Biren

Canuel
Cardin

Charest (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cliche

de Savoie
Deschênes

FOURGEND
GAY

HARRIS
HISTROM

LALIBERTE
MACKAY (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)

LAMBLEY
LYNN

MALONEY
MARTIN (Winnipeg Centre)

MACIEN
MACKAY (Scarborough East)

MARQUIS
McEACHERN

MAYNE
MAYNE

MAULAY
METHWELL

MÉNARD
MOFFATT

SCHAEFER
SCHAEFER

SCHULZ
SCHULZ

SWYLFORD
SWYLFORD

WHITSTEAD
WILFERT

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams

Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabask)

Baker
Bélair

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand

Blais
Blais

Bonwick
Bulte

Cadieux
Cederre

Deschênes
Dion

Eggleton
Eggleton

Gruending
Gruending

Harrow
Harris

Harrow
Herval

Karetak-Lindell
Karetk—Andrew

Laliberte
MacAulay

Marchand
Marchand

Sauvageau
Séguin

St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—25

Whelan

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 55 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 56. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed to the motion 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 House divided on Motion No. 56, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 808)
March 13, 2000

COMMONS DEBATES

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

○ (2725)

(The House divided on Motion No. 56, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 810)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Béliveau
Bergenon
Biggar
Brien
Canuel
Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Côté
de Savoie
Deschênes
Dumas
Fournier
Guay
Guimond
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Lebouthier
Marceau
Marchand
Ménard
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Anders
Augustine
Auger
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bélair
Bérubé
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar
Blais
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bonin
Bérubé
Bélair
Bouchard
Bone

The next question is on Motion No. 57. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

The next question is on Motion No. 57.
Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

• (2730)

(The House divided on Motion No. 57, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 811)

YEAS

Members
Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bélanger Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar Briere
Cabinet Cardin
Chatfield (Frontenac—Mégantic) Crete
de Savoie Deschênes
Dumas Guy
Guimond Lalonde
Laurin Lebel
Loubier Marcoux
Marchand Ménard
Sauveau St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—26

NAYS

Members
Abbott Anders
Augustine Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Beaumier Belzile
Bennett Bernier (Tobique—Macquac)
Blais Brison
Briden Buhr
Cachon Clouthier
Collinette Cullen
Drouin Duncan
Eggleston Gruending
Hardy Harris
Harvard Hilstrom
Karetk-Lindell Laflèche
MacAskill MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney Macini
Manley Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough McKay (Scarborough East)
Mifflin Myers
Phinney Provenzano
Redman Saada
Scott (Fredericton) Sekura
Sheriff St. Denis
Stoffer Strahl
Turner Ur
Valeri Whelan —50

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoepfner Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 57 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could you see if there is unanimous consent to thank the pages who are working with us throughout the night? I wish to thank Adam, Laura, Annie, Marc, Deborah, Annie, Christie, Julien, Jennifer, and Meg.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 58. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

• (2735)

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 58, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 812)

YEAS

Members
Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bélanger Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar Briere
Cabinet Cardin
Chatfield (Frontenac—Mégantic) Crete
de Savoie Deschênes
Dumas Guy
Guimond Lalonde
Laurin Lebel
Loubier Marcoux
Marchand Ménard
Sauveau St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—26

NAYS

Members
Abbott Anders
Augustine Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Beaumier Belzile
Bennett Bernier (Tobique—Macquac)
Blais Brison
Briden Buhr
Cachon Clouthier
Collinette Cullen
Drouin Duncan
Eggleston Gruending
Hardy Harris
Harvard Hilstrom
Karetk-Lindell Laflèche
MacAskill MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney Macini
Manley Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough McKay (Scarborough East)
Mifflin Myers
Phinney Provenzano
Redman Saada
Scott (Fredericton) Sekura
Sheriff St. Denis
Stoffer Strahl
Turner Ur
Valeri Whelan —50
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Marchand
Sauvagreu
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—24

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alcock
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Belair
Blaiske
Cauchon
Collenette
Dion
Duncan
Fry
Hart
Harris
Hilstrom
 Laliberte
Maloney
Manley
McDonough
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Phinney
Saada
St. Denis
Stoffer
Torsney

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Brechenuer
Bremier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Brien
Caulin
Charles (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cire
de Savoye
Fournier
Guimond
Laurin
Laubier
Marchand
Sauvagreu
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—26

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 58 lost.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 59, which was negatived on the following division:)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)  Hudson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 59 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 60. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 60, which was negatived on the following division:)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)  Hudson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 60 lost.
Government Orders

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

And more than five members having risen:

● (2750 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 60, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 814)

YEAS Members
Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur Bergeron
Bigras Brien
Canuel Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) Crête
de Savoye Desrochers
Dumas Fournier
Guimond Lalonde
Laflamme Lebel
Loubier Marchand
Marchand Sauvageau
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—25

NA NAYS Members
Abbott Alcock
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska) Baker
Bennett Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaisie Bulte
Bouchier Cauchon
Bouchier Coderre
Boulet Coderre
Bruineau Dion
Buho Drouin
Chabot Dupuis
Christie Dussault
Claude Dionne
Duncan Eggleston
Dumais Foulon
Easter Girard
Eggleston Gruending
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst) Gruending
Harb Hardy
Harris Harvey
Hilstrom Jackson
Karetak-Lindell Keyes
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough) Manini
Manley Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough McKay (Scarborough East)
Mifflin Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nault Parish
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex) Proud
Redman Squires
Shepherd Stebbin
Stoffer Strahl
Szabo Ur
Valeri Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan Wilfert—54

PAIRED MEMBERS
Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 60 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 61.

● (2755 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 61, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 815)

YEAS Members
Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur Bergeron
Bigras Brien
Canuel Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) Crête
de Savoye Desrochers
Dumas Fournier
Guimond Guimond
Laflamme Laflamme
Loubier Marchand
Marchand Sauvageau
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NA NAYS Members
Abbott Adams
Alcock Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska) Baker
Bennett Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaisie Bulte
Bouchier Cauchon
Bouchier Coderre
Boulet Coderre
Bruineau Dion
Buho Drouin
Chabot Dupuis
Christie Dussault
Claude Dionne
Duncan Eggleston
Dumais Foulon
Easter Girard
Eggleston Gruending
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst) Gruending
Harb Hardy
Harris Harvey
Hilstrom Jackson
Karetak-Lindell Keyes
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough) Manini
Manley Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough McKay (Scarborough East)
Mifflin Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nault Parish
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex) Proud
Redman Squires
Shepherd Stebbin
Stoffer Strahl
Szabo Ur
Valeri Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan Wilfert—54

PAIRED MEMBERS
Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 61 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 62.

● (2800 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 62, which was negatived on the following division:)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 60 lost.
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(Division No. 816)

YEAS

Members

Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Béliveau Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé–Îles-de-la-Madeleine–Pabok)
Biggar Brien
Cauchon Cardin
Côté Desjardins
Dumas Fournier
Guay Guimond
Lalonde Laurin
Lebel Loubier
Marceau Marchand
Ménard Sauvageau
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS

Members

Abbott Adams
Alcock Anders
Augustine Bachand (Richmond–Arthabaska)
Baker Bélanger
Beaumier Bennett
Bernier (Tobique–Mactaquac) Blaiske
Bouin Brisson
Butt Cauchon
Coderre Cotler
Cullen Dion
Drummond Duncan
Easter Eggleston
Grondin Gédin (Acadie–Bathurst)
Grondin Haiburn
Hardy Harris
Harvard Hilstrom
Jackson Keyes
Kraft Sloan Laliberte
MacKay (Pictou–Antigonish–Guysborough) Mancini
Maloney Manley
Manley Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonald (Broadview–Greenwood) O'Reilly
O'Reilly Peric
Proulx Proud
Proulx Sgro
St. Denis St-Julien
Stewart (Brant) Stuffer
Stuffer Tomas
Strahl Wayllycia-Leis—57

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 62 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 63. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed to the motion 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:

(2805)

(The House divided on Motion No. 63, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 817)

YEAS

Members

Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Béliveau Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé–Îles-de-la-Madeleine–Pabok)
Biggar Brien
Cauchon Cardin
Côté Desjardins
Dumas Fournier
Guay Guimond
Lalonde Laurin
Lebel Loubier
Marceau Marchand
Ménard Sauvageau
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS

Members

Abbott Adams
Alcock Anders
Augustine Bachand (Richmond–Arthabaska)
Baker Bélanger
Beaumier Bennett
Bernier (Tobique–Mactaquac) Blaiske
Bouin Brisson
Butt Cauchon
Coderre Cotler
Cullen Dion
Drummond Duncan
Easter Eggleston
Grondin Gédin (Acadie–Bathurst)
Grondin Haiburn
Hardy Harris
Harvard Hilstrom
Jackson Keyes
Kraft Sloan Laliberte
MacKay (Pictou–Antigonish–Guysborough) Mancini
Maloney Manley
Manley Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonald (Broadview–Greenwood) O'Reilly
O'Reilly Peric
Proulx Proud
Proulx Sgro
St. Denis St-Julien
Stewart (Brant) Stuffer
Stuffer Tomas
Strahl Wayllycia-Leis—57

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonald
Mills (Broadview–Greenwood)
McKay
McKay (Scarborough East)
McKee
McKee (Scarborough East)
McKee
Peric
Proulx
Redman
Sgro
Steckle
Stuffer
Stuffer
Tomas
Wayllycia-Leis
Wilfert—61

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 62 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 63. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.
Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 63 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 64. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(2810)

(The House divided on Motion No. 64, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 818)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bérubé (Boucherville—Hochelaga-Maisonneuve—Papineau)
Bernier (Jonquière—Laurentides—Saint-Hilaire)
Bigras
Brien
Camel
Cardin
Charette (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Dumas
Guay
Lalonde
Lemieux
Marchand
Marceau
Ménard
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Assad
Augustine
Barnes
Beaumier
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blais
Bonin
Bonwick
Brison
Cauchon
Collette
coul
Dumoulin
Dumouchel
EGG
godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Grundy
Hard
Harrell
Harries
Hay
Hislop
Laflèche
Lawler
MacKay (Picton—Antigonish— Guysborough)
Malik
Maloney
Manley
McDonough
Pardy
Penashue
Scott (Fredericton)
Shepard
Siegel
Stoffer
Szabo
Uyl
Wasylycia-Leis
Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Paradis
Phinney
Saada
Sgro
St-Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Strahl
Tuszey
Valeri
Whelan—56

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kidgell (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour
Nunziatta

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 64 lost.

Before we go to the next motion I want to ask for the co-operation of members. When the vote is being called, I wonder if members would please not jump up and down and exchange seats. It makes it almost impossible for the vote callers.

In addition, members should not wander in and out when the vote is being called on this side or the other side, and let us not hold up any signs. This is still the House of Commons. It may be early in the morning, but we will still conduct ourselves as we should.

The next question is on Motion No. 65.

(2815)

(The House divided on Motion No. 65, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 819)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bérubé (Boucherville—Hochelaga-Maisonneuve—Papineau)
Bigras
Brien
Camel
Cardin
Charette (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Dumas
Guay
Lalonde
Lemieux
Marchand
Marceau
Ménard
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Assad
Augustine
Barnes
Beaumier
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blais
Bonin
Bonwick
Brison
Cauchon
Collette
coul
Dumoulin
Dumouchel
EGG
godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Grundy
Hard
Harrell
Harries
Hay
Hislop
Laflèche
Lawler
MacKay (Picton—Antigonish— Guysborough)
Malik
Maloney
Manley
McDonough
Pardy
Penashue
Scott (Fredericton)
Shepard
Siegel
Stoffer
Szabo
Uyl
Wasylycia-Leis
Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Paradis
Phinney
Saada
Sgro
St-Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Strahl
Tuszey
Valeri
Whelan—56

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kidgell (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour
Nunziatta
March 13, 2000

Government Orders

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed to the motion 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 House divided on Motion No. 66, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 820)

YEAS

Members

Blankinship
Gruending
Laliberte
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Stoffer

Abbot
Assad
Bouchard (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bergeron
Brison
Christen (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Eggleton
Harb
Harvard
Lalonde
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Manley
Scott (Fredericton)
Strahl

NA Y S

Members

Blaikie
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hardy
Mancini
McDonough
Wasylycia-Leis

And more than five members having risen:

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 67 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 67. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.
Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(Yea)

Members
Adams Alcock
Assad Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska) Baker
Bélanger Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac) Bertrand
Blaike Blondin-Andrew
Bonin Bonwick
Braithwaite Birchon
Buote Calder
Cauchon Chan
Chaubet Codere
Collette Colter
Cullen DeVillers
Dion Drouin
Dufault Finlay
Eggerton Fry
Goodale Guay
Goodearl Hardy
Harb Hardy
Harvard Hubbard
Idube Jackson
Jones Jordan
Kerak-Lindell Keyes
Kilgour (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottetown) Laliberte
Lastewka Lemege
Lincoln Longfield
MacAulay MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mallin Maloney
Mancini Mainey
Martel O'Reilly
Martin (Winnipeg Centre) O'Reilly
McDonough McKinnon (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West) Mills (Broadway—Greenwood)
Mitchell Myers
Mortimer O'Reilly
Paradis Parish
Parry Perry
Phynne Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt Proud
Proulx Provenzano
Redman Reed
Saad Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora Sgro
Shepherd Speller
St. Denis Steeke
Stewart (Brant) Stoffer
Szabo Teleldi
Turcotte Ur
Valeri Vanclef
Wasylycia-Leis Whelan
Wilfert—101

(Nay)

Members
Abbott Alcock
Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bélanger Berenger
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok) Bélanger
Bigras Brien
Canel Carlin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) Crête
de Savoye Desrochers
Dumas Duncan
Fournier Guay
Hilston Harris
Lalonde Harb
Loubier Lebel
Marceau Marchand
Mérin Sauve
St-Hilaire Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) White (Langley—Abbotsford)—35

(Paired Members)

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 67 agreed to.

The next question is on Motion No. 68.

(Yea)

Members
Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bélanger Berenger
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok) Bélanger
Bigras Brien
Canel Carlin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) Crête
de Savoye Desrochers
Dumas Duncan
Fournier Guay
Guimond Lalonde
Loubier Loubier
Marceau Marchand
Mérin Sauve
St-Hilaire Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—25

(Nay)

Members
Abbott Alcock
Asselin Bachand (Arthabaska)
Bélanger Blaike
Bennett Buote
Bigras Bélanger
Canel Carlin
Chaput Choulier
Colinet Colter
Drouin Duncan
Easter Eggleton
Finlay Finlay
Goodale Guay
Harb Hardy
Harris Harvard
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The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 68 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 69. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 71. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 70, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 824)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Béliveau
Bergeron

Bernier (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)

Bigras
Brien

Canuel
Chretien (Frontenac—Mégantic)

Cirté
de Savoye

Deschênes
Fournier

Guay
Guimond

Lalonde
Loubier

Marchand
Marchand

Ménard
Sauvageau

St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—23

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams

Anders
Assad

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker

Blakie
Blondin-Andrew

Bradshaw
Brison

Caucous
Chain

Coderre
Collette

Dion
Dubuisson

Duncan
Eglinton

Fry
Girouin (Acadie—Bathurst)

Goodale
Gaudreault

Huber
Hubbard

Hilstrom
Jordan

Jackson
Laliberte

Karetak-Lindell
Lemieux

Lincoln
Longfield

Lowther
MacAskill

Mackay (Pictou—Antigonish— Guysborough)
Maloney

Mallard
Manzini

Manley
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)

McCormick
McDonough

McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)

Myers
O'Reilly

Parrish
Patry

Perreault
Peele

Proulx
Provenzano

Redman
Reed

Scott (Fredericton)
Sekura

Seddique
Stewart (Brant)

Strahl
Strahl

Telegdi
Ur

Valeri
Wasylycia-Leis—48

White (Lanark—Carleton)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Heeppner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 69 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 70. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 71. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 70, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 824)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Béliveau
Bergeron

Bernier (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)

Bigras
Brien

Canuel
Chretien (Frontenac—Mégantic)

Cirté
de Savoye

Deschênes
Fournier

Guay
Guimond

Lalonde
Loubier

Marchand
Marchand

Ménard
Sauvageau

St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—25

Government Orders

Harris
Harvard

Hilstrom
Laliberte

Lowther
MacAskill

Mackay (Pictou—Antigonish— Guysborough)
Manzini

Manley
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)

McDonough
McLellan (Edmonton West)

McEachern
Mitchell

Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud

Scott (Fredericton)
Stewart

Stoffer
Strahl

Vancilf
Wasylycia-Leis—48
Government Orders

NAYS

Members
Abbott
Assad
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Braunias
Bonin
Bryden
Colliette
Dromisky
Eggleton
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending
Hare
Hilts
Laliberte
MacAsay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney
McConnell
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Paradis
Pearce
Redman
Sadik
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Tortney
Wood—51

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Béliveau
Bigras
Cameron
Charbonneau (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savary
Dumas
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Marceau
Ménard
St-Hilaire

NAYS

Members
Abbott
Assad
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bélanger

PAIRED MEMBERS

Andrews Hochner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 72 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With your permission, considering that this is a historical moment, I would like, on behalf of my colleagues of the Bloc Quebecois, to tell Quebecers who are watching that, as long as we will sit in this Parliament, they can always rely on us to defend the interests of Quebec.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The next question is on Motion No. 73. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(2850)

(The House divided on Motion No. 73, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Yeas: Bachand (Saint-Jean), Bergeron, Béthune, Blache, Bouchard, Bound, Bourget, Brunelle, Cardin, Carry, Charbonneau (Frontenac—Mégantic), Deschênes, Dussault, Fournier, Guindon, Larouche, Lefebvre, Marchand, Savard, Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—26)

(Nays: Anders, Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska), Bélanger, Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac))
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YEAS

Members

Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur Bergeron
Bernier (Boudunduc—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar Brien
Caissie Cardin
Chatteau (Frontnac—Mégantic) Crête deschênes
Dumas Fournier
Guay Guimond
Lalonde Laurin
Lebel Loubier
Marceau Marchand
Ménard Sauvagre
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) —27

NAYS

Members

Alcock Anders
Belanger Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac) Blaikie
Brison Bulte
Clouthier Colleman
Coutler Drouin
Duncan Easter
Eggerton Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale Grundy
Harb Hardy
Harvard Hinslton
Hubbard Jackson
Jordan Kartak-Lindell
Lahontne Limesse
Lincoln Longfield
Lowther MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough) Mahoney
Malhi Mancini
Manley McCormick
McDonough McKay (Scarbrough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West) Myers
O'Reilly Parish
Patry Pratt
Proulx Provenzano
Redman Reed
Scott (Fredericton) Sekura
Sgro Shepherd
Steele Stewart (Braun)
Stoffer Stahl
Ur Wastycki-Less
Whelan Wilfert —62

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) Hooper
Kilgour Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 73 lost.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): This is not a point of order.

[English]

Committees are creatures of their own. I do not have any idea what is going to happen with the committee.

● (2855)

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête: Mr. Speaker, will you please allow me to speak and be heard by the members of the House?

You have—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): No, I will not. I recognized the member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques on a point of order. The point of order would have to have something to do with what is going on in the House right now, for example the order of the vote. If your point of order is pertinent to what is going on right now I will listen to it, but there is no other reason.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order specifically in reference to the vote, because I want my right to vote as a parliamentarian to be respected. I am indicating that certain committees are scheduled to sit today and my right to vote in this place might be affected if committees are sitting at the same time.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I would suggest the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques consult with his caucus. We will do the question first and I will check that later.

The next question is on Motion No. 74. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.
**Government Orders**

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

And more than five members having risen:

(2000)

(The House divided on Motion No. 74, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 827)

**YEAS**

Members

Anders
Duncan
Gruending
Hluskin
Lowther
McDonough
Strahl

Blakie
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hardy
Laliberte
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Sfuzier

NAYS

Members

Anders
Asselin
Bergeron
Biggar
Bradshaw
Bisson
Cardin
Collellou

Assad
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellelumeur
Bourier (Bonaventure–Gaspé–Îles-de-la-Madeleine–Pabok)
Bire

NAIYS

Members

Anders
Augustine
Galam
Gagnon
Harvard
Lalonde
Lebel

Assad
Barrett
Bourier (Tobique–Mactaquac)
Bourier
Bouchard

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoopner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 74 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 75. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 75 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 76. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 76 lost.
Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 76, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 829)

YEAS

Members
Blaike
Duncan
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending
Hilson
Lowther
Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Stoffer
Stuldf
Wasylycia-Leis—12

NAYS

Members
Assad
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonneventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar
Bouchier
Cardin
Collinette
de Savoye
Desrochers
Drouin
Eggleton
Gibson
Guay
Harvard
Karetak-Lindell
Lalonde
Luton
Lebel
Loubier
MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marchand
MacKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Ménard
Myers
Pituit
Nunziata
Peters
Quirke
Riedel
Saccomano
Sekora
Shephard
Steckle
Szabo
Ur
Valeri
Whelan
Wasylycia-Leis

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoegbren
Nunziata

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 76 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 77. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed to the motion 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 House divided on Motion No. 77, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 830)

YEAS

Members
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonneventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar
Bouchier
Bérubé
de Savoye
Deschênes
Dumas
Eggleton
Egginton
Goay
goodale
Harvard
Harvard
Karetak-Lindell
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marchand
Marchand
MacKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Ménard
Myers
Pituit
Nunziata
Peters
Quirke
Riedel
Saccomano
Sekora
Shephard
Steckle
Szabo
Ur
Valeri
Whelan
Wasylycia-Leis

NAYS

Members
Anders
Anders
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonneventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar
Bouchier
Bérubé
de Savoye
Deschênes
Dumas
Eggleton
Egginton
Goay
goodale
Harvard
Harvard
Karetak-Lindell
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marchand
Marchand
MacKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Ménard
Myers
Pituit
Nunziata
Peters
Quirke
Riedel
Saccomano
Sekora
Shephard
Steckle
Szabo
Ur
Valeri
Whelan
Wasylycia-Leis
Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 77 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 78.

(2920)

(The House divided on Motion No. 78, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 831)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Bélanger
Cardin
Chéziers (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Dumas
Fournier
Guay
Guimond
Label
Loubier
Marceau
Marchand
Ménard
Sauvé
St-Hilaire

NAYS

Members
Adams
Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blais
Brison
Bulte
Cauchon
Colleymette
Côté
Drouin
Dardenne
Easter
Eggleton
Finlay
Gaudreau (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Gruending
Harb
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Karetak-Lindell
Laliberte
Limosges
Lincoln
Longfield
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Manley
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
Pardy
Pépin
Proulx
Scott (Fredericton)
Sgro
Shea
Sheehan
Stoffer
Telegdi
Volpi
Wilfert—55

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 78 lost.

I have noticed that there are quite a few members coming in and out. I will remind everyone again that if a member is not in the House when the question is put, that member is not to vote. Did everybody understand that? For a member to vote the member must be in the House when the question is put. If the vote is obvious in one direction or another it is not a problem but imagine if the vote was very close. The rule is that if members are not in the House they cannot vote. Is that fair enough? Do hon. members want me to explain that in more detail?

The question is on Motion No. 79. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(2925)

(The House divided on Motion No. 79, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 832)

YEAS

Members
Blais
Gruending
Mancini
McDonough
Wasylycia-Leis—9

NAYS

Members
Adams
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker
Bergeron
Brison
Brient
Cardin
Chan
Coderre
Crête
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 79 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 80. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(2930)

(The House divided on Motion No. 80, which was agreed to on the following division):

(Division No. 833)

YEAS

Members

Adams Alcock
Assad Augustine
Baker Barnes
Beaumier Belanger
Bennett Bertrand
Blaike Bradshaw
Brison Bryden
Buhr Cauchon
Chan Couthier
Codere Collette
Collet DeVilliers
Don Drouin
Drouin Fry
Eggleton Goodale
Grenville Hubbard
Hargie Jackson
Jordan Kellogg (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottetown)

Desrochers Dumas
Fournier Guay
Harb Haud
Lalonde Larin
Lebel MacKay (Picton—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Scott (Fredericton)
Vancilf—50

MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)

Laliberte Longfield
MacKay (Picton—Antigonish—Guysborough) Maloney
Mancini Manley
Martin (Winnipeg Centre) McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East) Mitchell
Myers Nault
Paradis Parry
Perron Peterson
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex) Proulx
Redman Saada
Scott (Fredericton) Sekora
Sgro Shepherd
St. Denis Steckle
Stewart (Brant) Stuffer
Szabo Telegdi
Torsney Vez
Valeri Whelan
Wasylycia-Leis Wilfert

Anders Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean) Bellehumeur
Bergeron Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspe—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar Bigras
Brien Camel
Cardin Chretien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye de Savoye
Dumas Duford
Guimond Guimond
Lalonde Lalonde
Lelor Loubier
Lawther Loubier
Marchand Marchand
Sauvageau Sauvageau
St-Hilaire St-Hilaire
Stoffel Stoffel
Telegdi Telegdi
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

YEAS

Members

Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspe—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar Bigras
Brien Camel
Cardin Chretien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye de Savoye
Dumas Duford
Guimond Guimond
Lalonde Lalonde
Lelor Loubier
Lawther Loubier
Marchand Marchand
Sauvageau Sauvageau
St-Hilaire St-Hilaire
Stoffel Stoffel
Telegdi Telegdi
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

(2935)
Government Orders

NAYS

Members
Abbott
Anders
Augustine
Bonin
Bradshaw
Caucion
Collenette
Dion
Duhamel
Eggleton
Golen (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grundring
Hilstrom
Laliberte
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nash
Peterson
St. Denis
Stoffer
Torsney
Wasylycia-Leis
Wood—49

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 81 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 82.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 82 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 83.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 83 lost.

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

YEAS

Members
Abbott
Adams
Anders
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Bonin
Boudria
Bradshaw
Brison
Caucion
Cedrette
Collenette
De Villiers
Dion
Drominsky
Duhamel
Duncan
Eggleton
Gagliano
Goden (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Grundring
Harris
Hilstrom
Iftody
Lowther
Maloney
McDonough
Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nash
Pascal
Peterson
St. Denis
Stoffer
Torsney
Wasylycia-Leis
Wood—49

NAYS

Members
Lalonde
Lebel
Lincoln
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Manley
Marchand
Myers
Sauve
Sgro
St-Hilaire
Stewart (Brant)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Whelan—49

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

YEAS

Members
Abbott
Anders
Duncan
Hilstrom
Strahl—7

NAYS

Members
Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Berner (Tobique—Macquaquins)
Blahkie
Brien
Bryden
Bryden
Carr
Collin
Collinette
de Savoie
De Villiers
Dumas
Dunlop
Fournier
Gaul
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Guay
Guimond
Laliberte
Lapointe
Laurin
Laurin
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini
Marcel
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Ménard
Saada
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Strahl
Torsney
Wasylycia-Leis

(The House divided on Motion No. 82, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 836)

YEAS

Members
Abbott
Anders
Duncan
Hilstrom
Strahl—7

NAYS

Members
Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Berner (Tobique—Macquaquins)
Blahkie
Brien
Bryden
Carr
Collin
Collinette
de Savoie
De Villiers
Dumas
Dunlop
Fournier
Gaul
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Guay
Guimond
Laliberte
Lapointe
Laurin
Laurin
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini
Marcel
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Ménard
Saada
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Strahl
Torsney
Wasylycia-Leis

(The House divided on Motion No. 83, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 835)

YEAS

Members
Abbott
Adams
Anders
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Bonin
Boudria
Bradshaw
Brison
Caucion
Cedrette
Collenette
De Villiers
Dion
Drominsky
Duhamel
Duncan
Eggleton
Gagliano
Goden (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Grundring
Harris
Hilstrom
Iftody
Lowther
Maloney
McDonough
Mancini
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nash
Pascal
Peterson
St. Denis
Stoffer
Torsney
Wasylycia-Leis
Wood—49

NAYS

Members
Lalonde
Lebel
Lincoln
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Manley
Marchand
Myers
Sauve
Sgro
St-Hilaire
Stewart (Brant)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Whelan—49

The next question is on Motion No. 83 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 82.

● (2940)

The next question is on Motion No. 82.

● (2945)

The next question is on Motion No. 83.
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- (2955)

(The House divided on Motion No. 86, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 838)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bennett
Bergevin (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bennett (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blais
Collenette
Coté de Savoye
Drouin
Dumas
Duncan
Eggleton
Guay
Harris
Jordan
Lalonde
Laurin
Limoges
Lowther
Mancini
Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
McMurrphy
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
Murray
Myers
Sekera
Shepley
Sibley
Siddall
Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Sillery)
St-Hilaire
Telford
Telford
Thiessen
Valeri
Watson
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
—58

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Bennett
Cauchon
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Drouin
Duncan
Easter
Guarnieri
Hirstrom
Jackson
Lincoln
Mahoney
Manley
Marchand
McCormick
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
Murray
Myers
Peric
Sgro
Shepley
Steffler
Stoffier
Szabo
Ur
Wasylycia-Leis
White (Winnipeg Centre)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
—48

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 86 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 87. 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.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 83 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 85.

- (2950)

(The House divided on Motion No. 85, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 837)

YEAS

Members

Blaikie
Bennett
Cauchon
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Drouin
Dumas
Eggleton
Garcia
Guay
Harris
Jordan
Lalonde
Laurin
Limoges
Lowther
Mancini
Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
McMurrphy
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
Murray
Myers
Sekera
Shepley
Sibley
Siddall
Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Sillery)
St-Hilaire
Telford
Valeri
Watson
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
—58

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Bennett
Cauchon
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Drouin
Duncan
Easter
Guarnieri
Hirstrom
Jackson
Lincoln
Mahoney
Manley
Marchand
McCormick
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
Murray
Myers
Peric
Sgro
Shepley
Steffler
Stoffier
Szabo
Ur
Wasylycia-Leis
White (Winnipeg Centre)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
—48

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 85 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 86.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 83 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 85.

- (2950)

(The House divided on Motion No. 85, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 837)

YEAS

Members

Blaikie
Bennett
Cauchon
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Drouin
Dumas
Eggleton
Garcia
Guay
Harris
Jordan
Lalonde
Laurin
Limoges
Lowther
Mancini
Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
McMurrphy
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
Murray
Myers
Sekera
Shepley
Sibley
Siddall
Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Sillery)
St-Hilaire
Telford
Valeri
Watson
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
—58

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Bennett
Cauchon
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Drouin
Duncan
Easter
Guarnieri
Hirstrom
Jackson
Lincoln
Mahoney
Manley
Marchand
McCormick
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
Murray
Myers
Peric
Sgro
Shepley
Steffler
Stoffier
Szabo
Ur
Wasylycia-Leis
White (Winnipeg Centre)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
—48

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 85 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 86.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 83 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 85.

- (2950)

(The House divided on Motion No. 85, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 837)

YEAS

Members

Blaikie
Bennett
Cauchon
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Drouin
Dumas
Eggleton
Garcia
Guay
Harris
Jordan
Lalonde
Laurin
Limoges
Lowther
Mancini
Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
McMurrphy
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
Murray
Myers
Sekera
Shepley
Sibley
Siddall
Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Sillery)
St-Hilaire
Telford
Valeri
Watson
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
—58

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Bennett
Cauchon
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Drouin
Duncan
Easter
Guarnieri
Hirstrom
Jackson
Lincoln
Mahoney
Manley
Marchand
McCormick
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
Murray
Myers
Peric
Sgro
Shepley
Steffler
Stoffier
Szabo
Ur
Wasylycia-Leis
White (Winnipeg Centre)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
—48

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 85 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 86.

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 to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3000)

(The House divided on Motion No. 87, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 839)

YEAS

Members

Blaikie

Gruending

Mancini

McDonough

Wasylycia-Leis—9

NAYS

Members

Abbott

Asselin

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)

Berge

Bergeron

Collenette

de Savoye

Duncan

Duguay

Graham

Harris

Hubbard

Lalonde

Lebel

Loubier

Manley

Marchand

Maurice

McDonough

St-Hilaire

Stovel

White (Langley—Abbotsford)—46

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson

Hoepner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 88 lost. I therefore declare Motion No. 89 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 90.

● (3010)

(The House divided on Motion No. 90, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 841)

YEAS

Members

Abbott

Bercier

Berge

Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)

Gauvreau

Guay

Harris

Hubbard

Lalonde

Lebel

Loubier

Manley

Marchand

Maurice

McDonough

St-Hilaire

Stovel

White (Langley—Abbotsford)—46

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson

Hoepner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 87 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 88. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 89.

● (3005)

(The House divided on Motion No. 88, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 840)

YEAS

Members

Abbott

Asselin

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)

Berge

Bergeron

Collenette

de Savoye

Daham

Fourni

Gauvreau

Guay

Lalonde

Loubier

MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish— Guysborough)

Marchand

Martin (Winnipeg Centre)

Ménard

Sauvageau

Stewart (Brant)

Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Wasylycia-Leis—46

NAYS

Members

Adams

Asselin

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)

Berge

Bergeron

Collenette

de Savoye

Daham

Fourni

Gauvreau

Guay

Lalonde

Loubier

MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish— Guysborough)

Marchand

Martin (Winnipeg Centre)

Ménard

Sauvageau

Stewart (Brant)

Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Wasylycia-Leis—18

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson

Hoepner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 88 lost. I therefore declare Motion No. 89 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 90.
### Government Orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Murray</th>
<th>67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcock</td>
<td>Paradis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Peric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belanger</td>
<td>Sauvegar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Sgro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspe—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
<td>St. Denis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggar</td>
<td>Steckie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
<td>Szabo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannel</td>
<td>Torsney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chétre (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
<td>Ur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Savoye</td>
<td>Whelan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drouin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggerton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limoges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louhier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malhi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ménard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvegar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Denis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steckie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torsney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whelan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PAIRED MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anderson</th>
<th>Hoeppner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
<td>Nunziata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 90 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 91.
An act to give effect to the requirement for clarity as set out in the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec secession reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion Numbers</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 1 deferred</td>
<td>4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division on Motion No. 1 deferred</td>
<td>4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division on the amendment deferred</td>
<td>4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division on Motion No. 3 deferred</td>
<td>4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Marceau</td>
<td>4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 13</td>
<td>4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ménard</td>
<td>4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 14</td>
<td>4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rocheleau</td>
<td>4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 15</td>
<td>4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bigras</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 18</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bernier</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 19</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Marceau</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 21</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. St-Hilaire</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 22</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fournier</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 23</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion Nos. 24 and 26</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Gagnon</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 27</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. de Savoye</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 28</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Asselin</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 29</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Alarie</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 30</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lebel</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 32</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dumas</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion Nos. 33 and 34</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 35</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Guay</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 36</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Venne</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 37</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Canuel</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 38</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 39</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sauvageau</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 40</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Turp</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 41</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mercier</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 42</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Laurin</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motions Nos. 43 and 44</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Desrochers</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 48</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bigras</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 49</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 50</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bernier</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 51</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Marceau</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 52</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fournier</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 53</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. de Savoye</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 54</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Alarie</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 55</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 56</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lebel</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 57</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Canuel</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 58</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sauvageau</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 59</td>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Turp</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 60</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Perron</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 61</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 62</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Asselin</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 63</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 64</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sauvageau</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 65</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Blaikie</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motions Nos. 66 and 67</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Guimond</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 68</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division on Motion No. 13 deferred</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division on Motion No. 18 deferred</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division on Motion No. 48 deferred</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division on Motion No. 50 deferred</td>
<td>4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division on Motion No. 61 deferred</td>
<td>4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division on Motion No. 62 deferred</td>
<td>4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division on Motion No. 65 deferred</td>
<td>4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division on Motion No. 68 deferred</td>
<td>4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Laurin</td>
<td>4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 69</td>
<td>4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. St-Hilaire</td>
<td>4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 70</td>
<td>4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Turp</td>
<td>4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 71</td>
<td>4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lebel</td>
<td>4430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 72</td>
<td>4430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mercier</td>
<td>4430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 73</td>
<td>4430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Blaikie</td>
<td>4430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 74</td>
<td>4430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>4430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion No. 75</td>
<td>4430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Blaikie</td>
<td>4430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motion No. 76 .................................................. 4430
Mrs. Debien ............................................... 4430
Motion No. 77 ............................................... 4430
Mr. Marceau ............................................. 4430
Motion No. 78 ............................................... 4430
Mr. Blaikie ............................................... 4430
Motions Nos. 79 and 80 .................................. 4430
Mrs. Guay .................................................. 4430
Motion No. 81 ............................................... 4430
Mr. Hill (Macleod) ..................................... 4430
Motions Nos. 82 and 83 .................................. 4430
Division on Motion No. 69 deferred ................. 4430
Division on Motion No. 72 deferred ................. 4431
Division on Motion No. 78 deferred ................. 4431
Division on Motion No. 81 deferred ................. 4431
Division on Motion No. 82 deferred ................. 4431
Division on Motion No. 83 deferred ................. 4431
Mr. Blaikie ............................................... 4431
Motion No. 85 ............................................... 4431
Mr. Rocheleau ........................................... 4431
Motion No. 86 ............................................... 4431
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) ....................... 4431
Motion No. 87 ............................................... 4431
Mr. Hill (Macleod) ..................................... 4431
Motions Nos. 88 and 89 .................................. 4431
Division on Motion No. 85 deferred ................. 4432
Division on Motion No. 86 deferred ................. 4432
Division on Motion No. 88 deferred ................. 4432
Mr. Blaikie ............................................... 4432
Motion No. 90 ............................................... 4432
Mrs. Guay .................................................. 4432
Motion No. 91 ............................................... 4432
Mr. Lebel .................................................. 4432
Motion No. 92 ............................................... 4432
Mrs. Venne ................................................ 4433
Motion No. 93 ............................................... 4433
Mr. Marceau ............................................... 4433
Motion No. 94 ............................................... 4433
Ms. Alarie .................................................. 4433
Motion No. 95 ............................................... 4433
Mrs. Tremblay ........................................... 4433
Motion No. 96 ............................................... 4433
Mrs. Debien ............................................... 4433
Motion No. 97 ............................................... 4433
Mr. Bernier ............................................... 4433
Motion No. 98 ............................................... 4433
Ms. St-Hilaire ........................................... 4433
Motion No. 99 ............................................... 4433
Mrs. Guay .................................................. 4434
Motion No. 100 ............................................ 4434
Mr. Lebel .................................................. 4434
Motion No. 101 ............................................ 4434
Mr. Godin (Châteauguay) ............................ 4434
Motion No. 102 ............................................ 4434
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) ............................ 4434
Motion No. 103 ............................................ 4434
Mr. Camuel ............................................... 4434
Motion No. 104 ............................................ 4434
Mr. Desrochers ......................................... 4434
Motion No. 105 ............................................ 4434
Mr. Turp ................................................... 4434
Motion No. 106 ............................................ 4434
Mr. Bigras ................................................ 4434
Motion No. 107 ............................................ 4434
Mr. Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) .... 4434
Motion No. 108 ............................................ 4434
Mr. Ménard ............................................... 4435
Motion No. 109 ............................................ 4435
Mrs. Venne ............................................... 4435
Motion No. 110 ............................................ 4435
Mr. Marceau ............................................... 4435
Motion No. 111 ............................................ 4435
Ms. Alarie .................................................. 4435
Motion No. 112 ............................................ 4435
Mr. Tremblay ............................................ 4435
Motion No. 113 ............................................ 4435
Ms. Girard–Bujold ...................................... 4435
Motion No. 114 ............................................ 4435
Mr. Lebel .................................................. 4435
Motion No. 115 ............................................ 4435
Mr. de Savoye ........................................... 4435
Motion No. 116 ............................................ 4435
Mrs. Debien ............................................... 4436
Motion No. 117 ............................................ 4436
Mr. Bernier ............................................... 4436
Motion No. 118 ............................................ 4436
Mr. Godin (Châteauguay) ............................ 4436
Motion No. 119 ............................................ 4436
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) ............................ 4436
Motion No. 120 ............................................ 4436
Mr. Perron .................................................. 4436
Motion No. 121 ............................................ 4436
Mr. Laurin .................................................. 4436
Motion No. 122 ............................................ 4436
Mrs. Picard ............................................... 4436
Motion No. 123 ............................................ 4436
Mr. Camuel ............................................... 4436
Motion No. 124 ............................................ 4436
Ms. Girard–Bujold ...................................... 4437
Motion No. 125 ............................................ 4437
Mr. Lebel .................................................. 4437
Motion No. 126 ............................................ 4437
Mr. de Savoye ........................................... 4437
Motion No. 127 ............................................ 4437
Mr. Asselin ............................................... 4437
Motion No. 128 ............................................ 4437
Mr. Guimond ............................................. 4437
Motion No. 129 ............................................ 4437
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac–Mégantic) ............... 4437
Motion No. 130 ............................................ 4437
Mr. Perron .................................................. 4437
Motion No. 131 ............................................ 4437
Mr. Laurin .................................................. 4437
Motion No. 132 ............................................ 4437
Mrs. Picard ............................................... 4438
Motion No. 133 ............................................ 4438
Mr. Asselin ............................................... 4438
Motion No. 134 ............................................ 4438
Mr. Sauvageau .......................................... 4438
Motion No. 135 ............................................ 4438
Mr. Mercier ............................................... 4438
Motion No. 136 ............................................ 4438
Mr. Rocheleau .......................................... 4438
Motion No. 137 ............................................ 4438
Mr. White (Langley–Abbotsford) ................. 4438
Mr. Guimond ............................................. 4438
Motion No. 138 ............................................ 4438
Motion No. 268  4451
Mr. Dumas  4451
Motion No. 269  4451
Mr. Lebel  4451
Motion No. 270  4451
Mr. Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  4451
Motion No. 271  4451
Ms. Girard-Bujold  4451
Motion No. 272  4451
Mr. Rocheleau  4451
Motion No. 273  4451
Mrs. Desbiens  4451
Motion No. 274  4451
Mr. Fournier  4451
Motion No. 275  4451
Mr. Bernier  4451
Motion No. 276  4451
Mr. Cardin  4451
Motion No. 277  4451
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean)  4452
Motion No. 278  4452
Ms. Alarie  4452
Motion No. 280  4452
Ms. St-Hilaire  4452
Motion No. 281  4452
Mr. Marceau  4452
Motion No. 282  4452
Mrs. Guay  4452
Motion No. 283  4452
Ms. Girard-Bujold  4452
Motion No. 284  4452
Mr. Plamondon  4452
Motion No. 285  4452
Mr. Ménard  4452
Motion No. 286  4452
Ms. Alarie  4452
Motion No. 287  4452
Mrs. Venne  4452
Motion No. 288  4452
Mr. Marceau  4452
Motion No. 289  4453
Mr. Plamondon  4453
Motion No. 290  4453
Mr. Fournier  4453
Motion No. 291  4453
Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean)  4453
Motion No. 292  4453
Mrs. Gagnon  4453
Motion No. 293  4453
Mr. Canuel  4453
Motion No. 294  4453
Mr. Dumas  4453
Motion No. 295  4453
Mr. Biglow  4453
Motion No. 296  4453
Mrs. Desbiens  4453
Motion No. 297  4453
Mr. Cardin  4453
Motion No. 298  4453
Mr. Turp  4454
Motion No. 299  4454
Mrs. Venne  4454
Motion No. 300  4454
Ms. Alarie  4454
Motion No. 301  4454
Mr. Cardin  4454
Motion No. 302  4454
Mr. Plamondon  4454
Motion No. 303  4454
Mr. Biglow  4454
Motion No. 304  4454
Mr. Godin (Châteauguay)  4454
Motion No. 305  4454
Mrs. Guay  4454
Motion No. 306  4454
Mr. Desbiens  4454
Motion No. 307  4454
Mr. Biglow  4454
Motion No. 308  4454
Mrs. Desbiens  4454
Motion No. 309  4454
Mrs. Venne  4454
Motion No. 310  4454
Mr. Godin (Châteauguay)  4454
Motion No. 311  4454
Mrs. Guay  4455
Motion No. 312  4455
Mr. Turp  4455
Motion No. 313  4455
Mr. Marceau  4455
Motion No. 314  4455
Mr. Desbiens  4455
Motion No. 315  4455
Ms. St-Hilaire  4455
Motion No. 316  4455
Mr. Biglow  4455
Motion No. 317  4455
Mr. Turp  4455
Motion No. 318  4455
Mr. Desbiens  4455
Motion No. 319  4455
Mrs. Guay  4455
Motion No. 320  4455
Ms. St-Hilaire  4455
Motion No. 321  4455
Mr. Desbiens  4455
Motion No. 322  4455
Mr. Turp  4455
Motion No. 323  4455
Mr. Biglow  4455
Motion No. 324  4455
Mr. Sauvageau  4455
Motion No. 325  4455
Mr. Cardin  4455
Motion No. 326  4455
Mr. Marceau  4456
Motion No. 327  4456
Mrs. Guay  4456
Motion No. 328  4456
Mrs. Venne  4456
Motion No. 329  4456
Mr. Bernier  4456
Motion No. 330  4456
Mrs. Desbiens  4456
Motion No. 331  4456
Mr. Plamondon  4456
Motion No. 332  4456
Motion No. 397
Mr. Cardin
Motion No. 398
Mr. Bigras
Motion No. 399
Mr. Marceau
Motion No. 400
Mr. Desrochers
Motion No. 401
Mr. Bernier
Motion No. 402
Mrs. Gagnon
Motion No. 403
Mr. Lebel
Motion No. 404
Mr. Canuel
Motion No. 405
Mrs. venne
Motion No. 406
Mr. Sauvageau
Motion No. 407
Mr. Laurin
Motions Nos. 408 and 409
Mr. Mercier
Motion No. 410
Mr. MacKay
Motion No. 411
Division on Motion No. 90 deferred
Division on Motion No. 91 deferred
Division on Motion No. 150 deferred
Division on Motion No. 398 deferred
(Motion No. 411 negatived)
Mr. Bergeron

Motion No. 1 negatived
Amendment negatived
Motion No. 2 negatived
Motion No. 3 negatived
Motion No. 4 negatived
Amendment negatived
Motion No. 5 negatived
Motion No. 6 negatived
Motion No. 7 negatived
Motion No. 8 negatived
Amendment negatived
Motion No. 9 negatived
Motion No. 10 defeated
Motion No. 11 negatived
Motion No. 12 negatived
Motion No. 13 negatived
Motion No. 14 negatived
Motion No. 15 negatived
Motion No. 18 negatived
Motion No. 19 negatived
Motion No. 21 negatived
Motion No. 22 negatived
Motion No. 23 negatived
Motion No. 24 negatived
Motion No. 26 negatived
Motion No. 27 negatived
Motion No. 28 negatived
Motion No. 29 negatived

Mr. Ménard

Motion No. 30 negatived
Motion No. 32 negatived
Motion No. 33 negatived
Motion No. 34 negatived
Mr. Ménard
Motion No. 35 negatived
Mr. Ménard
Motion No. 36 negatived
Mr. Bellehumeur
Motion No. 37 negatived
Motion No. 38 negatived
Motion No. 39 negatived
Motion No. 40 negatived
Motion No. 41 negatived
Motion No. 42 negatived
Mr. Bellehumeur
Mr. Marceau
Mr. Ménard
Mr. Crête
Mr. Asselin
Mr. Sauvageau
Motion No. 43 negatived
Mr. Bergeron
Motion No. 44 negatived
Mr. Bergeron
Motion No. 48 negatived
Motion No. 50 negatived
Mr. Fournier
Motion No. 51 negatived
Motion No. 52 negatived
Motion No. 53 negatived
Motion No. 54 negatived
Motion No. 55 negatived
Motion No. 56 negatived
Motion No. 57 negatived
Mr. Ménard
Motion No. 58 negatived
Motion No. 59 negatived
Motion No. 60 negatived
Motion No. 61 negatived
Motion No. 62 negatived
Motion No. 63 negatived
Motion No. 64 negatived
Motion No. 65 negatived
Mr. Marchand

Motion No. 66 negatived
Motion 67 agreed to
Motion No. 68 negatived
Motion No. 69 negatived
Motion No. 70 negatived
Motion No. 72 negatived
Mr. Ménard
Motion No. 73 negatived
Mr. Crête
Motion No. 74 negatived
Motion No. 75 negatived
Motion No. 76 negatived
Motion No. 77 negatived
Motion No. 78 negatived
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion No.</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>negatived</td>
<td>4507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>agreed to</td>
<td>4507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>negatived</td>
<td>4508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>negatived</td>
<td>4508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>negatived</td>
<td>4509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>negatived</td>
<td>4509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>negatived</td>
<td>4509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>negatived</td>
<td>4510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>negatived</td>
<td>4510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>negatived</td>
<td>4511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AN ACT TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE REQUIREMENT FOR CLARITY AS SET OUT IN THE OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA IN THE QUEBEC SECESSION REFERENCE

(The House divided on Motion No. 91, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 842)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Béliveau
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Canuel
Cardin
de Savoie
Fournier
Guay
Guimond
Lalonde
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire — 22

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Canuel
Cardin
Charlebois (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Côté
de Savoie
Fournier
Guay
Guimond
Lalonde
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Ménard
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—26

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 91 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 92. 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:

(Division No. 843)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Béliveau
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Canuel
Cardin
Charlebois (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Côté
de Savoie
Fournier
Guay
Guimond
Lalonde
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Ménard
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—26

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bélanger
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Canuel
Cardin
Charlebois (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Côté
de Savoie
Fournier
Guay
Guimond
Lalonde
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Ménard
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Government Orders

Dromisky  Drouin  Godfrey  Gruending  Harris  Hubbard  Jordan  Lamoges  Lowther  McCormick  Murray  Proulx  Sgro  Stewart (Brant)  Szabo  Vanclef  Wood—53

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 92 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 93. 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.

And more than five members having risen:

• (3025 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 93, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 844)

YEAS

Asselin  Bachand (Saint-Jean)  Bergeron  Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  Bigras  Brien  Caron  Cardin  ChétiBIN (Frontenac—Mégantic)  Côté  de Savoie  Deschênes  Dumas  Fournier  Guay  Lalonde  Lebel  Marchand  MÉnard  St-Hilaire  Tremblay (Laç-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS


The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 93 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 94. 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:

• (3030 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 94, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 845)

YEAS

Asselin  Bachand (Saint-Jean)  Bergeron  Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  Bigras  Brien  Caron  Cardin  ChétiBIN (Frontenac—Mégantic)  Côté  de Savoie  Deschênes  Dumas  Fournier  Guay  Lalonde  Lebel  Marchand  MÉnard  St-Hilaire  Tremblay (Laç-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS


The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 94 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 95. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?
March and Ménard Sauvageau St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—27

NAYS

Members


PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 94 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 95.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like you to give me a bit of an explanation of what is going on.

I have been observing the procedure in the past few votes and I have the feeling that something strikes me as somewhat irregular at first glance. You are asking which members are for and which against, and then you are moving immediately on to the recorded vote, without a decision from you as to whether the yeas or the nays have it, and as to whether five members have risen to call for a recorded vote.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member. He is right, as far as Motion No. 95 is concerned.

[English]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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:

● (3035)

(The House divided on Motion No. 95, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 846)

YEAS

Members


NAYS

Members


PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 95 lost.
The next question is on Motion No. 96. 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: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 96, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 847)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Brien
Carrin
Crête
Destruches
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Marceau
Ménard
St-Hilaire

Asselin (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Brien
Carrin
Crête
Destruches
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Marceau
Ménard
St-Hilaire

NAWS

Members

Bellemare
Bennett
Bouchard
Bradshaw
Caplan
Dahalwal
Drouin
Godbey
Guindon
Hubbard
Knutson
Leung
Lincoln
Mahoney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Parry
Price
Sgro
Stewart (Brant)
Wood—39

YEAS

Members

Bellemare
Bennett
Bouchard
Bradshaw
Caplan
Dahalwal
Drouin
Godbey
Guindon
Hubbard
Knutson
Leung
Lincoln
Mahoney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Parry
Price
Sgro
Stewart (Brant)
Wood—49

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 96 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 97. 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: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 97, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 848)

YEAS

Members

Bellemare
Bennett
Bouchard
Bradshaw
Caplan
Dahalwal
Drouin
Godbey
Guindon
Hubbard
Knutson
Leung
Lincoln
Mahoney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Parry
Price
Sgro
Stewart (Brant)
Wood—49

YEAS

Members

Bellemare
Bennett
Bouchard
Bradshaw
Caplan
Dahalwal
Drouin
Godbey
Guindon
Hubbard
Knutson
Leung
Lincoln
Mahoney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Parry
Price
Sgro
Stewart (Brant)
Wood—49

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 97 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 98. 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: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 98, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 849)

YEAS

Members

Bellemare
Bennett
Bouchard
Bradshaw
Caplan
Dahalwal
Drouin
Godbey
Guindon
Hubbard
Knutson
Leung
Lincoln
Mahoney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Parry
Price
Sgro
Stewart (Brant)
Wood—49

YEAS

Members

Bellemare
Bennett
Bouchard
Bradshaw
Caplan
Dahalwal
Drouin
Godbey
Guindon
Hubbard
Knutson
Leung
Lincoln
Mahoney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Parry
Price
Sgro
Stewart (Brant)
Wood—49

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 98 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 99. 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: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 99, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 850)

YEAS

Members

Bellemare
Bennett
Bouchard
Bradshaw
Caplan
Dahalwal
Drouin
Godbey
Guindon
Hubbard
Knutson
Leung
Lincoln
Mahoney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Parry
Price
Sgro
Stewart (Brant)
Wood—49

YEAS

Members

Bellemare
Bennett
Bouchard
Bradshaw
Caplan
Dahalwal
Drouin
Godbey
Guindon
Hubbard
Knutson
Leung
Lincoln
Mahoney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Parry
Price
Sgro
Stewart (Brant)
Wood—49

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 99 lost.
Government Orders

St-Julien  Stewar (Brant)
Strahl  Szabo
Vanelief  Wood—46

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson  Heoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 97 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 98. 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:

● (3050 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 98, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 849)

YEAS

Members

Asselin  Bellehumeur
Bergeron  Bernier (Gaspé—Bonaventure)
Lacs-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok  Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras  Brien
Cannel  Cardin
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)  Cyrille
de Savoie  Desrochers
Dumas  Fournier
Guay  Guimond
Herron  Lalonde
Lebel  Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  Ménard
Price  Sauvageau
St-Hilaire  St-Jacques
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—28

NAYS

Members

Anders  Bellemare
Bennett  Boudria
Bradshaw  Bryden
Calder  Caplan
DeVillers  Dhaliwal
Discepola  Drohan
Duncan  Gagliano
Godfrey  Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grauer  Guarini
Harris  Hirson
Hubbard  Jackson
Kilgour (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)  Knutson
Laliberte  Leung
Limosges  Lincoln
Mahoney  McCormack
McDonough  Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minnie  Mitchell
Murray  Paradis
Parry  Peterson
Pratt  Sgro

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson  Heoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 98 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 99. 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:

● (3055 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 99, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 850)

YEAS

Members

Asselin  Bellehumeur
Bergeron  Bernier (Gaspé—Bonaventure)
Lacs-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok  Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras  Brien
Cannel  Cardin
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)  Cyrille
de Savoie  Desrochers
Dumas  Fournier
Guay  Guimond
Herron  Lalonde
Lebel  Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  Ménard
Price  Sauvageau
St-Hilaire  St-Jacques
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—24

NAYS

Members

Abbott  Anders
Bennett  Bellemare
Bordua  Bernier (Gaspé—Bonaventure)
Bradshaw  Bryden
Brisson  Calder
Caplan  DeVillers
Dhaliwal  Diccepolo
Drohan  Duncan
Fontana  Gagliano
Godfrey  Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grauer  Guarini
Harris  Hirson
Hubbard  Jackson
Jennings  Knutson
Laliberte  Leung
Limosges  Lincoln
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  Mahoney
McDonough  Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 99 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 100. 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 yays have it.

And more than five having risen:

● (3100)

(The House divided on Motion No. 100, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 851)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bérubé (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Canaïd
Cardin
Côté
de Savoie
Deschênes
Giguère
Guay
Lafortune
Marchand
Savard
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—21

NAYS

Members

Anders
Bélanger
Bennett
Brassard
Bryden
De Villers
Dion
d’Entremont
Gaudet
Guinard
Guimond
Hébert
Hubbard
Jennings
Liabot
c

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 100 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 101. 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:

● (3105)

(The House divided on Motion No. 101, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 852)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bérubé (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Canaïd
Cardin
de Savoie
Dumas
Guay
Lalonde
Labbé
Marceau
Savard
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—24

NAYS

Members

Anders
Bélanger
Bennett
Brassard
Bryden
De Villers
Dion
d’Entremont
Gaudet
Guinard
Guimond
Hébert
Hubbard
Jennings
Liabot
c
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Guarnieri Herron
Halstrom Hubbard
Jackson Jennings
Knutson Leung
Lastewka Lincoln
Limoges Laliberte
Lowny Matthews
McCormick McDonough
Miller (Broadview—Greenwood) Minna
Mitchell Murray
Patty Price
Pratt Rock
Robillard Sgro
St. Denis St-Jacques
St-Julien Starbeit (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland) Stahl
Szabo Torsney
Vanclief Wood—54

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 101 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 102. 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:

- (3110)

(The House divided on Motion No. 102, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 853)

YEAS

Members

Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar Brien
Cameron Cardin
Charbonneau (Frontenac—Mégantic) Côté
de Savoie Deschênes
Dumas Fournier
Guay Guimond
Lafrance Laurin
Lefebvre Marchand
Marceau Marchand
Sauvageau St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—26

NAYS

Members

Bellemare Bennett
Boudria Brulé
Bryden Calder
Caplan Carroll
DeVilliers Dhaliwal
DiCicco Drouin
Duncan Fontaine
Gaglano Godfrey
Godbout Grewal
Guarnieri Herron
Hubbard Jackson
Jennings Knutson
Jalberte Lastewka
Leung Limoges
Lincoln Lorange
Lunn Mahoney
Matthews McCormick
McDonough Mitchell
O’Reilly Murray
Paradis Peterson
Patty Price
Pratt Rock
Robillard Sgro
St. Denis St-Jacques
St-Julien Starbeit (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland) Stahl
Szabo Torsney
Vanclief Wood—55

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 102 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 103. 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:

- (3115)

(The House divided on Motion No. 103, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 854)

YEAS

Members

Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar Brien
Cameron Cardin
Charbonneau (Frontenac—Mégantic) Côté
de Savoie Côté
Government Orders

Desrochers  
Guay  
Lalonde  
Loubier  
Marchand  
Sauvageau  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) — 25

NAYS

Members

Axworthy  
Bradshaw  
DeVillers  
Drouin  
Fontana  
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)  
Herron  
Jackson  
Laliberte  
Leung  
Lincoln  
Lunn  
Mathews  
McDonough  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Murray  
Paradis  
Peterson  
Price  
Rock  
St. Denis  
St-Julien  
Stewart (Northumberland)

NA Y S

Members

Axworthy  
Bradshaw  
DeVillers  
Drouin  
Fontana  
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)  
Herron  
Jackson  
Laliberte  
Leung  
Lincoln  
Lunn  
Mathews  
McDonough  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Paradis  
Price  
Rock  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)  
Torsney

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 103 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 104. 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 yea's have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3120)

(The House divided on Motion No. 104, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 855)

YEAS

Members

Asselin  
Bellehumeur  
Bergeron  
Bigras  
Cabinet

Chretien (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
de Savoye  
Guay  
Laurin  
Loubier  
Marchand  
Sauvageau  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) — 22

NA Y S

Members

Axworthy  
Bradshaw  
DeVillers  
Drouin  
Fontana  
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)  
Herron  
Jackson  
Laliberte  
Leung  
Lincoln  
Lunn  
Mathews  
McDonough  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Paradis  
Price  
Rock  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)  
Torsney

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 104 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 105. 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:

(3125)

(The House divided on Motion No. 105, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 856)

YEAS

Members

Asselin  
Bellehumeur  
Bergeron  
Bigras  
Cabinet

Chretien (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
de Savoye  
Guay  
Laurin  
Loubier  
Marchand  
Sauvageau  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) — 38

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 104 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 105. 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:

(3120)

(The House divided on Motion No. 105, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 855)
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NAYS

Members
Axworthy Bellemare
Bryden Calder
Carroll DeVillers
Discepola Drouin
Godfrey Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal Hubbard
Heron Laliberte
Knutson Limoges
Leung Lincoln
Mahoney Matthews
Mc Cormick Mills (Red Deer)
McNally Paran
Murray Prat
Price Rock
Sgro St. Denis
St-Jacques Stewart (Northumberland)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 106 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 107. 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:

(3135)

(The House divided on Motion No. 107, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 858)

YEAS

Members
Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé)
Bergeron Deschênes—Pabok)
Brien Côté
Carlin Daubert
Côté Deschênes
Drouin Gagnon
Guay Lalonde
Label Marceau
Marchand Sauvageau
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—26

NAYS

Members
Axworthy Bellemare
Bryden Calder
Carroll DeVillers
Discepola Drouin
Godfrey Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal Hubbard
Heron Laliberte
Knutson Limoges
Leung Lincoln
Mahoney Matthews
Mc Cormick Mills (Red Deer)
McNally Minna
Murray Paradis
Peterson Price
Robillard Rock
Sgro St. Denis
St-Jacques Stewart (Northumberland)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 105 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 106. 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:

(3130)

(The House divided on Motion No. 106, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 857)
Government Orders

NAYS Members
Axworthy
Bradshaw
Caplan
DeVillers
Drouin
Fontana
Grewal
Heron
Knutson
Leung
Lincoln
Mahoney
McDonough
Mills (Red Deer)
Murray
Pagtakhan
Peterson
Price
Robillard
Schmidt
St-Jacques
Wood—43

YEAS Members
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Béliveau
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar
Bouchard
Caron
Charlebois (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Gaudreault
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 107 lost.

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 108 lost.

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 109 lost.
The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 109 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 110. 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:

(3150)

(The House divided on Motion No. 110, which was negatived on the following division:)

Division No. 861

YEAS

Members

Axworthy  Bellemare
Bradshaw  Bryden
Caccia  Calder
Caplan  Carroll
DeVillers  Dhaliwal
Dion  Elley
Fontana  Gagliano
Giguere  Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal  Guarnieri
Herron  Hubbard
Jennings  Knutson
Laliberte  Leung
Limoges  Lincoln
Lunn  Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews  McNally
Mils (Broadview—Greenwood)  Mills (Red Deer)
Mina  Mitchell
Murray  Normand
O'Reilly  Parry
Peterson  Pratt
Price  Ritz
Robillard  Rock
Schmidt  St-Jacques
Stewart (Northumberland)  Szabo
Torsney—49

NAYS

Members

Asselin  Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Belhumeur  Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar  Brière
Caulier  Cardin
Chézine (Frontenac—Mégantic)  Deschênes
de Savoie  Gagnon
Fournier  Guay
Girard-Bujold  Laurin
Guimond  Loubier
Lebel  Marceau
Marchand  Peron
Plamondon  Sauvé
St-Hilaire  Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—28

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)  Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 110 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 111. 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:

(3155)

(The House divided on Motion No. 111, which was negatived on the following division:)

Division No. 862

YEAS

Members

Asselin  Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Belhumeur  Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar  Brière
Caulier  Cardin
Chézine (Frontenac—Mégantic)  Deschênes
de Savoie  Gagnon
Fournier  Guay
Girard-Bujold  Laurin
Guimond  Loubier
Lebel  Marceau
Marchand  Peron
Plamondon  Sauvé
St-Hilaire  Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—28

NAYS

Members

Axworthy  Bellemare
Bradshaw  Bryden
Caccia  Calder
Caplan  Carroll
DeVillers  Dhaliwal
Dion  Elley
Fontana  Gagliano
Giguere  Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal  Guarnieri
Herron  Hubbard
Jennings  Knutson
Laliberte  Leung
Limoges  Lincoln
Lunn  Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews  McNally
Mils (Broadview—Greenwood)  Mills (Red Deer)
Mina  Mitchell
Murray  Normand
O'Reilly  Parry
Peterson  Pratt
Price  Ritz
Robillard  Rock
Schmidt  St-Jacques
Stewart (Northumberland)  Szabo
Torsney—46

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)  Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  Nunziata
Government Orders

Perron Plamondon
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—20

NAYS

Members
Bellemare Bradshaw
Bryden Caccia
Calder Carroll
Carty Dhaliwal
Gagliano Edley
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst) Godfrey
Herron Jennings
Knutson Laliberte
Leung Limoges
Lunn Matthews
McNally Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Normand
O'Reilly
Robillard Rock
Schmidt Sgro
St-Julien Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo—37

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 111 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 112. 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 yea's have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Division No. 863

YEAS

Members
Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur Bergeron
Bernier (Boulevard—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok) Brien
Bigras Côté
de Savoie Dubé
Denochers Duquette
Fournier Gagnon
Girard-Bujold Guay
Laurin Label
Loubier Marcoux
Marchand Mercier
Perron Picard (Drummond)
Rochefort Sauvé
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)—31

NAYS

Members
Assad Axworthy
Bellemare Bradshaw
Bryden Caccia
Calder Caplan
Carroll Dhaliwal
Carty Drouin
DeVillers Fontaine
Edley Godfrey
Gagliano Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Godfrey Guarini
Jennings Jurie
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh) Knutson
LaLiberte Lastewka
Leung Lincoln
Mahoney Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews McNally
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) Murray
Normand O'Reilly
Pagtakhan Patry
Pratt Price
Robillard Rock
Schmidt Sgro
St-Julien Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland) Vanclief
Wood—51

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 112 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 113. 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 yea's have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Division No. 864

YEAS

Members
Alarie Asselin
Bellehumeur Bergeron
Bernier (Boulevard—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok) Brien
Bigras Côté
dé Savoie Dechêne
Duquette Deben
Girard-Bujold Gagnon
Goudreau Gauthier
Marchand Menuet
March 13, 2000

Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau—22

NAYS

Bryden
Caplan
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Gagliano
Guarnieri
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Laliberte
Leung
Lincoln
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McDonough
Minna
Normand
Patry
Price
Schmidt
Stewart (Brant)
Torsney

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 113 lost.

The next question is on Motion 114. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 114, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 865)

YEAS

Alarie
Asselin
Béliveau
Bergeron
Bernier (Bouavenue—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Falic)
Biggar
Brien
Côté
Ducharme
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Gaulin (Châteauguay)
Guérin
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau—20

(Asselin
Bergen
Brex
Côté
Ducharme
Dubé
Gagnon
Gaulin
Guérin
Mercier
Picard
Sauvageau)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 114 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 115. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 115, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 866)

YEAS

Alarie
Asselin
Béliveau
Bernier
Biggar
Brien
Côté
Dubé
Gagnon
Gaulin
Guérin
Mercier
Picard
Sauvageau—21

(Asselin
Bergen
Brex
Côté
Dubé
Gagnon
Gaulin
Guérin
Mercier
Picard
Sauvageau)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 115 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 116. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?
Government Orders

NAYS

Members
Axworthy  Caccia
Calder   Carroll
Drouin  Grewal
Guarnieri Herron
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh) Knutson
Lacson  Limoges
Mahoneys Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) Mills (Red Deer)
Minna    Mitchell
Normand  O’reilly
Pagtkhan  Parry
Proctor  Robillard
St. Jacques St. Julien
Stewart (Brant) Szabo
Volpe    Wood—36

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 115 lost.
The next question is on Motion No. 116. 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 yea’s have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3215)

(The House divided on Motion No. 116, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 867)

YEAS

Members
Alarie  Asselin
Bergeron Biggar
Brien Cardin
Cride Debienc
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) Ducppe
Gagnon Girard-Bujold
Gidou (Châteauguay) Mercier
Perron Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon Rochellean
Sauvageau

NAYS

Members
Abbott  Caccia
Carroll DiCiccapola
Earle  Guarnieri
Hubbard  Laval
Imoques  Limoges
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) Matthews
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) Mills (Red Deer)
Minna  O’reilly
Proctor  Parry
Robillard Stewart (Brant)
Wood—39

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 116 lost.
The next question is on Motion No. 117. 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 yea’s have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3220)

(The House divided on Motion No. 117, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 868)

YEAS

Members
Alarie  Asselin
Bergeron Biggar
Brien Cardin
Cride Debienc
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) Ducppe
Gagnon Girard-Bujold
Gidou (Châteauguay) Mercier
Perron Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon Rochellean
Sauvageau

NAYS

Members
Axworthy  Caccia
Calder   Carroll
Drouin  Grewal
Guarnieri Herron
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh) Knutson
Lacson  Limoges
Mahoneys Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) Mills (Red Deer)
Minna    Mitchell
Normand  O’reilly
Pagtkhan  Parry
Proctor  Robillard
St. Jacques St. Julien
Stewart (Brant) Szabo
Volpe
The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 117 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 118. 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:

(3225)

(The House divided on Motion No. 118, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 869)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair (Bonaventure—Gaspé)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp—22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cacci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Villers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drouin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limoges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (LaSalle—Émard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ménard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpetit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Brant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood—47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoepner
Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 118 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 119. 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:

(3230)

(The House divided on Motion No. 119, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 870)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair (Bonaventure—Gaspé)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp—22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cacci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Villers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drouin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limoges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (LaSalle—Émard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ménard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpetit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Brant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoepner
Nunziata
**Government Orders**

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boudia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discepola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson | Hoeppner |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) | Nunziata |

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 119 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 120. 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:**

(3235)

(The House divided on Motion No. 120, which was negatived on the following division:)

**Division No. 871**

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gédéon (Chateauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boudia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discepola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson | Hoeppner |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) | Nunziata |

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 120 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 121. 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:**

(3240)

(The House divided on Motion No. 121, which was negatived on the following division:)

**Division No. 872**

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gédéon (Chateauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 121 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 122. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3245)

(The House divided on Motion No. 122, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 873)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Cardin
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Godin (Châteauguay)
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Mercier
Plamondon
Rochelieu
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Tup—19

NAYS

Members
Axworthy
Caccia
Caplan
Desjardais
Elley
Gagliano
Giguere
Godfrey
Grewal
Herron
Limoges
Mahoney
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McDonough
Normand
Pagtakhan
Proctor
Ritz
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stewart (Brant)
Volpe
Wood—48

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 122 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 123. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3250)

(The House divided on Motion No. 123, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 874)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bergeon
Bérubé (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Cardin
Dubé (Lévis-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Mercier
Plamondon
Sauvé
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Tup—23

NAYS

Members
Axworthy
Caccia
Caplan
Desjardais
Elley
Gagliano
Giguere
Godfrey
Grewal
Herron
Limoges
Mahoney
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McDonough
Normand
Pagtakhan
Proctor
Ritz
Rock
Sgro
Stewart (Brant)
Wood—48

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 121 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 122. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3245)

(The House divided on Motion No. 122, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 873)

YEAS

Members

NAYS

Members

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 122 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 123. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3250)

(The House divided on Motion No. 123, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 874)
Government Orders

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellemare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caccia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhalawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limoges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martel (Laval—Memphremagog)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nylund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Brant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood—51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson         |
| Hoeppner         |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) |
| Nunziata         |

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 123 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 124. 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:**

(3255)

(The House divided on Motion No. 124, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 875)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Créte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochefort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvagare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellemare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caccia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhalawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limoges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martel (Laval—Memphremagog)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nylund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Brant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood—43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson         |
| Hoeppner         |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) |
| Nunziata         |

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** I declare Motion No. 124 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 125. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

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

(The House divided on Motion No. 125, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 876)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Créte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochefort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvagare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellemare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caccia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhalawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limoges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martel (Laval—Memphremagog)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nylund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Brant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood—43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 125 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 126.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 126, which was negatived on the following division:)

**Government Orders**

*(Division No. 877)*

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bérinier (Bonaventure—Gaspé)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debiens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duceppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocheski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellemare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discepola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limoges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (LaSalle—Émard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serré</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Brant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volpe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anderson</th>
<th>Hoepner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
<td>Nunziata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 126 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 127.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 126, which was negatived on the following division:)

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anderson</th>
<th>Hoepner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
<td>Nunziata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 126 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 127.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.
Government Orders

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 127, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 878)

YEAS

Members

Bigras
Bergeron
Bergeron (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)
Brien
Bruneau (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rochefort
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp

(3310)

NAYS

Members

Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bakopanos
Bradshaw
Caccia
Caplan
Carrillo
Carrillo
Copps
Desjardins
Duceppe
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Numata

The next question is on Motion No. 128.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: Yes.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 128, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 879)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin
Bigras
Bergeron
Bergeron (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)
Brien
Carle
Cardin
Debien
Dubé
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Guimond
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bakopanos
Bradshaw
Caccia
Caplan
Carrillo
Carrillo
Copps
Desjardins
Duceppe
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bakopanos
Bradshaw
Caccia
Caplan
Carrillo
Carrillo
Copps
Desjardins
Duceppe
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bakopanos
Bradshaw
Caccia
Caplan
Carrillo
Carrillo
Copps
Desjardins
Duceppe
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS
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PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)  Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 128 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 129.

● (3315)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 129, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 880)

YEAS

Members

Alarie  Asselin
Biggar  Brien
Cardin  Crête
Dubé  Dioupe
Gagnon  Girard-Bujold
Godbout (Châteauguay)  Guimond
Mercier  Perron
Picard (Drummond)  Plamondon
Rochefran  Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vézina—21

NAYS

Members

Assadourian  Bakopanos
Bellemare  Bradshaw
Brown  Caccia
Calder  Caplain
Carroll  Desjarlais
Copp  Desjardins
Dhaliwal  Dioupe
Drouin  Earle
Elie  Fontana
Godfrey  Gray (Windsor West)
Grose  Herron
Huseyn  Knutson
Lee  Leblanc
Lincoln  Mahoney
Marleau  Matthews
McDonough  McNally
Mills (Red Deer)  Minna
Murray  Normand
Nystrom  Patry

Government Orders

Peterson  Pratt
Price  Procureur
Ritz  Robillard
Rock  Schmidt
Serré  Sgro
Stewart (Brant)  Stewart (Northumberland)
Volpe  Wood—52

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)  Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 129 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 130.

● (3320)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 130, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 881)

YEAS

Members

Alarie  Asselin
Biggar  Brien
Cardin  Crête
Dubé  Dioupe
Gagnon  Girard-Bujold
Godbout (Châteauguay)  Guimond
Mercier  Perron
Picard (Drummond)  Plamondon
Rochefran  Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vézina—20

NAYS

Members

Assadourian  Bakopanos
Bellemare  Bradshaw
Brown  Caccia
Calder  Caplain
Carroll  Desjarlais
Copp  Desjardins
Dhaliwal  Dioupe
Drouin  Earle
Elie  Fontana
Godfrey  Gray (Windsor West)
Government Orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigras</td>
<td>Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
<td>Crête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debien</td>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duceppe</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimond</td>
<td>Mercier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peron</td>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumondon</td>
<td>Rocheleau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitza)</td>
<td>Vennis—22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Hoeppner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
<td>Nunziata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 130 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 131. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3325)

(The House divided on Motion No. 131, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 882)

YEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigras</td>
<td>Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
<td>Crête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debien</td>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duceppe</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimond</td>
<td>Mercier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peron</td>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumondon</td>
<td>Rocheleau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitza)</td>
<td>Vennis—22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AssadOURian</td>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BréléSMare</td>
<td>Booudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BradWaw</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coccia</td>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copps</td>
<td>Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desj ³   Nais</td>
<td>Dhaliwal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc ³  pola</td>
<td>Drum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
<td>Elley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagliano</td>
<td>Godfrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray (Windsor West)</td>
<td>Greywal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girose</td>
<td>Guarnieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
<td>Jennings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leung</td>
<td>LimoGeS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Marleau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (LaSalle—Emard)</td>
<td>Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonough</td>
<td>McNally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Nystrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pugakhan</td>
<td>Patry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritz</td>
<td>Robillard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>Seré</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Brant)</td>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)—50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Hoeppner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
<td>Nunziata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 131 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 132. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3330)

(The House divided on Motion No. 132, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 883)

YEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigras</td>
<td>Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
<td>Crête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debien</td>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duceppe</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimond</td>
<td>Mercier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peron</td>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumondon</td>
<td>Rocheleau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitza)</td>
<td>Vennis—22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 132 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 133. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 133, which was negatived on the following division:)

**Government Orders**

(Division No. 884)

**YEAS**

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Brian Côte
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

**NAYS**

Members

Bakopanos
Boudria
Brown
Caplan
Caterall
Davies
Desjardins
Drouin
Earle
Elley
Godfrey
Grewal
Herron
Jennings
Limage
Lampp
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Metcalf
Mills (Red Deer)
Misson
Nystrom
Peterson
Price
Robillard
Sgro
Stewart (Brant)

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Numata

*Nil/aucun*
Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

● (3340)

(The House divided on Motion No. 134, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 885)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Bergeron Brien Crête Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) Gagnon Godin (Châteauguay) Mercier Picard (Drummond) Sauvageau Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis) Asselin Bigras Cardin Debien Ducourneau Girard-Bujold Guimond Peron Plamondon Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

NAYS

Members

Assadourian Bellemare Bradshaw Calder Casey Cupps Desjarlais Earl Godfrey Grewal Gauthier Jennings Knutson Limoges Lunn Martin (LaSalle—Éilda) McDonough Minna Normand O’Brien (Labrador) Peterson Proctor Robillard Serr Stewart (Brant)

YEAS

Members

Assaelin Bergeron Brien Crête Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) Gagnon Godin (Châteauguay) Mercier Picard (Drummond) Sauvageau Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) Asselin Bigras Cardin Debien Ducourneau Girard-Bujold Guimond Peron Plamondon Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

NAYS

Members

Assadourian Bellemare Bradshaw Calder Casey Cupps Desjarlais Earl Godfrey Grewal Gauthier Jennings Knutson Limoges Lunn Martin (LaSalle—Éilda) McDonough Minna Normand O’Brien (Labrador) Peterson Proctor Robillard Serr Stewart (Brant)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoepner Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 134 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 135. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion may please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3345)

(The House divided on Motion No. 135, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 886)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Bergeron Brien Crête Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) Gagnon Godin (Châteauguay) Mercier Picard (Drummond) Sauvageau Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) Assaelin Bigras Cardin Debien Ducourneau Girard-Bujold Guimond Peron Plamondon Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

NAYS

Members

Assadourian Bellemare Bradshaw Calder Casey Cupps Desjarlais Earl Godfrey Grewal Gauthier Jennings Knutson Limoges Lunn Martin (LaSalle—Éilda) McDonough Minna Normand O’Brien (Labrador) Peterson Proctor Robillard Serr Stewart (Northumberland)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoepner Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 135 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 136.

(3350)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 136, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 887)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
<td>Biggar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
<td>Crête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debién</td>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duceppe</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
<td>Rochefort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvagueres</td>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)</td>
<td>Vézina—20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assadourian</td>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
<td>Bellemare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boudria</td>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne</td>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catrall</td>
<td>Charbonneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copps</td>
<td>Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
<td>Duceppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummond</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elley</td>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallaway</td>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray (Windsor West)</td>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grisé</td>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ianno</td>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>Vézina—22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karygiannis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limoges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien (Labrador)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seré</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volpe—53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIRED MEMBERS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Hoepner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
<td>Nuniata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 136 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 137.

(3355)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 137, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 888)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
<td>Biggar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
<td>Crête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debién</td>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duceppe</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
<td>Rochefort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvagueres</td>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)</td>
<td>Vézina—22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assadourian</td>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
<td>Bellemare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boudria</td>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne</td>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catrall</td>
<td>Charbonneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copps</td>
<td>Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
<td>Duceppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummond</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elley</td>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallaway</td>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray (Windsor West)</td>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grisé</td>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ianno</td>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>Vézina—22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karygiannis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limoges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien (Labrador)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seré</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volpe—53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIRED MEMBERS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Hoepner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
<td>Nuniata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government Orders

Mills (Red Deer) Muna
Normand Nystrom Patry
O’Brien (Labrador) Price Ritz
Peterson Schmidt Sgro
Proctor Senft Volpe—54
Rock Stewart (Northumberland)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 137 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 138. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 138, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 889)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bergeron Bigras
Brien Cardin
Crête Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) Duceppe
Gagnon Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay) Mercier
Perron Picard (Drummound)
Plamondon Rochelieu
Sauvéau Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis) Turp
Venne—23

NAYS

Members

Assadourian Axworthy
Bakopanos Bellemare
Brahmaw Bye
Caccia Calder
Campion Carroll
Catterall Copps
Davies Desjarlais
Discopolis Earle

Elley Gallaway
Godfrey Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal Grose
Guarnieri Harvey
Heron Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Ianno Karygiannis
Leung Limoges
Lincoln Mahoney
McNulty Matthews
Minna Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom N’Bien
Patry O’Brien (Labrador)
Price Pilitteri
Ritz Rock
Schmidt Sgro
Stewart (Northumberland) Volpe—50

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 138 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 139. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 139, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 890)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bergeron Bigras
Brien Cardin
Crête Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) Duceppe
Gagnon Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay) Mercier
Perron Picard (Drummound)
Plamondon Rochelieu
Sauvéau Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis) Turp
Venne—22

NAYS

Members

Assadourian Axworthy
Bakopanos Bellemare
Brahmaw Bye
Caccia Calder
Campion Carroll
Catterall Copps
Davies Desjarlais
Discopolis Earle

Elley Gallaway
Godfrey Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal Grose
Guarnieri Harvey
Heron Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Ianno Karygiannis
Leung Limoges
Lincoln Mahoney
McNulty Matthews
Minna Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom N’Bien
Patry O’Brien (Labrador)
Price Pilitteri
Ritz Rock
Schmidt Sgro
Stewart (Northumberland) Volpe—50

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 139 lost.
Government Orders

NAYS
Members
Assadourian
Bakopanos
Byrne
Calder
Carter
Charbonneau
Davies
Discepola
Elgie
Godfrey
Grewal
Guarnieri
Herron
Ianno
Leung
Lincoln
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Munna
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Piliftieri
Prucy
Robillard
Schmidt
Volpe—59

YEAS
Members
Gagnon
Godin
Perron
Tremblay
Turp—21

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 139 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 140. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 140, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 891)

YEAS
Members
Alarie
Bergeon
Borders—La-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Crête
Duceppe
Asselin
Benoit—Gaspé—Caspé—
Biggar
Cardin
Didon

NAYS
Members
Assadourian
Bakopanos
Byrne
Carter
Charbonneau
Davies
Discepola
Elgie
Godfrey
Grewal
Guarnieri
Herron
Ianno
Leung
Lincoln
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Munna
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Piliftieri
Prucy
Robillard
Schmidt
Volpe—59

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 140 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 141. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(PAIRED MEMBERS)

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) Hoepner
Kilgour (Labrador) Nunziata
Government Orders

(3415)

(The House divided on Motion No. 141, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 892)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Cardin
Debien
Duceppe
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Perron
Plamondon
Sanuageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matane—Témiscouata—Saguenay)
Venne—22

NAYS

Members

Assadourian
Bailey
Bradshaw
Byne
Calder
Charbonneau
Davies
Douin
Ellery
Gallaway
Grewal
Guarnieri
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Knutson
Limage
Lunn
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Normand
O’Brien (Labrador)
Paity
Pilitteri
Proctor
Ritz
Rock
Volpe—55

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3420)

(The House divided on Motion No. 142, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 893)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Cardin
Debien
Duceppe
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Perron
Plamondon
Sanuageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp—18

NAYS

Members

Assadourian
Bailey
Bradshaw
Byne
Calder
Charbonneau
Davies
Douin
Ellery
Gallaway
Grewal
Guarnieri
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Knoutson
Limage
Lunn
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Normand
O’Brien (Labrador)
Paity
Pilitteri
Proctor
Ritz
Rock
Volpe—55

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 141 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 142. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 142 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 143. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(Division No. 894)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruneau (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendron (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienne—20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caccia (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copps (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjardins (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagliano (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grose (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunn (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McTavish (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McTavish (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagtakhan (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienne—51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) |
| Kilgour (Edmonton South) |

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 143 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 144. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(Division No. 895)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruneau (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendron (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienne—22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caccia (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copps (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjardins (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagliano (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grose (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunn (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McTavish (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McTavish (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagtakhan (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienne—51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) |
| Kilgour (Edmonton South) |

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 145 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 146. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(Division No. 896)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruneau (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendron (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienne—22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caccia (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copps (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjardins (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagliano (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grose (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunn (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McTavish (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McTavish (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagtakhan (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienne—51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government Orders

Peterson
Pilitteri
Proctor
Ritz
Schmidt
Stewart (Brant)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Volpe—55

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 144 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 145. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3435 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 145, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 896)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Brien
Cardin
Côté
Debien
Dubé (Lévis—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Girard-Buïld
Godin (Châteauguay)
Lefebvre
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon
Rochefort
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

NAYS

Members

Axworthy
Bailey
Bakopanos
Boudria
Bradshaw
Brown
Byrne
Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Carroll
Catterall
Charbonneau
Côté
Charbonneau
Dubé (Lévis—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Debien
Godin (Châteauguay)
Mercier
Nicoll
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matane)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 145 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 146. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3434 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 146, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 897)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin
Bergeron
Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Cardin
Côté
Debien
Dubé (Lévis—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Girard-Buïld
Godin (Châteauguay)
Lefebvre
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

NAYS

Members

Axworthy
Bailey
Bakopanos
Boudria
Bradshaw
Brown
Byrne
Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Carroll
Catterall
Charbonneau
Côté
Charbonneau
Dubé (Lévis—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Debien
Godin (Châteauguay)
Mercier
Nicoll
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matane)
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 146 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 147. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3445)

(Division No. 898)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Belleau—Pabok
Cardin
Debien

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 147 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 148. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3450)

(Division No. 899)

YEAS

Members

Athanaci
Boudria
Byrne
Calder
Charbonneau
Copps
Earle
Gallaway
Gray
Hill
Karygiannis
Lincoln
McDonough
Mills
Nystrom
Patry
Petitgrew
Price
Ritz
Rock
Serré
Stewart
Thompson

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 148 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 149. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3453)

(Division No. 900)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Iles-de-la-Madeleine
Cardin
Debien

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 149 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 150. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3456)

(Division No. 901)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Bélanger
Bonaventure
Charbonneau
Davies
Earle
Gallaway
Gagnon
Hill
Karygiannis
Leung
Matthews
McDonough
McNally
Mercier
Mills
Mills
Nystrom
Patry
Petitgrew
Price
Ritz
Schmidt
Stewart
Stinson
Thompson

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 150 lost.
Government Orders

(Division No. 899)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Breton (Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Cahier
Cahier
D'Entremont
Gagnon
Godbout (Châteauguay)
Gérard Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rochefort
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Bailey
Belemare
Béliveau
Charbonneau
Charbonneau
Copps
Davies
Earle
Gallaway
Giglioni
Harvey
Higgins
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Karygiannis
Lincoln
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McDonough
McNally
Nystrom
Paré
Petitclerc
Richardson
Robillard
Schmitt
St-Jacques
Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 148 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 149. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The next question is on Motion No. 170. I have just checked with the clerks and we are moving to Motion No. 170 because of the grouping that has been done. We shall go back to Motion No. 150 in a few minutes.

An hon. member: This is a very important motion.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): We will keep that in mind.

The next question is on Motion No. 170. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3505)

(The House divided on Motion No. 170, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 901)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Brien
Cardin
Crie
Debiene
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Golin (Châteauguay)
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matane)
Venne —22

NAYS

Members
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bailey
Bakogianas
Bellemare
Boudria
Brown
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Charbonneau
Capps
Davies
Dhaliwal
Earle
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal

Government Orders

Grose
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Leung
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
McNally
Morrison
Nystrom
Pankiw
Peterson
Pillitteri
Richardson
Schmidt
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour —55
Harvard
Heron
Karygiannis
Lincoln
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McDonough
McTague
Normand
Pattakos
Petty
Price
Rock
St. Jacques
Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Asselin
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 170 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 171. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3510)

(The House divided on Motion No. 171, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 902)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Brien
Cardin
Crie
Debiene
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Golin (Châteauguay)
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne —20

NAYS

Members
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bailey
Bakogianas
Bellemare
Boudria
Brown
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Charbonneau
Capps
Davies
Dhaliwal
Earle
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal

Asselin
Bergerson
Bouvier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Brien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Golin (Châteauguay)
Perron
Plamondon
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne —20

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): This is a very important motion.

The next question is on Motion No. 170. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3505)

(The House divided on Motion No. 170, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 901)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Brien
Cardin
Crie
Debiene
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Golin (Châteauguay)
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matane)
Venne —22

NAYS

Members
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bailey
Bakogianas
Bellemare
Boudria
Brown
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Charbonneau
Capps
Davies
Dhaliwal
Earle
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal

Government Orders

Grose
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Leung
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
McNally
Morrison
Nystrom
Pankiw
Peterson
Pillitteri
Richardson
Schmidt
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour —55
Harvard
Heron
Karygiannis
Lincoln
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McDonough
McTague
Normand
Pattakos
Petty
Price
Rock
St. Jacques
Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Asselin
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 170 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 171. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3510)

(The House divided on Motion No. 171, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 902)
Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Assadourian
Bailey
Brown
Calder
Catterall
Copps
Dhaliwal
Earle
Gallaway
Graham
Grewal
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Lincoln
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McDonough
McToigue
Morrison
Obhrai
Peterson
Price
Richardson
Schmidt
Serré
Sinistron
Vellacott
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Byrne
Charbonneau
Davies
Discepola
Godfrey
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Herron
Karygiannis
Mahoney
Matthews
McNally
Mills (Red Deer)
Pagtakhan
Pelleriti
Prootor
Rock
Sekura
St-Jacques
Vandevelde
Wappel—54

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 171 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 173. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (3515)

(The House divided on Motion No. 173, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 903)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergevin
Bélanger Tardif—Pabok)
Cardin
Debien
Asselin
Bigras
Côté

NAYS

Members

Assadourian
Bailey
Brown
Calder
Catterall
Copps
Dhaliwal
Earle
Gallaway
Graham
Grewal
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Lincoln
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McDonough
McToigue
Morrison
Obhrai
Peterson
Price
Richardson
Schmidt
Serré
St-Jacques

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 173 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvan Bernier: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have been in this House since the voting started last night. I have seen all sorts of things happening. What has just happened is the House of Commons game. Members have to answer questions when the time is right, and they have to face the consequences of their mistakes.

• (3520)

I feel the need to point out that, when one of our members was not in his seat last night—he was in the House but not in his seat—we lost a motion, namely Motion No. 84. What has happened just now is that the Liberals were asleep at the switch, and I think they ought to live with the consequences.

Your slowness in acknowledging that they were not standing casts somewhat of a shadow over your impartiality, Madam Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I can assure the hon. member—
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Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more that five members having risen:

(3525)

(The House divided on Motion No. 175, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 904)

YEAS

Members

Alarie  Asselin
Bezanson  Berri (Bonaventure—Gaspé)
Bergeron  Biggar
Èles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok  Cardin
Neu  Delean
Dubé (Levis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)  Duclose
Gagnon  Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)  Mercier
Perron  Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon  Rocherel
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  Tremblay (Rimouski—Minis)
Tourt  Venne—23

NAYS

Members

Assadourian  Axworthy
Bailey  Bakvanos
Bellemare  Bondar
Bradshaw  Byrne
Caccia  Caplan
Carroll  Carterall
Charbonneau  Comuzzi
Coppa  Davies
Desjardins  Dhaliwal
Earle  Gagliano
Godfrey  Graham
Gray (Windsor West)  Grove
Herron  Harvard
Karygiannis  Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Kotson  Knutson
Leung  Lincoln
Mahoney  Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews  McDougall
McNally  McTeague
Morrison  Normand
Nykatnum  Obhrai
Pagekhan  Pankiw
Patty  Pettitigrew
Pallister  Pece
Proctor  Richardson
Robillard  Sekura
Soré  Speller
St-Jacques  Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)  Stinson
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)  Vellacott
Vappel—63

The next question is on Motion No. 175. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Order, please. I can assure the hon. member that I saw four Liberal members on their feet here, plus one more right at the back of the room. He was standing, right at the back. So, there were five in all.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The next question is on—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I will not accept the behaviour of the member whose riding I shall not name for the moment. I caution the hon. member that, if he does not calm down, I shall take the necessary steps.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: Madam Speaker, I think everyone is tired. That is understandable.

What I wish to ask, however—and we have it on tape—it takes—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: Could the hooligans be asked—

An hon. member: That is what happens to cheaters.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Another comment from the hon. member and I will be forced to take the necessary steps and name him. For the moment, the hon. leader of the Bloc Quebecois has the floor.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: Madam Speaker, I wish I could have appreciated it if you had asked the hooligans across the floor to pipe down while I was speaking, but you did not.

That said, and we have it on the tape, members are taking a good 45 seconds to rise. In future, I would request that you not give them a signal to stand but let them act on their own, as happened this time.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): That is an accusation which I reject outright, because I have never signalled any member or told any member to rise. Let that be clear.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 175. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.
Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 175 lost.

● (3530)

The next question is on Motion No. 179. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 179, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 905)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bergeron Bernier (Brossard—Longueuil)
Brien Biggs
Curtis Debe
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) Duquette
Gagnon Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay) Mercier
Perron Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis) Turp
Venne—22

NAYS

Members

Assadourian Bailey
Bakopanos Bellemare
Boudria Byrne
Caccia Cappe
Carroll Catterall
Comuzzi Copp
Davies Dhalwai
Earle Fogliano
Godfrey Graham
Gray (Windsor West) Grose
Guarnieri Harvard
Heron Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Karygiannis Knutson
Louni Lincoln
Mahoney Martin (LaSalle—Emard)
Mathews McGuire
McNally McTague
Morrison Nyström
Obhrai Paglihan
Pankiw Parry

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 179 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 182.

● (3535)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 182, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 906)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bergeron Biggs
Brien Debe
Curtis Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay) Guimond
Mercier Picard (Drummond)
Rochebeau Turp
Venne—22

NAYS

Members

Assadourian Bailey
Bakopanos Bellemare
Boudria Byrne
Caccia Caplan
Carroll Catterall
Comuzzi Copp
Davies Dhalwai
Earle Fogliano
Godfrey Graham
Gray (Windsor West) Grose
Guarnieri Harvard
Heron Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Karygiannis Knutson
Louni Lincoln
Mahoney Martin (LaSalle—Emard)
Mathews McGuire
McNally McTague
Morrison Nyström
Obhrai Paglihan
Pankiw Parry

Government Orders
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Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 182 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 184. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3545)

(The House divided on Motion No. 184, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 907)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Bérubé
Bigras
Cardin
Dube
Dubé
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Girouard
Perron
Plamondon
Turp

Asselin
Bernard (Bonaventure—Gaspé)
Bigras
Cardin
Dube
Dubé
Gagnon
Girouard
Girouard
Perron
Plamondon
Turp

VENUE—21

NAYS

Members

Assadourian
Bakopoulos
Boudria
Byrne
Caplan

VENUE—21
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Catterall  
Davies  
Dockrill  
Earle  
Gallaway  
Green  
Harvard  
Karygiannis  
Lincoln  
Martin (LaSalle—Émad)  
McGuire  
McTeague  
Morrison  
Nystrom  
Parry  
Price  
Richardson  
Scott (Skeena)  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Vautour  
Volpe  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assemin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bellemare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bes-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Céline</td>
<td></td>
<td>Catterall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ducepope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Girard-Bégoold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard ( Drummond)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocheroux</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitsu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vienne—23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 187 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 191. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 191, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 909)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Yeas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bes-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Céline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard ( Drummond)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocheroux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bes-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Céline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard ( Drummond)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocheroux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 191 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 193. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 193, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 909)
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The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3605)

(The House divided on Motion No. 198, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 911)

YEAS

Members

Assadourian
Bellemare
Brown
Caccia
Caplan
Catterall
Davies
Dockrill
Douglas
Drouin
Gallaway
Guarnieri
Heron
Karygiannis
Lincoln
Matthews
McGuire
Munna
Normand
Pagaluk
Pallister
Proctor
Richardson
Scott (Skeena)
Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
Wappel—57

NAYS

Members

Assadourian
Bellemare
Brown
Caccia
Caplan
Catterall
Davies
Dockrill
Douglas
Drouin
Gallaway
Guarnieri
Heron
Karygiannis
Lincoln
Matthews
McGuire
Munna
Normand
Pagaluk
Pallister
Proctor
Richardson
Scott (Skeena)
Stewart (Northumberland)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
Wappel—48

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoepner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 193 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 198. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoepner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 198 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 199. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?
Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3610)

(The House divided on Motion No. 199, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 912)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin
Brien
Cardin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Girard-Bujold
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Turp

NAYS

Members

Assadourian
Bakopanos
Bellemare
Bertrand
Borotsik
Brown
Caccia
Calder
Casey
Catterall
Clouthier
Davies
Desjardins
Duhamel
Drolet
Earle
Duhamel
Gallaway
Gagnon
Graham
Earle
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Harvey
McGuire
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Munro
McQuarrie
Norman
Morrison
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pettingrew
Pilipeni
Proctor
Robillard
Rock
Stewart (Brant)
Wappel
Wessel

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoegpner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 199 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 201. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 201, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 913)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin
Brien
Cardin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Girard-Bujold
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Turp

NAYS

Members

Assadourian
Bakopanos
Bellemare
Bertrand
Borotsik
Brown
Caccia
Calder
Casey
Catterall
Clouthier
Davies
Desjardins
Duhamel
Drolet
Earle
Duhamel
Gallaway
Gagnon
Graham
Earle
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Harvey
McGuire
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Munro
McQuarrie
Norman
Morrison
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pettingrew
Pilipeni
Proctor
Robillard
Rock
Stewart (Brant)
Wappel
Wessel

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoegpner
Nunziata
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The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 201 lost.

● (3615 )

The next question is on Motion No. 204. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Aye.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the ayes have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 204, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 914)

YEAS

Members

- Alarie Asselin
- Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
- Bigras Brien
- Cardin Debsen
- Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
- Gagnon Godin (Châteauguay)
- Guimond Mercier
- Perron Picard (Drummond)
- Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—16

NAYS

Members

- Assadourian Bailey
- Bellmore Bertrand
- Borotusk Brown
- Byrne Caccia
- Catterall Cauchon
- Comuzzi Davies
- Desjardins Dubuc
- Earl Gallaway
- Godfrey Graham
- Gray (Windsor West) Harvard
- Harvey Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
- Karpyiannis Knutson
- Marleau Minna
- Morrison Nystrom
- Pettigrew Proctor
- Robillard Rock
- Scott (Sheen Valley) Speller
- Sivellott Volpe
- Wappel Wilfert—38

PAIRED MEMBERS

- Andison Hoeppner
- Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 204 lost.

Government Orders

The next question is on Motion No. 211. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 211, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 915)

YEAS

Members

- Alarie Asselin
- Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
- Bigras Brien
- Cardin Debsen
- Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
- Gagnon Godin (Châteauguay)
- Guimond Mercier
- Perron Picard (Drummond)
- Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—19

NAYS

Members

- Bertrand Bailey
- Brown Bertrand
- Caccia Brown
- Caccia Caccia
- Comuzzi Cauchon
- Desjardins Davies
- Earl Dubuc
- Godfrey Gallaway
- Gray (Windsor West) Graham
- Harvey Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
- Karpyiannis Knutson
- Marleau Minna
- Morrison Nystrom
- Pettigrew Proctor
- Robillard Rock
- Scott (Sheen Valley) Speller
- St-Jacques Volpe
- Volpe Whelan
- Wappel Wilfert—44

PAIRED MEMBERS

- Andison Hoeppner
- Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata
Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 211 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 215. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3625)

(The House divided on Motion No. 215, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 916)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)

Bigras

Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)

Duceppe

Godin (Châteauguay)

Guimond

Mercier

Picard (Drummond)

Rocheleau

Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Venne—18

NAYS

Members

Bailey

Bakopanos

Borotsik

Brown

Byrne

Caccia

Casey

Cauvin

Conzuzi

Cochon

Desjardins

Dion

Earle

Dion

Godfrey

Graham

Gray (Windsor West)

Hill (Prince George—Peace River)

Kariya

Lincoln

Mathews

Matthews

Nault

Nystrom

O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)

Petitgrew

Price

Proctor

Richardson

Robillard

Saada

Scott (Skeena)

Specter

St-Jacques

Stinson

Volpe

Wachsmuth—42

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson

Hoepner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Nunziata

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson

Hoepner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Nunziata
Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 222 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 224. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(Division No. 919)
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 224 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 225. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 225, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 920)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Bergeron (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Cardin
Duceppe
Girard-Bujold
Mercier
Plamondon
Saumureau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne —20

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Bakopanos
Cacci
Casey
Catterall
Chéretien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Davies
Dockrill
Duchesne
Gallaway
Graham
Harvard
Ianni
Jennings
Leung
MacAulay
Nault
Nystrom
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O’Brien
Petigrew
Proctor
Proulx
Saada

Sokora
St. Denis
Stinson

Speller
St-Jacques
Wilfert—54

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 225 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 227. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 227, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 921)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Bergeron (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Cardin
Duceppe
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Perron
Plamondon
Saumureau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne —22

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Bakopanos
Cacci
Casey
Catterall
Chéretien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Davies
Dockrill
Duchesne
Gallaway
Gray (Windsor West)
Gray
Harvard
Ianni
Jennings
Leung
MacAulay
Nault

Alcock
Bakopanos
Calder
Casson
Chéretien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Davies
Dockrill
Duchesne
Gallaway
Gray (Windsor West)
Gray
Harvard
Ianni
Jennings
Leung
MacAulay
McNally
Nault

Bailey
Byrne
Casey
Catterall
Chéretien
Coderre
Davies
Dockrill
Duchesne
Gallaway
Gray
Harvard
Ianni
Jennings
Leung
MacAulay
Nault
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Jennings
Leung
MacAulay
McNally
Nafti
Nystrom
Obhrai
Pankiew
Pettigrew
Proulx
Proctor
Proud
Pugel
Racette
Riendeau
Scott (Skeena)
Sekora
Shaw
Shepherd
St-Denis
St-Julien
Stewar
Sukhna
Swan
Tavares
Telford
Whelan
Wilfert—55

Karygiannis
Lincoln
McGuire
McTeague
Normand
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pankiew
Pettigrew
Proulx
Proctor
Proud
Pugel
Racette
Riendeau
Scott (Skeena)
Sekora
St.-Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoepner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 227 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 229. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3650)

(The House divided on Motion No. 229, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 922)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bergeron
Cardin
Dube (Levis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudiere)
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Perron
Rochefort
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp

Asselin
Biggar
Debien
Gagnon
Gandin (Chateauguay)
Mercier
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venue —20

NAYS

Members
Alcock
Bailey
Belzile
Byrne
Casey
Chefren (Saint-Maurice)
Codere
Davies
Dockrill
Dube (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Godfrey
Harvard
Iammarino
Augustine
Bakahpanos
Bellemare
Calder
Casson
Cloutier
Consarni
Dion
Drouin
Earle
Graham
Hubbard
Jackson

(3655)

(The House divided on Motion No. 231, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 923)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bergeron
Bacchus—Madeleine—Pabok
Cardin
Dube (Levis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudiere)
Guimond
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venue —22

NAYS

Members
Alcock
Bailey
Beaumier
Bellemare
Calder
Augustine
Bakahpanos
Belzile
Byrne
Casey
Government Orders

The next question is on Motion No. 234. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 234, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 924)

YEAS

Members

Aldio
Ballell
Bélanger
Bérubé
Billan
Blais
Boivin
Bourassa
Boulet
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bourassa
Bouchard
Bouchet
Bou
April 20, 1995

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 235 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 237. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it. And more than five members having risen:


table

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 237 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 238. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?


table

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 238 lost.
Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3720)

(The House divided on Motion No. 238, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 927)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Berner (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Crête
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rochefort
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Augustine
Bakopanos
Bellemare
Brown
Caccia
Casey
Chan
Davies
Don
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Fontana
Gibson (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Harvard
Jackson
Johnston
Knott
Lincoln
Manley
McNulty
Morison
Nault
Nystrand
Pagtakhan
Pettigrew
Pillette
Proud
Saada
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Valeri
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 238 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 240. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3725)

(The House divided on Motion No. 240, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 928)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Berner (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Crête
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Augustine
Bakopanos
Bellemare
Brown
Caccia
Casey
Chan
Davies
Don
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Fontana
Gibson (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Harvard
Jackson
Johnston
Knott
Lincoln
Manley
McNulty
Morison
Nault
Nystrand
Pagtakhan
Pettigrew
Pillette
Proud
Saada
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Valeri
Whelan

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3720)

(The House divided on Motion No. 238, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 927)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Berner (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Crête
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Augustine
Bakopanos
Bellemare
Brown
Caccia
Casey
Chan
Davies
Don
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Fontana
Gibson (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Harvard
Jackson
Johnston
Knott
Lincoln
Manley
McNulty
Morison
Nault
Nystrand
Pagtakhan
Pettigrew
Pillette
Proud
Saada
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Valeri
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 238 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 240. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3725)

(The House divided on Motion No. 240, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 928)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Berner (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Crête
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Augustine
Bakopanos
Bellemare
Brown
Caccia
Casey
Chan
Davies
Don
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Fontana
Gibson (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Harvard
Jackson
Johnston
Knott
Lincoln
Manley
McNulty
Morison
Nault
Nystrand
Pagtakhan
Pettigrew
Pillette
Proud
Saada
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Brant)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Valeri
Whelan
Murray
Normand
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pettigrew
Pillette
Proud
Rook
Sgro
St. Denis
Steele
Stewart (Northumberland)
Ur
Wilfert—67

PAIRED MEMBERS
Anderson
Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 240 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 266. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3730 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 266, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 929)

YEAS
Members
Asselin
Asselin (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Bigras (Gatineau)
Cardin
Birn
Côté
Birn (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dube
Dube (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Gagnon (Châteauguay)
Gélinas
Gélinas (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Guimond (Châteauguay)
Lajoie
Guimond (Châteauguay)
Forest
Mercier
Moisan
Mercier (Châteauguay)
Muller
Méthot
Perreault
Perreault (Châteauguay)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Turp

NAYS
Members
Asaad
Asaad (Beloeil—Charlevoix)
Augustine
Augustine (Beloeil—Charlevoix)
Bakran
Bakran (Beloeil—Charlevoix)
Bélanger
Bélanger (Beloeil—Charlevoix)
Bouillon
Bouillon (Beloeil—Charlevoix)
Caccia
Caccia (Beloeil—Charlevoix)
Catanese
Catanese (Beloeil—Charlevoix)
Chair
Chair (Beloeil—Charlevoix)

PAIRED MEMBERS
Anderson
Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 266 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 269. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3735 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 269, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 930)

YEAS
Members
Asselin
Asselin
Bigras
Bigras
Cardin
Cardin
Côté
Côté
Dube
Dube (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Gagnon (Châteauguay)
Gélinas
Gélinas (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Guimond (Châteauguay)
Perron
Perron (Châteauguay)
Rochette
Rochette (Châteauguay)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Turp
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 269 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 271. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3740)

(The House divided on Motion No. 271, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 931)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bégin</td>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchet</td>
<td>Bellemare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borotsik</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caille</td>
<td>Catterall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caron</td>
<td>Charbonneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapdelaine</td>
<td>Copps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmarais</td>
<td>Dujardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Khoury</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantin</td>
<td>Godfrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gérin-Lajoie</td>
<td>Gérin-Lajoie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glavine</td>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hébert</td>
<td>Goodale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellway</td>
<td>Goodale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeBel</td>
<td>Gourdeau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemieux</td>
<td>Guindon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libman</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauro</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>Giguère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>Giguère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mérette</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolin</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellerin</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitras</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottie</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouliot</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proulx</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racette</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robichaud</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossy</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touré</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vellacott</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoepner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 271 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 273. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3745)

(The House divided on Motion No. 273, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 932)
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 273 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 275. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3750)

(The House divided on Motion No. 275, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 933)

YEAS

Members

Alarie 
Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar 
Brien
Cardin 
Deshen
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon 
Duceppe
Godin (Châteauguay) 
Guimond
Mercier 
Perron
Picard (Drummond) 
Plamondon
Rochefort 
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) 
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—22

NA YS

Members

Assadourian 
Bailey
Bakopanos 
Bellemare
Botrosik 
Caccia
Catterall 
Cauchon
Charbonneau 
Copps
Dockrill 
Desjardins
Earle 
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Fontana 
Gagnon
Goodale 
Godfrey
Harb 
Guarnieri
Hill (Prince George—Peace River) 
Harvard
Jones 
Iftody
Manley 
Jones
McNally 
Karygiannis
Morris 
McGuire
Nystrom 
Normand
Pettigrew 
Picard (Drummond)
Proctor 
Plamondon
Saada 
Richardson
St. Denis 
Sauvageau
Stewart (Northumberland) 
Tremblay (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott —39

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 275 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 280. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3755)

(The House divided on Motion No. 280, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 934)

YEAS

Members

Alarie 
Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar 
Côté
Cardin 
Dube (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon 
Duceppe
Godin (Châteauguay) 
Guimond
Mercier 
Perron
Picard (Drummond) 
Plamondon
Rochefort 
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) 
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—21

NA YS

Members

Assadourian 
Bailey
Bakopanos 
Bellemare
Botrosik 
Caccia
Catterall 
Cauchon
Charbonneau 
Copps
Dockrill 
Desjardins
Earle 
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Fontana 
Gagnon
Goodale 
Godfrey
Harb 
Guarnieri
Hill (Prince George—Peace River) 
Harvard
Jones 
Iftody
Manley 
Jones
McNally 
Karygiannis
Morris 
McGuire
Nystrom 
Normand
Pettigrew 
Picard (Drummond)
Proctor 
Plamondon
Saada 
Richardson
St. Denis 
Sauvageau
Stewart (Northumberland) 
Tremblay (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott —42
Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Bailey
Bélanger
Bellemare
Bozoki
Borotsik
Caccia
Carroll
Cauchoin
Copps
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Folco
Fontana
Goodliffe
Grodin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Harb
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Jones
Longfield
Manley
Matthews
McWhinney
Murray
Proctor
Rock
Sgro
Ur
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 280 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 283. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 283, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 935)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Côté
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Mercier
Mercuri (Drummond)
Plamondon
Rochefleau
Rumsey (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Sgro
Stoffer
Vellacott
Wilfert—49

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 283 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 285. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 285, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 936)
March 13, 2000

COMMONS DEBATES

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 285 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Turp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The speed at which you are reading out these motions is more akin to that of an auctioneer or the commentator at a horse race than to that of a Speaker of the House of Commons.

The Deputy Speaker: It is always the desire of the Chair to serve the House, for—as hon. members are aware—the Chair is the servant of the House. We do not, however, wish to waste time with these motions. This is the third—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: This is already the third time these motions have been read to the House. All hon. members also have before them, or available to them, the Order Paper, in which the motions are all listed. I always give the motion number as well. Hon. members can eve read them in both official languages. I therefore believe that, even at the speed I am reading, it is possible to understand what is being said.
Mr. Daniel Turp: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that what you said was that we are wasting the time of the House with these amendments and motions? Is that what you said, Mr. Speaker?

The Deputy Speaker: Not at all. Perhaps how I said it in French is what caused the problem.

[English]

I said that the Speaker does not wish to waste the time of the Chamber in going slowly in reading when it is the third time these motions have been read to the House, and members have in front of them copies in both languages so they can easily follow.

[Translation]

That is why I read a bit quickly, but I did not suggest that the time of the House is being wasted. It is not up to the Speaker to suggest such a thing.

Mr. Daniel Turp: For the record, Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat that you said we are wasting the time of the House, whereas we have rights in this House and we are claiming our democratic rights to debate a bill.

[English]

Mr. Ted McWhinney: Mr. Speaker, I would take as a point of order that you should exercise your powers to control tendentious and abusive use of parliamentary procedures. This is not a point of order.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair must continue with the voting at this time.

The next question is on Motion No. 288. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (3815)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 288, which was negatived on the following division:)

YEAS

Alarie
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar
Cardin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Girard-Bujold
Gim mond
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mirisc)
Venne —22

NAYS

Bailey
Bellemare
Byrne
Carroll
Desjardins
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Eggleton
Godfrey
Grose
Harb
Harvard
Jones
Longfield
Mallins
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Murray
Obhrai
Scott (Skeena)
Stoffler
Valeri
Whelan—43

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 288 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 289. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:
(The House divided on Motion No. 289, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 939)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras Brien
Cardin Crête
Debien Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay) Guimond
Mercier Perron
Picard ( Drummond) Plamondon
Rochelieu Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) Venne—21

NAYS

Members

Bailey Belanger
Bellemare Bosnick
Byrne Caccia
Carroll Davies
Drouin Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle Easter
Eggleton Godfrey
Goodale Guest
Guarnieri Harb
Hardy Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River) Jennings
Jordan Lincoln
Malhi Matthews
McKay (Scarborough East) McNally
McWhinney Morrison
Murray Nystrom
O'Brien Pankow
Peric Pillitteri
Proctor Redman
Richardson Scott (Skeena)
Stoffer Ur
Valeri Wellacott
Whelan Wilfert—48

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 289 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 291. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 291 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 293. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.
Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(3830)

(The House divided on Motion No. 293, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 941)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar
Bois
Dufresne
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duclos
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Gladu (Vendée-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Guimond
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Plessis
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Saurel
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp
Venne — 21

NAYS

Members

Bailey
Belanger
Bellemare
Bemard
Birge
Boulanger
Boivin
Byrne
Caccia
Carroll
Cassidy
Davies
Drolet
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Easter
Fedigan
Folco
Godfrey
Gérin-Lajoie
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Gosse
Guerin
Hardy
Harb
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hillman
Johnson
Jennings
Jennings
Johnston
Johnson
Jones
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maheu
Mathews
McKay (Scarborough East)
McFadden
McWhirter
Meade
Morrison
Murray
Ntoumou
Obhrai
Oliphant
Proctor
Redman
Richardson
Scott (Skeena)
Stelfox
Stewart
Stuart
Sudbrooke
Wilcox
Wilman
Wilson
Wolfe
Wong
Wyse
Yellowhead
Young

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoogstraten
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 293 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In order to respond to the arguments of the government House leader, who finds that this voting process is costing the taxpayers a great deal of money, I have consulted with the other three opposition parties, and we propose, and request of this House, unanimous consent for the division to be held during the regular sitting hours of the House. We are doing so in response to the demands of the government.

I can state that all opposition parties would be in agreement on this. If we do not obtain unanimous consent, then the party in government will bear the responsibility. People will see how hypocritical they are.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: There is obviously not unanimous consent.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, I would like you to explain what you mean by “obviously not”. I do not understand your comment.

The Deputy Speaker: I heard many nays, so it is obvious that there is not unanimous consent.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 295. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.
(The House divided on Motion No. 295, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 942)

**YEAS**

Members

Alarie  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Biggs  
Cardin  
Debien  
Duceppe  
Girard-Bujold  
Guimond  
Perron  
Plamondon  
Sauvageau  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Venne—24

**NAYS**

Members

Augustine  
Bailey  
Beaumier  
Borotsik  
Casey  
Chan  
Cullen  
Dion  
Drouin  
Duhamel  
Easter  
Fontana  
Goodale  
Harb  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Jones  
Knutson  
McWhinney  
Morrison  
Nysewrom  
Pankiw  
Proctor  
Richardson  
St. Denis  
Vellacott

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Anderson  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 295 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 296. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.
Government Orders

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3845)

(The House divided on Motion No. 297, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 944)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Brien
Crête
Dube
Duceppe
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Mercier
Perron
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—20

NAYS

Members

Assadourian
Axworthy
Bailey
Bakopoulos
Beaumier
Boornik
Boudria
Caccia
Carroll
Casey
Catterall
Cham
Charbonneau
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Davies
Dockrill
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Guarnieri
Harb
Hardy
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Iltopy
Jones
Kazyiannis
Malhi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mathews
McKay (Scarborough East)
Mitchell
Morrison
Normand
Nystrøm
Pankiw
Parlìsh
Proctor
Saada
Scott (Skeena)
Sgro
St. Denis
Volpe—50

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (3850)

(The House divided on Motion No. 298, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 945)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin
Bergeron
Brien
Bryan
Crête
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Mercier
Perron
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—23

NAYS

Members

Adams
Axworthy
Bailey
Bakopoulos
Boudria
Boornik
Casey
Caccia
Cham
Cutterall
Coderre
Cullen
Desjardins
Dockrill
Duhamel
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Guarnieri
Hardy
Harvard
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jones
Kazarian
LaSalle—Émard
Maurice
Morgan
Nystrøm
Parlìsh
Periniewski
Saada
St. Denis
Volpe—45

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata
March 13, 2000

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 298 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 399.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 399, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 946)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Casnel
Dehen
Ducoppe
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Perron
Sauvageau
Turp—20

NAYS

Members

Adams
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Bergeron (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Brié)
Benoit
Boromik
Caccia
Catterall
Charbonneau
Corrazi
Davies
Dhuibh
Ducoppe
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jones
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Morrison
Nystrom
Saada
St. Denis

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 399 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 400. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 400, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 947)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Cyr
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Mercier
Rochefort
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Borotnick
Casey
Catterall
Charbonneau
Cullen
Desjarlais
Dhuibh
Ducoppe
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Gilmour
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Morrison
Pankiw

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Government Orders

The next question is on Motion No. 401. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Before we get to taking the vote, I remind members again that if the member is not in the House when the question is put, he or she is not to vote.

(The House divided on Motion No. 401, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 948)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Bégin de la Madeleine—Pabok
Bren
Debien
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matane)
Veilleux —20

Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Biggar
Dubé (Lévis—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Girard-Bujold
Girouard
Girouard
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matane)

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Assalounian
Ashworth
Boroxak
Caccia
Carulli
Charbonneau
Copp
Davies

Adams
Augustine
Beaumier
Boudria
Casey
Chan
Codere
Cullen
Desjardins

Earle
Gilmore
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Hart
Johnston
Manley
Mayfield
Mitchell
Petigrew
Saada
St. Denis
Volpe —45

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson—Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) —Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 401 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Turp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Certain members on the other side of this House have been caught in the act of using cell phones. They were trying to surf on their cell phones.

Could you please remind them that the use of cell phones is not allowed in the House? I am referring, among others, to the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Every opportunity that I get to remind members of the decorum of the House is welcome. Members know that cellphones are not to be used in the House and that includes behind the curtains. If people want to use cellphones, go into the lobbies.

The next question is on Motion No. 402. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson—Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) —Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 402 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Turp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Certain members on the other side of this House have been caught in the act of using cell phones. They were trying to surf on their cell phones.

Could you please remind them that the use of cell phones is not allowed in the House? I am referring, among others, to the Minister of Canadian Heritage.
And more than five members having risen:

● (3915)

(The House divided on Motion No. 402, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 949)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debién</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocherleur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Missis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veuen — 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ablonczy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assadourian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boudria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caccia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catierall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charbonneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray (Windsor West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettigrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (Skenea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Denis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vellacott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) | Hoppner |
| Nunziata |

**Government Orders**

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

● (3920)

(The House divided on Motion No. 403, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 950)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debién</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocherleur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Missis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp — 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ablonczy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assadourian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boudria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charbonneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray (Windsor West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (LaSalle—Émard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (Skenea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volpé — 39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) | Hoppner |
| Nunziata |

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 404 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 404. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.
Government Orders

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 House divided on Motion No. 404, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 951)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Berry
Brien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Mercier
Perron
Pion
Plamondon
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleur
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—20

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bakranos
Beaumier
Bozoknik
Boudria
Caccia
Cardinal
Chan
Charbonneau
Copp
Cullen
Davies
Dejardins
Dion
Bouchard
Eggleton
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleur
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—21

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 404 lost.

● (3925) 

The next question is on Motion No. 405. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 405, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 952)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Berry
Brien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Mercier
Perron
Plamondon
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleur
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—21

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bakranos
Beaumier
Bozoknik
Boudria
Caccia
Cardinal
Chan
Charbonneau
Copp
Cullen
Davies
Dejardins
Dion
Bouchard
Eggleton
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleur
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—47

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 405 lost.
The next question is on Motion No. 406. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on Motion No. 406, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 953)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Bigras
Brien
Dubé
Debien
Ducppe
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Turp

Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)
Côté (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon (Châteauguay)
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleur
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne—23

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Belanger
Butler
Copps
Drummond
Folco
Grose
Harb
Harbour
Harvey
Hart
Harvard
Johnston
Jordan
Mailey
Mayfield
McWhinney
Murray
Peric
Pittiti
Rock
Stoffer
Valeri
Whelan—41

Axlworthy
Boon
Carroll
Davies
Earle
Gouk
Guarnieri
Hart
Harvey
Jones
Longfield
Mathews
McEwen
Meredith
Parish
Petigrew
Richardson
Scott (Shenaz)
Ur
Vellacott

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 406 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 407. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on Motion No. 407, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 954)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bergeron
Bigras
Brien
Dubé
Debien
Ducppe
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Turp

Arana
Belanger
Borotuk
Carroll
Copps
Drummond
Drolet
Earle
Gouk
Guarnieri
Hart
Harvey
Harvard
Johnston
Johnston
Johnston
Johnston
Jordan
McEwen
Meredith
Meredith
Murray
Petigrew
Petigrew
Stoffer
Valeri
Whelan—37

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Belanger
Birze
Côté (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Gagnon (Châteauguay)
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleur
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne—22

The next question is on Motion No. 407. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on Motion No. 407, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 954)
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 407 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 408. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 408, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 955)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bigras
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Guimond
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Bélanger
Borossak
Carroll
Copps
Earle
Gouk
Guarnieri
Harvey
Harvard
Johnston
Lincoln
Malhi
Mathews
McTeague
Meredith
Parish
Pallister
Richardson
Stoffer

(Division No. 956)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bélanger
Borossak
Carroll
Copps
Earle
Gouk
Guarnieri
Harvey
Harvard
Johnston
Lincoln
Malhi
Mathews
McTeague
Meredith
Parish
Pallister
Richardson
Stoffer

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Bélanger
Borossak
Carroll
Copps
Earle
Folco
Gouk
Guarnieri
Harvey
Harvard
Johnston
Lincoln
Malhi
Mathews
McKay (Scarborough East)
Meredith
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 409 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 410. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(3950 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 410, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 957)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caccia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drouin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) |
| Hoepner (Scarborough East) |
Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 150 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 151. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 151 obviates the necessity of the question being put on Motions Nos. 152 to 169, 172, 174, 176 to 178, 180, 181, 183, 185, 186, 188 to 190, 192, 194 to 197, 200, 202, 203, 205 to 210, 212 to 214, 216 to 218, 220, 221, 223, 226, 228, 230, 232, 233, 236, 239, 241 to 265, 267, 268, 270, 272, 274, 276 to 278, 281, 282, 284, 287, 290, 292, 294, 299 to 397.

On the other hand, a negative vote on Motion No. 151 necessitates the question being put on Motions Nos. 152 to 169, 172, 174, 176 to 178, 180, 181, 183, 185, 186, 188 to 190, 192, 194 to 197, 200, 202, 203, 205 to 210, 212 to 214, 216 to 218, 220, 221, 223, 226, 228, 230, 232, 233, 236, 239, 241 to 265, 267, 268, 270, 272, 274, 276 to 278, 281, 282, 284, 287, 290, 292, 294, 299 to 397, provided that the adoption of any one of these motions will obviate the necessity of the question being put on the remaining motions in this series.

● (4000)

An affirmative vote on this motion obviates the necessity of the question being put on all the motions. On the other hand, a negative vote on this motion necessitates the question being put on all those motions.

The next question is on Motion No. 151. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 151, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 959)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean) Bigras
Canuel de Savoye
Debien Dumas
Gagnon Girard-Bujold
Gelinas (Châteauguay) Label
t
Marceau Marchand
Ménard Perron
Plamondon Rocheleau
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turb—22

NAYS

Members

Abinczyc Axworthy
Bélanger Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotck Caccia
Carroll Cauchon
Copp Davies
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche) Earle
Easter Gilmour
Gibbs Hardy
Hart Harvard
Harvey Jennings
Hamlin Mathews
Johnston McKay (Scarborough East)
Longfield McWhinney
Mansfield Murray
Mayfield Pettigrew
Meredith Stoffer
Parish Valeri
Redman Whelan—41

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Nunziata
Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 151 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 152. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 152, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 960)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean) Bigras
Canuel de Savoye
Debien Dumas
Gagnon Girard-Bujold
Gelinas (Châteauguay) Label
Marceau Marchand
Ménard Perron
Plamondon Rocheleau
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turb—22

NAYS

Members

Abinczyc Axworthy
Bélanger Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotck Caccia
Carroll Cauchon
Copp Davies
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche) Earle
Easter Gilmour
Gibbs Hardy
Hart Harvard
Harvey Jennings
Hamlin Mathews
Johnston McKay (Scarborough East)
Longfield McWhinney
Mansfield Murray
Mayfield Pettigrew
Meredith Stoffer
Parish Valeri
Redman Whelan—41

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Nunziata
Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 152 lost.
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 152 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 153. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

● (4010)

(The House divided on Motion No. 153, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 961)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Caron
Côté
Dumas

Asselin
Bellehumeur
de Savoie
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Fournier

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Awasty
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bute
Carroll
Copp
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Gilmour
Grose
Hardy
Harvey
Johnston
Longfield
Manley
Mayfield
McWhinney
Murray
Ur
Wilfert—39

Ablonczy
Awasty
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bute
Carroll
Copp
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Gilmour
Grose
Hardy
Harvey
Johnston
Longfield
Manley
Mayfield
McWhinney
Murray
Ur
Wilfert—48

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 153 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 154. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

● (4015)

(The House divided on Motion No. 154, which was negatived on the following division:)
Government Orders

(Division No. 962)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
Dumas
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Lebel
Marchand
Mercier
St-Hilaire

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Fournier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Laurin
Marceau
Ménard
Perron
Venne—20

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Axworthy
BéLANGER
Bulte
Caccia
Carroll
Dubé
Earle
Galloway
Hardy
Harvard
Johnston
Longfield
Manley
Matthews
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Murray
Nystrom
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Peric
Rock
Stoffer
Valeri
Whelan

Augustine
Axworthy
BéLANGER
Bulte
Caccia
Carroll
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Easter
Galloway
Grose
Hart
Harvey
Johnston
Longfield
Manley
Matthews
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Murray
Nystrom
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Peric
Redman
Rock
Stoffer
Valeri
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 154 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 155. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(4020)

(The House divided on Motion No. 155, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 963)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
Dumas
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Lebel
Marchand
Mercier
Perron
Plamondon
St-Hilaire

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Fournier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Laurin
Marceau
Ménard
Perron
Plamondon
St-Hilaire

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Axworthy
BéLANGER
Bulte
Caccia
Carroll
Dubé
Earle
Galloway
Hardy
Harvard
Johnston
Longfield
Manley
Matthews
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Murray
Nystrom
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Peric
Redman
Rock
Stoffer
Valeri
Whelan

Augustine
Axworthy
BéLANGER
Bulte
Caccia
Carroll
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Easter
Galloway
Grose
Hart
Harvey
Johnston
Longfield
Manley
Matthews
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Murray
Nystrom
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Peric
Redman
Rock
Stoffer
Valeri
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 155 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 156. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.
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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:

(4025 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 156, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 964)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
Desrochers
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Giroux
Lebel
Marchand
Mercier
Plamondon
St-Hilaire

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dumas
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Laurin
Marceau
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Venne—24

NAYS

Members
Ablonczy
Borotsik
Caccia
Cauchon
Earle
Gallaway
Gray (Windsor West)
Greene
Hart
Jennings
Malhi
Matthews
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Murray
Parish
Redman
Steckle
Ur
Wasyliw-Leis

Belanger
Buie
Carroll
Dockrill
Easter
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Hurt
Johnston
Longfield
Manley
Mayfield
McLelland (Edmonton West)
Meredith
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pettigrew
Rock
Stoffer
Valeri
Whelan—40

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Nunziata

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 157, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 965)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
Desrochers
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Giroux
Lebel
Marchand
Mercier
Plamondon
St-Hilaire

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dumas
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Laurin
Marceau
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Venne—24

NAYS

Members
Ablonczy
Borotsik
Caccia
Cauchon
Earle
Gallaway
Gouk
Greene
Hart
Jennings
Malhi
Matthews
McWhinney
Murray
Parish
Redman
Steckle
Ur
Wasyliw-Leis

Augustine
Belanger
Buie
Carroll
Dockrill
Easter
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grose
Hurt
Johnston
Longfield
Manley
Mayfield
McLelland (Edmonton West)
Meredith
Murry
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Petigrew
Rock
Stoffer
Valeri
Whelan—40

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Nunziata
Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 157 lost.

(4030)

The next question is on Motion No. 158. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 158, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 966)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
Dumas
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Lebel
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Laurin
Marceau
Ménard
Perron
Venne — 20

NA YS

Members

Ablonczy
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bertin (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Caccia
Coderre
Dion
Dockrill
Easter
Gallaway
Gough
Gray (Edmonton North)
Grenier
Guthrie
Hahn
Lafleche
Malhi
Mayfield
McWhaney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nystrom
Parish
Rock

Augustine
Bakopanos
Borotuk
Cannis
Caucion
Collenette
Discopolia
Earle
Gagliano
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gray (WindsoWest)
Grose
Hart
Johnston
Lincoln
Manley
McGuire
Meredith
Mitchell
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Proud
Saada — 44

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoepner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 158 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 159.

(4035)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 159, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 967)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
Desrochers
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Laurin
Marceau
Ménard
Perron
Rocheleau
Venne — 23

NA YS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dumas
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Lebel
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
St-Hilaire

NAY S

Members

Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Caccia
Coderre
Dockrill
Gagliano
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gray (WindsoWest)
Gough
Grene
Hahn
Lafleche
Malhi
Mayfield
McGuire
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)

Augustine
Bakopanos
Borotuk
Cannis
Caucion
Collenette
Discopolia
Earle
Galliway
Grose
Hart
Johnston
Lincoln
Manley
McGuire
Meredith
Mitchell
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Proud
Saada — 44

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoepner
Nunziata
Nystrom
Petitgrew
Rock
Speller
Wasylycia-Leis —45

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 159 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 160. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(4040 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 160, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 968)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
Desrochers
Dion
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Laurin
Mareau
Ménard
Perron
Rocheleau
Venne—23

NAYS

Members
Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Caccia
Catterall
Chat
Collinette
Drouin
Earle
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Grundling
Hedy
Knutson
MacAskill
McGuire
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nystrom
Piozzi
Rock
Speller
St. Denis

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 160 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 161. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(4045 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 161, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 969)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
Desrochers
Fournier
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Label
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
St-Hilaire

NAYS

Members
Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Caccia
Catterall
Chat
Collinette
Drouin
Earle
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Grundling
Hedy
Knutson
McAskill
McGuire
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nystrom
Piozzi
Rock
Speller
St. Denis

Government Orders

Members
Augustine
Baker
Bennett
Bégin
Bélanger
Borotnik
Caccia
Catterall

NAYS

Members
Augustine
Bakopanos
Bélanger
Borotnik
Caccia
Catterall
**Government Orders**

Cauchon  
Coderre  
Dion  
Dockrill  
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Gruending  
Hart  
Johnston  
MacAulay  
McGuire  
Mitchell  
Proctor  
Rock  
Stewart (Northumberland)  

Chan  
Collenette  
Diseopola  
Earle  
Gouk  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Hart  
Johnston  
Kilgour  
Mayfield  
Meredith  
Nystrom  
Peric  
Proud  
Saada  
Wilfert  

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Anderson  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 161 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 162. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 162, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 970)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canel</td>
<td>Chefren (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
<td>Guay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
<td>Lebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marceau</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minard</td>
<td>Mercier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocherhou</td>
<td>So-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assadourian</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Richmond—Armabaska)</td>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremier (Tikoup—Maconquie)</td>
<td>Caccia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boudreau</td>
<td>Caterall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canios</td>
<td>Chan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauchon</td>
<td>Collenette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codere</td>
<td>Diseopola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockrill</td>
<td>Gouk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foko</td>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giray (Edmonton North)</td>
<td>Gruending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>Hildy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>Knutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laliberte</td>
<td>MacAulay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>Mayfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuire</td>
<td>McKay (Scarborough East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McWhinney</td>
<td>Mereloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Nystrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien (London—Funshawe)</td>
<td>Paradis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peric</td>
<td>Proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>Saada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speller</td>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)</td>
<td>Wilfert — 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Anderson  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 162 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 163. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 163, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 971)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canel</td>
<td>Chefren (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
<td>Guay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
<td>Lebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marceau</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assadourian</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Richmond—Armabaska)</td>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremier (Tikoup—Maconquie)</td>
<td>Caccia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boudreau</td>
<td>Caterall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canios</td>
<td>Chan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauchon</td>
<td>Collenette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codere</td>
<td>Diseopola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockrill</td>
<td>Gouk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foko</td>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giray (Edmonton North)</td>
<td>Gruending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>Hildy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>Knutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laliberte</td>
<td>MacAulay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>Mayfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuire</td>
<td>McKay (Scarborough East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McWhinney</td>
<td>Mereloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Nystrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien (London—Funshawe)</td>
<td>Paradis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peric</td>
<td>Proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>Saada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speller</td>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)</td>
<td>Wilfert — 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I seek unanimous consent to offer my congratulations to the Bouchard government on the Landry budget, which has lowered taxes by $2 billion over a four year period.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I seek unanimous consent to offer my congratulations to the Bouchard government on the Landry budget, which has lowered taxes by $2 billion over a four year period.

[English]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I seek unanimous consent to offer my congratulations to the Bouchard government on the Landry budget, which has lowered taxes by $2 billion over a four year period.

The next question is on Motion No. 164. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 164, which was negatived on the following division:)

Division No. 972

YEAS

Members

Alarie

Asselin

Augustine

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)

Baranuk

Béthune

Baron

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

Bergeron

Boudria

Boisvert

Chartrand

Boudria

Caccia

Cannis

Catterall

Caucon

Chan

Chétien (Saint-Maurice)

Collette

Desjarlais

Collopj

Dockrill

Dumont

Dube (Madawaska—Restigouche)

Earle

Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)

Gagnon

Gray (Windsor West)

Galliano

Gualay

Gagnon

Gualay

Gouk

Gualay

Grey (Edmonton North)

Gualay

Gualay

Harb

Harvey

Iftody

Johnston

Karygiannis

Knutson

Laiberte

Leung

MacAulay

Mathews

Mayfield

McGuire

McWhinney

McWhinney

Ménard

Mercier

Perron

Peterson

Proud

Redman

Saint-Denis

St. Denis

Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)

Trottier

Wilson—St. Clair

Wilson—St. Clair

Wilson—St. Clair

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson

Hoepner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Nunziata

Government Orders

The next question is on Motion No. 164. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 164, which was negatived on the following division:)

Division No. 972

YEAS

Members

Alarie

Asselin

Augustine

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)

Baranuk

Béthune

Baron

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

Bergeron

Boudria

Boisvert

Chartrand

Boudria

Caccia

Cannis

Catterall

Caucon

Chan

Chétien (Saint-Maurice)

Collette

Desjarlais

Collopj

Dockrill

Dumont

Dube (Madawaska—Restigouche)

Earle

Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)

Gagnon

Gray (Windsor West)

Galliano

Gualay

Gouk

Gualay

Grey (Edmonton North)

Gualay

Gualay

Harb

Harvey

Iftody

Johnston

Karygiannis

Knutson

Laiberte

Leung

MacAulay

Mathews

Mayfield

McGuire

McWhinney

McWhinney

Ménard

Mercier

Perron

Peterson

Proud

Redman

Saint-Denis

St. Denis

Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)

Trottier

Wilson—St. Clair

Wilson—St. Clair

Wilson—St. Clair

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson

Hoepner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Nunziata
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 164 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 165. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

*(4100)*

(The House divided on Motion No. 165, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 973)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
<td>Chétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrochers</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founeau</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebel</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ménard</td>
<td>Mercier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochelieu</td>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venne—23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
<td>Blakie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borouk</td>
<td>Bouirda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caccia</td>
<td>Cannis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catterall</td>
<td>Cauchon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan</td>
<td>Chétien (Saint-Maurice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collellette</td>
<td>Desjardins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doo</td>
<td>Driskill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dromisky</td>
<td>Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
<td>Gaglano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmour</td>
<td>Gouk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray (Windsor West)</td>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruendling</td>
<td>Harb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Hoopman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>Karyagannis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutson</td>
<td>Laliberte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacAskill</td>
<td>Manicavas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (LaSalle—Émard)</td>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield</td>
<td>McGuire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nystrom</td>
<td>Paradis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Denis</td>
<td>Steckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
<td>—51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIRED MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 165 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 166. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

*(4105)*

(The House divided on Motion No. 166, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
<td>Chétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrochers</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founeau</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebel</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ménard</td>
<td>Mercier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venne—23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abitibi-Clearwater</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakie</td>
<td>Boudria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
<td>Cannis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caccia</td>
<td>Chan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catterall</td>
<td>Collenette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chétien (Saint-Maurice)</td>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppers</td>
<td>Driskill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dromisky</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duhamel</td>
<td>Gallaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
<td>Gouk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmour</td>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray (Windsor West)</td>
<td>Harb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruendling</td>
<td>Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>Karyagannis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutson</td>
<td>Laliberte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The next question is on Motion No. 167. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(4110)

(The House divided on Motion No. 167, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Bellémument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canel</td>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Cannin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
<td>Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
<td>Collinette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcoux</td>
<td>Dockrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ménard</td>
<td>Dubé (Meadawaska—Restigouche)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
<td>St.-Denis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next question is on Motion No. 168. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(4115)

(The House divided on Motion No. 168, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 976)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Bellémument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canel</td>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Cannin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
<td>Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
<td>Collinette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcoux</td>
<td>Dockrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ménard</td>
<td>Dubé (Meadawaska—Restigouche)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
<td>St.-Denis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Bakopanos
Boadina
Catterall
Chan
Collette
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Gagliano
Gold
Grey
Guay
Guay
Hart
Johnston
MacAulay
Manley
Mitchell
Peterson
Rock
Speller
Stewart

Members

Augustine
Berreth (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Cannis
Chauchon
Desjardins
Dockrill
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Gilmour
Gray (Windsor West)
Grenier
Harvey
LaBonte
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
Méthot
Paradis
Proulx
Saada
St-Denis

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 169 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 172. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 172, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 978)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Couto
Desrochers
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Gauvreau
Lebel
Marchand
Mercier

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Christie (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dumas
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Laurin
Marchaud
Picard (Drummond)

St-Hilaire

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 169 lost.

(4120)

The next question is on Motion No. 169. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 172, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 978)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Couto
Desrochers
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Gauvreau
Lebel
Marchand
Mercier

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Christie (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dumas

St-Hilaire
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 172 lost.

(4125 )

The next question is on Motion No. 174. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

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

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 174, which was negatived on the following division:)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ablonczy Augustine</td>
<td>Ablonczy Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy Bakopanos</td>
<td>Bakopanos Bakopanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
<td>Bernard (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannis Cauchon</td>
<td>Cannis Cauchon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coderre Desjardins</td>
<td>Coderre Desjardins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion Dromisky</td>
<td>Dion Dromisky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche) Duhamelel</td>
<td>Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche) Duhamelel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle Gagnon</td>
<td>Earle Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst) Goodale</td>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst) Goodale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouk (Windsor West) Gobald</td>
<td>Gouk (Windsor West) Gobald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North) Groming</td>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North) Groming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri Harb</td>
<td>Guarnieri Harb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart Harvey</td>
<td>Hart Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston Manley</td>
<td>Johnston Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (LaSalle—Émand) Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
<td>Martin (LaSalle—Émand) Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield McDermott</td>
<td>Mayfield McDermott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Mitchell</td>
<td>Meredith Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nystrom O'Reilly</td>
<td>Nystrom O'Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradis Peterson</td>
<td>Paradis Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillitteri Proud</td>
<td>Pillitteri Proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Saada</td>
<td>Rock Saada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speller St. Denis</td>
<td>Speller St. Denis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland) Wappel</td>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland) Wappel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasylycia-Leis—49</td>
<td>Wasylycia-Leis—49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIRED MEMBERS</th>
<th>PAIRED MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Hoeppner</td>
<td>Anderson Hoeppner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata</td>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 176 lost.

(4130)

The next question is on Motion No. 176. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

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

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 176, which was negatived on the following division:)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie Alarie</td>
<td>Alarie Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean) Canel</td>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean) Canel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschênes Fournier</td>
<td>Deschênes Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold Guy</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold Guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label Ménard</td>
<td>Label Ménard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond) Rocheleau Vienne—21</td>
<td>Picard (Drummond) Rocheleau Vienne—21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIRED MEMBERS</th>
<th>PAIRED MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Hoeppner</td>
<td>Anderson Hoeppner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata</td>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government Orders

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 176, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 980)

**YEAS**

Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alarie</th>
<th>Asselin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Bellemurier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
<td>Chretien (Frontenac-Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebel</td>
<td>Manseau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Menard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
<td>Rocheleau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ablonczy</th>
<th>Assadourian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakopanos</td>
<td>Beanier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
<td>Brison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caccia</td>
<td>Cansis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterall</td>
<td>Cauchon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copps</td>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufour</td>
<td>Discoula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)</td>
<td>Duhamel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmour</td>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodale</td>
<td>Goul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray (Windsor West)</td>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruending</td>
<td>Harb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>Laybarte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manley</td>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonough</td>
<td>Meredith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Nault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nystrom</td>
<td>O’Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradis</td>
<td>Peres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Pillitteri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proulx</td>
<td>Redman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>Saada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speller (Northumberland)</td>
<td>Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
<td>Wasylycia-Leis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wappel</td>
<td>Wilen—56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)</th>
<th>Hoepner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour</td>
<td>Nunziata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 176 lost.

● (4135 )

The next question is on Motion No. 177. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

● (4140 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 177, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 981)

**YEAS**

Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alarie</th>
<th>Asselin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Bellemurier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
<td>Chretien (Frontenac-Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebel</td>
<td>Manseau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Menard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
<td>Rocheleau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ablonczy</th>
<th>Axworthy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blanger</td>
<td>Bellemare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaikie</td>
<td>Brison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>Caccia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Cauchon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjardins</td>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>Fako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagliano</td>
<td>Gallaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey</td>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodale</td>
<td>Gra (Windsor West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North)</td>
<td>Gruending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harb</td>
<td>Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leung</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfield</td>
<td>Mahoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancini</td>
<td>Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
<td>Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonough</td>
<td>Meredith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nault</td>
<td>Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)</td>
<td>Nystrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>O’Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Peres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redman</td>
<td>Pillitteri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
<td>Steckle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next question is on Motion No. 177. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?
March 13, 2000

Government Orders

Yahoo: Declare Motion No. 177 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 178. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 178, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 982)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Camel
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Lalonde
Lebel
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Venne—25

NAYS

Members

Axworthy
Bellemare
Brison
Caccia
Cachon
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Easter
Gallaway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gray (Windsor West)
Greening
Hart
Jennings
Labhente

The Speaker: Declare Motion No. 178 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 180. 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: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 180, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 983)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellemare
Chétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Deschênes
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Easter
Gallaway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gray (Windsor West)
Greening
Hart
Jennings
Labhente

NAYS

Members

Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Belanger
Bégin (Témiscaming—St-Maurice)
Bulte
Cachon
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Easter
Gallaway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 180, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 983)
Government Orders

Gooldie
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Harvey
Johnston
Lincoln
Mahoney
Mauley
Matthews
Meredith
Nystrom
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O’Reilly
Petticuba
Redman
So-Jacob
Stewart (Northumberland)
Ur
Whelan

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bélanger

YEAS

Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bélanger
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Caccia

(4150)

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.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 181, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 984)

(NAYS)

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bélanger
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

(4155)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 181 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 183. 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.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 183, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 985)
March 13, 2000

COMMONS DEBATES

Marchand Ménard
Mercier Perron
Picard (Drummond) Rocheleau
St-Hilaire Venne—24

NA Y S

Members

Marchand Ménard
Mercier Perron
Picard (Drummond) Rocheleau
St-Hilaire Venne—24

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 183 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 185. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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:

(A The House divided on Motion No. 185, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 986)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean) Camel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) Dubé
Destouches Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas Fournier
Gagnon Girard-Bujold

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 185 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 186. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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:

(A The House divided on Motion No. 186, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 987)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean) Camel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) de Savoye

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 186 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 187. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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:

(A The House divided on Motion No. 187, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 988)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean) Camel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) de Savoye

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 187 lost.
Government Orders

Debien Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Girard-Bujold Girard-Bujold
Lalonde Lalonde
Marchand Lalonde
Mercier Lalonde
Picard (Drummond) Lalonde
Venne—17

NAYS

Members
Ablonczy Acock
Axworthy Belanger
Bellemare Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bulte Bute
Cauchon Desjarlais
Dromisky Earle
Easter Falco
Gallaway Godfrey
Goodale Gray (Windsor West)
Gruending Harb
Johnston Leung
Karetak-Lindell Lincoln
Manley Longfield
Maheux Macnini
Matteys Mathews
Mayfield McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague McWhinney
Meredith Murray
Meyers Nyuon
Provenzano Redman
Rock Sgro
Shepherd St-Jacques
Steele Stewart (Northumberland)
Ur Valeri
Wagel Whelan
Wilfert—51

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 188 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 189. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 188, which was negatived on the following division;)

(Division No. 988)

YEAS

Members
Alarie Alcock
Breiteneder (Frontenac—Mégantic) Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Debien Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)

NAYS

Members
Ablonczy Acock
Axworthy Belanger
Bellemare Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bulte Bute
Cauchon Desjarlais
Dromisky Earle
Easter Falco
Gallaway Godfrey
Goodale Gray (Windsor West)
Gruending Harb
Johnston Leung
Karetak-Lindell Lincoln
Manley Longfield
Maheux Macnini
Matteys Mathews
Mayfield McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague McWhinney
Meredith Murray
Meyers Nyuon
Provenzano Redman
Rock Sgro
Shepherd St-Jacques
Steele Stewart (Northumberland)
Ur Valeri
Wagel Whelan
Wilfert—51

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 188 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 189.

● (4210 )

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 189, which was negatived on the following division;)

(Division No. 988)
YEAS

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
de Savoye
Deschênes
Dumas
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Laurin
Marchand
Perron
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Alcock
Belanger (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Caccia
Caucour
Denlerain
Folco
Goedde
Grauendig
Jennings
Kariak-Lindell
Leung
Longfield
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McTeague
Murray
Nyström
Pillitteri
Redman
Shepherd
Stewart (Northumberland)
Valeri
Wilfert—47

NAYS

Asselin
Cannel
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Fournier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Lafond
Lebel
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Venne—22

Axworthy
Bellemare
Berthe
Carroll
Collette
Collet
Easter
Godbrey
Gray (Windsor West)
Harvey
Johnston
Laliberte
Lincoln
Maloney
Mathews
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhanney
Myers
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Provenzano
Sgro
St-Jacques
Ur
Whelan

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 189 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 190. 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:
An act to give effect to the requirement for clarity as set out in the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec secession reference.
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(The House divided on Motion No. 190, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 990)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Canuel de Savoie
Debien Dub (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Lalonde Laurin
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)—13

NAYS

Members

Alcock Axworthy
Bellemare Bulte
Barber Caccia Carroll
Bellemare Collette Easter
Bellemare Godfrey Grenier
Bellemare Jennings Karak-Lindell
Bernier Bernier Gray (Windsor West)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe) Harvey Johnston
Kraft Sloan Lincoln
Mahoney Mallon
Matthews McKay (Scarborough East) McWhinney
Myers Newman
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe) Provenzano
Redman Robillard
Sgro Shepherd
St-Jacques Steeckle
Stewart (Northumberland) Ur
Valeri Whelan—46

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 190 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 192. 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:

(Division No. 991)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Canuel Descharests
Dumars Girard-Bujold
Lalonde Label Ninard
St-Hilaire

NAYS

Members

Alcock Bellemare
Blais (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) Bulte
Swan (Ottawa-Carleton) Cauchon
Chabot Cottier
Duford Collette
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche) Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Elder Harvey Johnston
Kraft Sloan Lincoln
Martin (L'Asile—Émard) Mayfield

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata
Government Orders

McTague
Meredith
Myers
Pillitteri
Redman
Sgro
St-Jacques
Stewart (Northumberland)
Valeri
Wilfert—45

McWhinney
Meredith Murray
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Provenzano
Robillard
Shepherd
Steele
Ur
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 192 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 194. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 194, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 992)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Canuel
Duceppe
Fournier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Laurin
Marceau
Ménard
Perron
Venne—19

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Belanger
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Caccia
Cauchon
Derasari
Easter
Johnston
Kraft Sloan
Lincoln
Mahoney
Mathews
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Murray

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 194 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 195. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 195, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 993)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Canuel
Debien
Dubé
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Girard-Bujold
Lalonde
Lebel
Marchand
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Bellemare
Bélanger
Bélanger
Bélanger
Bélanger
Bélanger
Brison
Brison
Brison

Caccia
Carroll
Collenette
Collenette
Collenette
Collenette
Collenette
Collenette
Collenette
Collenette

Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)

Gray (Windso...
The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 195 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 196. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yea's have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(Division No. 994)

YEAS

Members

Peelstein
Belhumeur
Christian (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Deschênes
Girard-Bujold
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Mercier
Rochefleur
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—21

NAYS

Members

Augustine
Beaumier
Boudria
Caccia
Cacchione
Chan
Codere
Duceppe
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Gouk
Harb
Johnston
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McGuire
Mitchell
Paradis
Proupin
Redman
Saada
Speller
Steckle
Szabo
Valeri
Wilfert—39

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton-Southwest) Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton-East) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 196 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 197. 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 yea's have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(Division No. 995)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
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Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
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Marchand
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Rochefleur
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NAYS

Members

Augustine
Beaumier
Boudria
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Cacchione
Chan
Codere
Duceppe
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Gouk
Harb
Johnston
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McGuire
Mitchell
Paradis
Proupin
Redman
Saada
Speller
Steckle
Szabo
Valeri
Wilfert—39

(4235)

(The House divided on Motion No. 197, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 995)
Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 197 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 200. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 200, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 996)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Béthune
Canuel

Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Déschênes

Dubé (Lévis—L'Île-d'Orléans—Chaudière)
Ducasse

Dumas
Gagnon

Girard-Bujold
Guay

Hébert
Loubier

Maurice
Marchand

Ménard
Perron

Rocheleau
St-Hilaire

Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne—22

NAYS

Members

Augustine
Bailey

Beaumier
Bonin

Bonwick
Boudria

Brison
Cassie

Chamberlain
Chan

Charbonneau
Codere

Collinette
Diépolo

Dromisky
Dubé (Mégantic)

Dubé (Lévis—L'Île-d'Orléans—Chaudière)
Ducasse

Earle
Drouin

Gauvreau
Gagnon

Marchand
Mercier

Nault
Pérusse

Paradis
Proulx

Rolin
Saada

Solomon
St-Denis

St. Denis
Tory—40

PAIRED MEMBERS

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 200 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 202. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 202, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 997)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Béliveau

Canuel
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)

Déschênes
Dubé (Lévis—L'Île-d'Orléans—Chaudière)

Ducasse
Dumais

Goulet
Godbout

Harb
Iftody

Johnston
Labrie

Laliberté
Martin (Winipeg Centre)

McGuire
McPherson

Mitchell
Mitchell

Nystrom
Nystrom

Proud
Proud

Saada
Saada

Solomon
St-Denis

White (Langley—Abbotsford)—43

NAYS

Members

Augustine
Bailey

Bianchini
Bonin

Bonwick
Boudria

Brison
Cassie

Chamberlain
Chan

Charbonneau
Codere

Collinette
Diépolo

Dromisky
Dubé (Mégantic)

Earle
Dumais

Gauvreau
Gagnon

Marchand
Mercier

Nault
Pérusse

Paradis
Proulx

Rolin
Saada

Solomon
St-Denis

St. Denis
Tory—40
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Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) Hoeppner Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 202 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 203. 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:

(4245)

(The House divided on Motion No. 203, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 998)
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Members

Alarie

Asselin

Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Bellehumeur

Canuel de Savoye

Christian (Frontenac—Mégantic)
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Duclos

Gagnon

Gagnon

Giray

Lafon

Marceau

Marchand

Mercier

Perron

Rochefort

Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Venne—23
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Members

Augustine
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Augustine
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Chan
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Hart

Hart

Hart

Hart

Jennings

Johnston

Jennings

Johnston

Laliberte
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d
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gre
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gre

Mitchell
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Mitchell
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Mayfield

Nault

Mayfield

Mitchell

Nault

Paradis

Paradis

Paradis

Paradis

Robillard

Saada

Saada

Saada

Schmidt

Saada

Saada

Saada

White (Langley—Abbotsford)—43

PAIRED MEMBERS
Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) Hoeppner Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 203 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 205. 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:

(4245)

(The House divided on Motion No. 205, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 999)

YEAS

Members

Alarie

Asselin

Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Bellehumeur

Canuel de Savoye

Christian (Frontenac—Mégantic)

Dubé (Levis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)

Duclos

Gagnon

Gagnon

Giray

Lafon

Marceau

Marchand

Mercier

Perron

Rochefort

Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Venne—24

NAYS

Members

Augustine

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)

Augustine

Bakopanos

Beaumier

Bakopanos

Bonwick

Bakopanos

Brison

Boulia

Chamberlain

Caccia

Charbonneau

Chan

Codere

Collenette

Discopola

Dromisky

Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)

Earle

Earle

Gog

Gog

Grouindin

Grouindin

Hart

Hart

Hart

Hart

Jennings

Johnston

Jennings

Johnston

Laliberte

Laliberte

Martin (Winnipeg Centre)

Mari
d

McCua
gre

McCua
gre

Mitchell

McGuire

Mitchell

Nault

Mayfield

Nault

Mayfield

Mitchell

Nault

Paradis

Paradis

Paradis

Paradis

Robillard

Saada

Saada

Saada

Schmidt

Saada

Saada

Saada

White (Langley—Abbotsford)—43

Government Orders

Speller

Wasylycia-Leis

White (Langley—Abbotsford)—49

PAIRED MEMBERS
Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) Hoeppner Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 202 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 203. 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:

(4245)

(The House divided on Motion No. 203, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 998)

YEAS

Members

Alarie

Asselin

Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Bellehumeur

Canuel de Savoye

Christian (Frontenac—Mégantic)

Dubé (Levis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)

Duclos

Gagnon

Gagnon

Giray

Lafon

Marceau

Marchand

Mercier

Perron

Rochefort

Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Venne—23

NAYS

Members

Augustine

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)

Augustine

Bakopanos

Beaumier

Bakopanos

Bonwick

Bakopanos

Brison

Boulia

Chamberlain

Caccia

Charbonneau

Chan

Codere

Collenette

Discopola

Dromisky

Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)

Earle

Earle

Gog

Gog

Grouindin

Grouindin

Hart

Hart

Hart

Hart

Jennings

Johnston

Jennings

Johnston

Laliberte

Laliberte

Martin (Winnipeg Centre)

Mari
d

McCua
gre

McCua
gre

Mitchell

McGuire

Mitchell

Nault

Mayfield

Nault

Mayfield

Mitchell

Nault

Paradis

Paradis

Paradis

Paradis

Robillard

Saada

Saada

Saada

Schmidt

Saada

Saada

Saada

White (Langley—Abbotsford)—43
Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 205 lost.

(4250)

The next question is on Motion No. 206. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 206, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1000)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
de Savoye
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Gagnon
Lafond
Loubier
Marchaud
Mercier
Plamoindon
St-Hilaire
Venne — 27

NAYS

Members

Augustine
Bailey
Bouin
Brison
Cadman
Chamberlain
Collenette
Drominsky
Earle
Gook
Grundling
Hart
Jennings
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McGuire
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Saada
Solomon

St. Denis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)—43

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 206 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 207. 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:

(4255)

(The House divided on Motion No. 207, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1001)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
de Savoye
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumes
Gagnon
Lafond
Loubier
Marchaud
Mercier
Plamoindon
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Augustine
Bailey
Bouin
Brison
Cadman
Chamberlain
Collenette
Drominsky
Earle
Gook
Grundling
Hart
Jennings
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McGuire
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Saada
Solomon

St. Denis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)—43

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 207 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 208. 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:

(4257)

(The House divided on Motion No. 208, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1002)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
de Savoye
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Gagnon
Lafond
Loubier
Marchaud
Mercier
Plamoindon
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Augustine
Bailey
Bouin
Brison
Cadman
Chamberlain
Collenette
Drominsky
Earle
Gook
Grundling
Hart
Jennings
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McGuire
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Saada
Solomon

St. Denis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)—43

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 208 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 209. 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:

(4259)

(The House divided on Motion No. 209, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1003)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
de Savoye
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Gagnon
Lafond
Loubier
Marchaud
Mercier
Plamoindon
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Augustine
Bailey
Bouin
Brison
Cadman
Chamberlain
Collenette
Drominsky
Earle
Gook
Grundling
Hart
Jennings
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McGuire
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Saada
Solomon

St. Denis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)—43

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 209 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 210. 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:

(4261)

(The House divided on Motion No. 210, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1004)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
de Savoye
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Gagnon
Lafond
Loubier
Marchaud
Mercier
Plamoindon
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Augustine
Bailey
Bouin
Brison
Cadman
Chamberlain
Collenette
Drominsky
Earle
Gook
Grundling
Hart
Jennings
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McGuire
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Saada
Solomon

St. Denis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)—43

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 210 lost.
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Government Orders

Proud
Rohbillard
Schmidt
Speller
Torsney
White (Langley—Abbotsford)—49

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 207 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 208. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 208, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1002)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
de Savoie
Chibouc (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Deschênes
de Châteauguay
Duchêne
Guay
Lafond
Marchand
Ménard
Mercier
Venne—21

NAYS

Members
Ablobonca
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos
Benoit
Bonin
Caccia
Carterall
Chamberlain
Cauazo
Colinet
Dockrill
Dromisky
Earle
Gauthier
Grondin
Harb
Hart
Iftody
Laliberté
Martin (Wanuskewin Centre)
Meredith
Mayfield
Michaud

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 208 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 209. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 209, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1003)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
de Savoie
Deschênes
Fourner
Godin (Châteauguay)
LaPierre
Marceau
Ménard
Rochebeau
Venne—23

NAYS

Members
Augustine
Bakopanos
Bertrand
Caccia
Chauveau
Desjardins
Dockrill
Dubé
Grey (Edmonton North)
Harvey
Iftody
Laliberté
Mayfield
Naught
Paradis
Phinney

Government Orders

Nystrom
Peterson
Robillard
Solomon
St. Denis
Torsney
Wasylycia-Leis

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 209 lost.
Government Orders

Solomon St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Wasylycia-Leis—39

March 13, 2000

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 209 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 210. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 210, which was negatived on the following division:)

(YEAS)

Members
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bertrand
Bouchard
Catterall
Charbonneau
Charlebois
Desharnais
Dockrill
Dumoulin
Fontana
Fraser
Haggie
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Karygiannis
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mitchell
Paradis
Peterson
Robillard

Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bouchard
Chaput
Couturier
Cressy
Dempsey
Dessureault
Dumoulin
Earle
Gillespie
Haig-Brown
Harley
Hodgins
Hodgins
Hodge
Jellicoe
Jellicoe
Jones
Kelley
Kusendovitch
Lalonde
Lebel
Leblanc
Lévesque
LeVasseur
Lefebvre
Lennox
Lent
MacKendrick
MacKendrick
Marchand
Marchand
Marceau
Moreau
Morin
Nordel
O'Keefe
Paradis
Parliamentary
Parliamentary
Parliamentary
Pardy
Peters
Peters
Price
Pratt
Wasylycia-Leis—45

NYAS

Members
Abbott
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bertrand
Bouchard
Catterall
Charbonneau
Charlebois
Desharnais
Dockrill
Dumoulin
Fontana
Fraser
Haggie
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Karygiannis
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mitchell
Paradis
Peterson
Robillard

Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bouchard
Chaput
Couturier
Cressy
Dempsey
Dessureault
Dumoulin
Earle
Gillespie
Haig-Brown
Harley
Hodgins
Hodgins
Hodge
Jellicoe
Jellicoe
Jones
Kelley
Kusendovitch
Lalonde
Lebel
Leblanc
Lévesque
LeVasseur
Lefebvre
Lennox
Lent
MacKendrick
MacKendrick
Marchand
Marchand
Marceau
Moreau
Morin
Nordel
O'Keefe
Paradis
Parliamentary
Parliamentary
Parliamentary
Pardy
Peters
Peters
Price
Pratt
Wasylycia-Leis—45

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 212 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 212. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 212, which was negatived on the following division:)

(YEAS)

Members
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Canuel
Chreitien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Deschênes
Ducharme
Duchesne
Fournier
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Marchand
Mercier
Marchand
St-Hilaire—22

NYAS

Members
Abbott
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bertrand
Bouchard
Catterall
Charbonneau
Charlebois
Desharnais
Dockrill
Dumoulin
Fontana
Fraser
Haggie
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Karygiannis
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mitchell
Paradis
Peterson
Robillard

Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bouchard
Chaput
Couturier
Cressy
Dempsey
Dessureault
Dumoulin
Earle
Gillespie
Haig-Brown
Harley
Hodgins
Hodgins
Hodge
Jellicoe
Jellicoe
Jones
Kelley
Kusendovitch
Lalonde
Lebel
Leblanc
Lévesque
LeVasseur
Lefebvre
Lennox
Lent
MacKendrick
MacKendrick
Marchand
Marchand
Marceau
Moreau
Morin
Nordel
O'Keefe
Paradis
Parliamentary
Parliamentary
Parliamentary
Pardy
Peters
Peters
Price
Pratt
Wasylycia-Leis—45
March 13, 2000

Commons Debates

Government Orders

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 212 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 213. 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: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 213, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1006)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Canuel
Chétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)

de Savoye
Debien

duceppe
Dumas

Fournier
Gagnon

Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)

Guay
Lafond

Laurin
Lefebvre

Marceau
Marchand

Ménard
Mercier

Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon

Rocheleau
St-Hilaire—24

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Augustine

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos

Bellemare
Benoit

Bertrand
Bouin

Boudia
Bryden

Caccia
Cadman

caterall
Cauc inex

Chat
Château

Codere
Collette

Desjarlais
Discopola

Droclair
Dromisky

Duhamel
Earle

Harb
Hill (Macleod)

Iftody
Iftody

Karygannis
Karygannis

Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McWhiteney

Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)

Mitchell
Nystrom

O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Paradis

Phinney
Purr

PAIRED MEMBERS

Provenzano
St-Jacques

Robillard
St-Jacques

Solomon
St-Denis

Stewart (Northumberland)
Wasylycia-Leis—45

—

45

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 213 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 214. 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: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 214, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1007)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Bélanger
Bélanger

Benoit
Bouin

Boudia
Bryden

Caccia
Cadman

caterall
Cauc inex

Chat
Château

Codere
Collette

Desjarlais
Discopola

Droclair
Dromisky

Duhamel
Earle

Harb
Hill (Macleod)

Iftody
Iftody

Karygannis
Karygannis

Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McWhiteney

Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)

Mitchell
Nystrom

O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Paradis

Phinney
Purr

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Augustine

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos

Bellemare
Benoit

Bertrand
Bouin

Boudia
Bryden

Caccia
Cadman

caterall
Cauc inex

Chat
Château

Codere
Collette

Desjarlais
Discopola

Droclair
Dromisky

Duhamel
Earle

Harb
Hill (Macleod)

Iftody
Iftody

Karygannis
Karygannis

Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McWhiteney

Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)

Mitchell
Nystrom

O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Paradis

Phinney
Purr
Government Orders

Longfield
Marin (Winnipeg Centre)
McWhinney
Mitchell
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Phinney
Robillard
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Mancini
Matthews
Mills (Red Deer)
Nyman
Paradis
Provenzano
Solomon
St-Jacques
Wasylycia-Leis—50

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 214 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 216. 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:

(4320)

(The House divided on Motion No. 216, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1008)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Charlier
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Laurin
Marchand
Mercier
Plamondon
St-Hilaire—27

NAYS

Members
Abbott
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bellemare
Bertrand
Boulon
Bryden
Cadam
Cauchon
Charbonneau
Collefontaine

Dicapeola
Dromisky
Earle
Goodale
Hill (Mackay)
Karyckyj
Mancini
Mills (Red Deer)
Nault
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Petrison
Provenzano
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)

Wasylycia-Leis—50

Deckrill
Duban
Fontana
Hubby
Hlady
Laliberte
McWhinney
Mitchell
Nyman
Paradis
Phinney
Robillard
Spel

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 216 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 217. 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:

(4325)

(The House divided on Motion No. 217, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1009)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
de Savoye
Deschênes
Dumas
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Lalonde
Lebel
Marchand
Marchand
Mercier
Plamondon
St-Hilaire—27

NAYS

Members
Abbott
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bellemare
Bertrand
Boulon
Bryden
Cadam
Cauchon
Charbonneau
Collefontaine

Augustine
Bakopanos
Benoit
Blais
Bobadilla
Caccia
Canell
Chamberlain
Codere
Desjarlais

Augustine
Bakopanos
Benoit
The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 217 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 218. 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:

(4330)

(The House divided on Motion No. 218, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1010)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
de Savoie
Descrochers
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Lebel
Marceau
Mercier
Plamondon
St-Hilaire

Asselin
Bellehumeur
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Debien
Dumas
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Picard (Drummond)
Rochefort
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—26

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Axworthy
Bakopoulos
Bellemare
Blakie
Bouchard
Cabinet
Chamberlain
Collet
Descrochers
Dromisky
Fraser
Fontana
Gray (Windsor West)
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Karygannis
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McWhiney
Mitchell
Nault
Paradis
Paradis
Phinney
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Wasylycia-Leis—50

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Government Orders

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 218 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 220. 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:

(4335)

(The House divided on Motion No. 220, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1011)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
de Savoie
Descrochers
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Guay

Asselin
Bellehumeur
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Debien
Dumas
Gagnon
Godin (Châteauguay)

Lalonde

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Government Orders

Laurin
Marchand
Picard (Drummond)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—23

NAYS

Members
Bréziner
Blakie
Byrne
Collenette
Desjarlais
Earle
Fontana
Goddale
Harb
Kraft
Légaré
Mancini
Matthews
McWhinney
Murray
O’Brien
Parry
Paty
Prat
Robillard
Solomon
Szabo

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bégin
Cabinet
Debèze
Dumas
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Laurin
Marchand

NAYS

Members
Axworthy
Bégin
Bouvrette
Cohen
Dockrill
Folco
Godbey
Gray
Harb
Laliberté
Mancini
Matthews
McWhinney
Muray
O’Brien
Paty
Pratt
Robillard
Solomon
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 220 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 221. 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:

(4340)

(The House divided on Motion No. 221, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1012)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Cabinet
Debèze
Dumas
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Laurin
Marchand

NAYS

Members
Asselin
Béliveau
Chétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Deschênes
Dufour
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Laurin
Marchand
Mercier
Plamondon
St-Hilaire

(Division No. 1013)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Cabinet
Debèze
Dumas
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Laurin
Marchand

NAYS

Members
Asselin
Béliveau
Chétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Deschênes
Dufour
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Laurin
Marchand
Mercier
Plamondon
St-Hilaire

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 221 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 223. 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:

(4340) (The House divided on Motion No. 223, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1013)
The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 223 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 226. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 226, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1014)

YEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Savoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschênes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foumier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deboni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-NAYS-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuffel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilotti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenzano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whelan—49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) Heeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 226 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 228. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 228, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1015)

YEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Savoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschênes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foumier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deboni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-NAYS-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuffel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilotti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenzano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whelan—48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) Heeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata
Government Orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Motion No. 228</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marchand Mercier</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—22</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—23</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 228 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 230. 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:

(3535)

(The House divided on Motion No. 230, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1016)

YEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Motion No. 232</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cansel</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Savoye</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchau</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>YEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
<td>YEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—22</td>
<td>YEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—23</td>
<td>YEA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 232 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 232. 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:

(4400)

(The House divided on Motion No. 232, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1017)

YEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Motion No. 232</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cansel</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Savoye</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchau</td>
<td>NAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>YEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
<td>YEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—22</td>
<td>YEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—23</td>
<td>YEA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 232 lost.
The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 232 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 233. 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 yays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (4405)

(The House divided on Motion No. 233, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1018)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
de Savoye
Duceppe
Fournier

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Dumas
Gagnon

Guay
Laurin
Marceau
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 233 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 236. 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 yays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (4410)

(The House divided on Motion No. 236, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1019)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
de Savoye

Asselin
Bellehumeur
de Savoye

Guay
Laurin
Marceau
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 236 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 238. 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 yays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (4412)

(The House divided on Motion No. 238, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1020)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
de Savoye

Asselin
Bellehumeur
de Savoye

Guay
Laurin
Marceau
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 238 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 240. 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 yays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (4414)

(The House divided on Motion No. 240, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1021)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
de Savoye

Asselin
Bellehumeur
de Savoye

Guay
Laurin
Marceau
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Debien  
Duquette  
Gagnon  
Gay  
Laurin  
Marceau  
Menard  
Picard (Drummond)  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—23

NAYS

Members

Asselin  
Bellemare  
Bertin (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
Debien  
Duquette  
Fournier  
Girard-Bujold  
Lalonde  
Lebel  
Marchand  
Mercier  
Plamondon  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—25

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson  
Hoeppner  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 236 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 239. 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:

(4415 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 239, which was negatived on the following division:)

Yeas:

Members

(Continued)

- Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
- Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
- Bonwick
- Cauchon
- Cauchon (Saint-Maurice)
- Duncan
- Freshco

Nay:

Members

(Continued)

- Bachand (South-Jean)
- de Savoye
- Debien
- Duquette
- Girard-Bujold
- Lalonde
- Marceau
- Picard (Drummond)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson  
Hoeppner  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 239 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 241. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.
And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 241, which was negatived on the following division:)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debién</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louhier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray (Windsor West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karetak-Lindell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Sloan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limoges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McTeague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nystrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilifieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenzano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Jacques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strahl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleldi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasylycia-Leis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Langley—Abbotsford)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 241 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 242. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 242 lost.
Government Orders

The next question is on Motion No. 243. 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: In my opinion the yays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4425)

(The House divided on Motion No. 243, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1023)

YEAS

Asselin
Belhumeur
de Savoye
Descrochers
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Lalonde
Marceau
Mercier
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire

NAYS

Assadourian
Bélair
Bernier (Tobique-Mactaquac)
Blakie
Byrne
Chénet (Saint-Maurice)
Desjarlais
Earle
Folco
Galloway
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hanger
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Karygiannis
Laliberte
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McWhinney
Mills (Red Deer)
Nystrom
Parish
Peric
Proulx
Robillard
Solomon
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stazo
Valeri
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 243 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 244. 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: In my opinion the yays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4430)

(The House divided on Motion No. 244, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1024)

YEAS

Asselin
Belhumeur
Chénet (Frontenac-Mégantic)
Descrochers
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Lebel
Marchand
Picard (Drummond)
St-Hilaire

NAYS

Assadourian
Bélair
Bernier (Tobique-Mactaquac)
Blakie
Byrne
Chénet (Saint-Maurice)
Desjarlais
Earle
Goodale
Guarnieri
Harg
Herron
Hill (Macleod)
Karygiannis
Laliberte
Mills (Broadview-Greenwood)
Mitchell
Nystrom
Phinney
Robillard
Syro
Speller

NAYS

Assadourian
Bélair
Bernier (Tobique-Mactaquac)
Blakie
Byrne
Chénet (Saint-Maurice)
Desjarlais
Earle
Goodale
Guarnieri
Harg
Herron
Hill (Macleod)
Karygiannis
Laliberte
Mills (Broadview-Greenwood)
Mitchell
Nystrom
Phinney
Robillard
Syro
Speller

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
March 13, 2000

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 244 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 245. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 245, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1025)

**YEAS**

Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alarie</th>
<th>Asselin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
<td>Christien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Savoie</td>
<td>Debono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschênes</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Gabrielle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
<td>Lebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Marcoux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Méniard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venne—25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbott</th>
<th>Assadourian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
<td>Bertrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
<td>Blais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadman</td>
<td>Boudria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td>Charbonneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrétiens (Saint-Maurice)</td>
<td>Collette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comuzzi</td>
<td>Desjardins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Découlpe</td>
<td>Dromsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duhamel</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
<td>Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodale</td>
<td>Gray (Windsor West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri</td>
<td>Hanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harb</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Prince George—Peace River)</td>
<td>Ianno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karygiannis</td>
<td>Lathbre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancini</td>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 245 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 246. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 246, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1026)

**YEAS**

Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alarie</th>
<th>Asselin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
<td>Christien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debien</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Gabrielle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
<td>Lebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Marcoux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Méniard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venne—23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbott</th>
<th>Assadourian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
<td>Bertrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
<td>Blais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaiske</td>
<td>Boudria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadman</td>
<td>Charbonneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td>Collette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrétiens (Saint-Maurice)</td>
<td>Desjardins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Découlpe</td>
<td>Dromsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duhamel</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
<td>Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodale</td>
<td>Gray (Windsor West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri</td>
<td>Hanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harb</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Peace River)</td>
<td>Ianno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karygiannis</td>
<td>Lathbre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancini</td>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government Orders

Earle
Gallaway
Guarnieri
Harb
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Karygiannis
MacAulay
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mitchell
Nystrom
Percy
Proud
Saada
Solomon
Stewart (Northumberland)
Torsney
Waylycia-Leis
Wood—57

Fontana
Gray (Windsor West)
Hanger
Harvey
Hill (Mackay)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Laberté
Mancini
Mills (Red Deer)
Nault
O’Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Phaneuf
Robillard
Sgro
Vanier
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 246 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 247. 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:

(4445)

(The House divided on Motion No. 247, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1027)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Cannel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Debien
Dérochers
Duquette
Dumas
Fourier
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Lalonde
Laurin
Marchand
Lebel
Mercier
Marceau
Plamondon
Ménard
St. Hilaire
Picard (Drummond)
Venue—27

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Benoit
Bennett
Bertrand
Bryden
Bertrand
Chamberlain
Clemenceau
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Collenette
Comuzzi
Drozdz
Consie
Dromisky
Corcoran
Duncan
Cristin
Fontana
Driedger
Ianno
Earle
Gray (Windsor West)
Earle
Hanger
Earle
Harvey
Earle
Herron
F测定
Hill (Mackay)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Karygiannis
Karygiannis
Laberté
Laliberte
Lalonde
Loubier
Lebel
Marchand
Mancini
Martel
McGirr
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McGuire
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Nault
Neff
Nystrom
Paradis
Proulx
Proud
Putman
Saada
Sgro
Sgro
Solet
Sgro
Sgro
Solomon
Speiler
St. Pierre
St-Hilaire
St.-Louis
Terson
Torsney
Waylycia-Leis
Wood—57

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 247 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 248. 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:

(4450)

(The House divided on Motion No. 248, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1028)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Cannel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Debien
Dérochers
Duquette
Dumas
Fourier
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 248 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 249. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 249, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1029)

YEAS

Members

Abbott

Assaadourian

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)

Asselin

Bertrand

de Savoye

Bryden

Deschênes

Camerlynck

Dumas

Couture

Gagnon

Ducharme

Guay

Lalonde

Laurin

Marchand

Ménard

Plamondon

Rocheleau

Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Venne

—27

NAYS

Members

Abbott

Assaadourian

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)

Asselin

Bertrand

de Savoye

Bryden

Deschênes

Camerlynck

Dumas

Couture

Gagnon

Ducharme

Guay

Lalonde

Laurin

Marchand

Ménard

Plamondon

Rocheleau

Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Venne

—22

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson

Hoeppner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 250 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 250. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson

Hoeppner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 249 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 250. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.
**Government Orders**

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 250, which was negatived on the following division:)

**(Division No. 1030)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Bellemeure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
<td>de Savoie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debièr</td>
<td>Deschênes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas</td>
<td>Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiy</td>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
<td>Lebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Marcoux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Ménard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochelerou</td>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Matane)</td>
<td>Venne — 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>Assadourian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Richmond—Anjihbaska)</td>
<td>Benoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrand</td>
<td>Blaikie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryden</td>
<td>Cadman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cans</td>
<td>Catterall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauchon</td>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charbonneau</td>
<td>Chéreau (Saint-Maurice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collet</td>
<td>Comuzzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjardins</td>
<td>Dockery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dromisky</td>
<td>Duhamel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray (Windsor West)</td>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harr</td>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (MacLeod)</td>
<td>Iannone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karygiannis</td>
<td>Keys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laliberte</td>
<td>MacAulay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancini</td>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonough</td>
<td>McGuire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
<td>Nault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Reilly</td>
<td>Paradis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phinney</td>
<td>Pittiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohd</td>
<td>Robillard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saada</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sperl</td>
<td>St. Denis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So-Jacobs</td>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strahl</td>
<td>Torresy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderper</td>
<td>Wasylczuk-Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Langle—Abbotsford)</td>
<td>Wood — 56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson | Hoegpeter |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) | Nunziata |

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 250 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 252. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 252, which was negatived on the following division:)

**(Division No. 1031)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Bellemeure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
<td>de Savoie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debièr</td>
<td>Deschênes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas</td>
<td>Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiy</td>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
<td>Lebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Marcoux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Ménard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochelerou</td>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Matane)</td>
<td>Venne — 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>Assadourian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benoit</td>
<td>Blaikie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryden</td>
<td>Cadman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cans</td>
<td>Catterall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charbonneau</td>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chéreau (Saint-Maurice)</td>
<td>Comuzzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjardins</td>
<td>Dockery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dromisky</td>
<td>Duhamel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
<td>Grey (Windsor West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey (Edmonton North)</td>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karygiannis</td>
<td>Laliberte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonough</td>
<td>McGuire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson | Hoegpeter |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) | Nunziata |

| Abbott | Assadourian |
| Benoit | Blaikie |
| Bryden | Cadman |
| Cans | Catterall |
| Charbonneau | Chamberlain |
| Comuzzi | Dockery |
| Duhamel | Earle |
| Grey (Windsor West) | Herron |
| Karygiannis | Laliberte |
| MacDonough | McGuire |
| Mills (Red Deer) | Paradis |
| Phinney | Proud |
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 252 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 253. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (4505 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 253, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1032)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
Debien
Dumas
Gagnon
Lalonde
Lebel
Marchand
Plamondon
Venne

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
de Savoye
Deschênes
Fournier
Guay
Laurin
Loubier
Mercier
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Baker
Blakie
Bryden
Cannis
Caschon
Charbonneau
Cuimuzi
Dockrill
Duhamel
Earle
Gray (Windsor West)

Members

Assadourian
Benoin
Bonin
Cadman
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chriestien (Saint-Maurice)
Desjardins
Dromisky
Duncan
Gallaway
Guarnieri

Government Orders

Harb
Hill (Mackenzie)
Ianno
Kraft Sloan
Macini
McDonough
Mills (Red Deer)
Normand
O'Reilly
Perc
Pellitteri
Robillard
Solomon
St-Jacques
Strahl
Torsney
Vanclief
Wasylycia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood—48

Heron
Hubbard
Karygiannis
Laliberte
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McNally
Nafti
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Paradis
Phinney
Proud
Saada
St Denis
St-Julien
Szabo
U

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 253 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 254. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (4510 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 254, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1033)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
Debien
Dumas
Gagnon
Lalonde
Lebel
Marchand
Plamondon
Venne—21

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
de Savoye
Deschênes
Fournier
Guay
Laurin
Loubier
Mercier
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Baker
Blakie
Bryden
Cannis
Caschon
Charbonneau
Cuimuzi
Dockrill
Duhamel
Earle
Gray (Windsor West)

Members

Assadourian
Benoin
Bonin
Cadman
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chriestien (Saint-Maurice)
Desjardins
Dromisky
Duncan
Gallaway
Guarnieri

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 254 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 255. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (4515 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 255, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1034)
The next question is on Motion No. 254. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4515)

(The House divided on Motion No. 255, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1034)

YEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauchon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chretien (Saint-Maurice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dromisky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ianto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phinney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robillard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Jacques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strahl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasylycia-Leis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood—55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The next question is on Motion No. 255. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4507)

(The House divided on Motion No. 256, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1034)

YEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauchon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chretien (Saint-Maurice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dromisky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ianto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phinney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robillard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torsney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasylycia-Leis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood—54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata
(Division No. 1035)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
Debien
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Lalonde
Marchand
Picard (Drummond)
Venne—19

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Assad
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Benoit
Bouchard
Cadman
Cauchois
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Desjardins
Duchesne
Dumoulin
Earle
Harb
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Karygiannis
Laliberté
Mancini
McDonough
McNally
Nault
O'Reilly
Phinnery
Rohlik
Solomon
St-Jacques
Strahl
Vanclief
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 256 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 257. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 257, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1036)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
de Savoye
Dumas
Gagnon
Guay
Laurin
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Assad
Assadourian
Baker
Blaikie
Bisson
Borden
Cadman
Cottreau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Desjardins
Dockrill
Duchesne—Restigouche
Duncan
Earle
Gallaway
Harb
Hill (Macleod)
Karygiannis
Laliberté
Mancini
McDonough
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally
Normand
Paradis
Proud
Saada
St-Denis
St-Julien
Torsney
Ważyłyska-Leis
Wood—58

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 257 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 258. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.
Government Orders

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4525)

(The House divided on Motion No. 258, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1037)

YEAS

Members

Alarie

Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Canuel
de Savoye

Dumas

Girard-Bujold

Lalonde

Loubier

Marchand

Mercier

Plamondon

St-Hilaire

Venne—25

NAYS

Members

Adams

Assadourian

Baker

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

Bonin

Brison

Bulte

Cannis

Chénier (Saint-Maurice)

Desjardins

Dockrill

Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)

Earle

Harrt

Hill (Macleod)

Karygiannis

Kilgour (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)

Maloney

McLellan (Edmonton West)

Normand

Phinnery

Proud

Rehlland

Sekora

St. Denis

St-Julien

Turesey

Waycley-Leis

Wood—57

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner

Nutiniata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 258 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 259. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4530)

(The House divided on Motion No. 259, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1038)

YEAS

Members

Alarie

Bachand (Saint-Jean)

Canuel
de Savoye

Dumas

Girard-Bujold

Lalonde

Loubier

Marchand

Mercier

Plamondon

St-Hilaire

Venne—25

NAYS

Members

Adams

Assadourian

Baker

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

Bonin

Brison

Bulte

Cannis

Chénier (Saint-Maurice)

Desjardins

Dockrill

Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)

Earle

Harrt

Hill (Macleod)

Karygiannis

Kilgour (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)

Maloney

McLellan (Edmonton West)

Normand

Phinnery

Proud

Rehlland

Sekora

St. Denis

St-Julien

Turesey

Waycley-Leis

Wood—57

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner

Nutiniata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 258 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 259. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4530)

(The House divided on Motion No. 259, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1038)
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 259 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 260. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

* (4535)

(The House divided on Motion No. 260, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1039)

**YEAS**

Members

- Alarie
- Bachand (Saint-Jean)
- Canuel
- de Savoie
- Dumas
- Girard-Bujold
- Lalonde
- Loubier
- Marchand
- Mercier
- Rochelieu
- Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

**NAYS**

Members

- Adams
- Assadourian
- Baker
- Benoît
- Bertrand
- Brison
- Cadman
- Chamberlain
- Cotler
- De Villers
- Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
- Earle
- Harvey
- Karygiannis
- Laliberte
- McLeod (Edmonton West)
- Mills (Red Deer)
- Perreault
- Provenzano
- Robillard
- Scott (Fredericton)
- St. Denis
- Strahl
- White (Langley—Abbotsford)
- Wood

Government Orders

- Deckrill
- Dunigan
- Earle
- Hill (Macleod)
- Keys
- Maloney
- McNally
- Normand
- Phinney
- Proud
- Saada
- Solomon
- St-Julien
- Vancilf
- Wood

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 260 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 261. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

* (4540)

(The House divided on Motion No. 261, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1040)

**YEAS**

Members

- Alarie
- Bachand (Saint-Jean)
- Canuel
- de Savoie
- Dumais
- Girard-Bujold
- Lalonde
- Loubier
- Marchand
- Mercier
- Rochelieu
- Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

**NAYS**

Members

- Assad
- Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
- Belzil
- Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
- Bouchard
- Boucher
- Cannis
- Christin (Saint-Maurice)
- Desjardins

PAIRED MEMBERS

- Anderson
- Hoeppner
- Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
- Nunziata
- Alarie
- Bachand (Saint-Jean)
- Canuel
- de Savoie
- Dumas
- Girard-Bujold
- Lalonde
- Loubier
- Marchand
- Mercier
- Rochelieu
- Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Adams Alcock
Assad Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker Bélair
Benoit Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie Bonwick
Bradshaw Brisson
Buhler Cdman
Chirietten (Saint-Maurice) Cotler
Collenette Dockrill
Desjarlais Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle Gallaway
Harvey Herron
Hill (Macleod) Hubbard
Karygianis Laliberte
McLellan (Edmonton West) McNally
Mills (Red Deer) Murray
Normand Parrish
Price Provenzano
Robillard Redman
Sekora Scott (Fredericton)
Solomon Shepherd
Strahl Szabo
Ur Vancil
Wasylycia-Leis Whelan
White (Langley—Abbotsford) —57

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 261 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 262. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 262, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1041)

YEAS

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean) Bellehumeur
Cambell Cameron (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye Debe

Duman Fournier
Girard-Bujold Guay
Lalonde Laurin
Loubier Marcoux
Marchand Ménard
Mercier Picard (Drummond)
Rochefleur St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis) Vienne —24

NAYS

Members

Adams Alcock
Assad Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker Bélair
Benoit Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie Bonwick
Bradshaw Brisson
Buhler Cdman
Chirietten (Saint-Maurice) Cotler
Collenette Dockrill
Desjarlais Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle Gallaway
Harvey Herron
Hill (Macleod) Hubbard
Karygianis Laliberte
McLellan (Edmonton West) McNally
Mills (Red Deer) Murray
Normand Parrish
Price Provenzano
Robillard Redman
Sekora Scott (Fredericton)
Solomon Shepherd
Strahl Szabo
Ur Vancil
Wasylycia-Leis Whelan
White (Langley—Abbotsford) —50

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 262 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 263. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 263, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1042)
Government Orders

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

○ (4550 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 264, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1043)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
Dumas
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Laurin
Marchand
Mercier
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Assad
Belanger
Benoit
Bradshaw
Brydon
Cadman
Cloutier
Collette
Dockrill
Duncan
Earle
Eggleton
Hanger
Heron
Hubbard
Laliberte
Mancini
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mills (Red Deer)
Murray
O'Reilly
Pallister
Provenzano
Robillard
Sekora
Solem
Szabo
Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoepner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 263 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 264. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.
The next question is on Motion No. 267. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 267, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1045)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Assad
Bélair
Blakie
Cadman
Desjarlais
Duncan
Easter
Gallaway
Hill (Macleod)
Laibert
Mancini
Mclean (Edmonton West)
Murray
Pallister
Provenzano
Scott (Fredericton)
Serr
Solomon
Steckle
Szabo
Waylaycia-Leis

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Assad
Bélair
Boulet
Cameron
Desjarlais
Easter
Gallaway
Hill (Macleod)
Laibert
Mancini
Mclean (Edmonton West)
Murray
Pallister
Scott (Fredericton)
Serr
St-Jacques—33

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 267 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 268. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

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

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4600)

(The House divided on Motion No. 268, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1046)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
de Savoye
Girard-Bujold
Laurin
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Venne—15

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Boucher
Brison
Colleen
e
Earle
Hanger
Hill (Macleod)
Mancini
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Price
Scott (Fredericton)
Serri
Solomon
Szabo
Whelan—29

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 268 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 270. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 270, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1047)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
de Savoye
Fournier
Lalonde
Marchand
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—15

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Assad
Benoit
Bélanger
Blaikie
Collenette
Earle
Eggleton
Hill (Macleod)
Hubbard
Laliberte
Mancini
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Murray
Price
Reed
Sokora

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 270 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. You are perhaps in a hurry to get home to bed, but I would like you to read the motions more slowly.

Earlier, for Motion No. 270, you mentioned clauses 1 and 30, when it was a case of clauses 1 and 3. We voted on that. I would have liked to intervene—
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): It is possible that I made—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Order, please. It is quite possible that I made an error. From now on, I will be more careful.

The question is on Motion No. 272.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 272, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1048)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Deschênes
Girard-Bujold
Laurin
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
de Savoye
Desrochers
LaRonde
Marchand St-Hilaire

NAYS

Members
Assad
Bonwick
Boucher (Québec—Métabetchouan—Hat.describe)
Bradshaw
Brazeau
Brazeau
Brison
Brison
Collenette
Copps
Dumont
Eggleston
Harvey
Hilt (Mackay)
Hilt (Mackay)
Keys
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mills (Red Deer)
Price
Scott (Fredericton)
Solomon
Stobbe
Whelan—25

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Chartrand (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Deschênes
Girard-Bujold
Laurin
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Canuel
de Savoye
Desrochers
LaRonde
Marchand St-Hilaire

NAYS

Members
Assad
Baker
Bennett
Bernier (Québec—Métabetchouan—Hat.describe)
Bradshaw
Brazeau
Brazeau
Brison
Brison
Collenette
Copps
Dumont
Eggleston
Harvey
Hilt (Mackay)
Hilt (Mackay)
Keys
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mills (Red Deer)
Price
Scott (Fredericton)
Solomon

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 272 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 274. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 274, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1049)
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 274 lost.

The next question is on Motion 276. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(Yeas)

Asselin
Béliveau
Chérié (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Desrochers
Girard-Bujold
Laurin
Marchand
St-Hilaire

Nays

Abbott
Assad
Blais
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bonin
Cadman
Copps
Easter
Eggleton
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Herron
Hubbard
Keyes
Maloney
Mifflin
Myers
Price
Reed
Solomon
Whelan

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 276 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 277. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 277, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1051)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Béliveau
Chérié (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Desrochers
Girard-Bujold
Laurin
Marchand
St-Hilaire

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Assad
Blais
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bonin
Cadman
Copps
Easter
Eggleton
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Herron
Hubbard
Keyes
Maloney
Mifflin
Myers
Price
Reed
Solomon
Whelan
Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

| Anderson | Hoepner |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) | Nunziata |

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** I declare Motion No. 277 lost.

*(4620)*

The next question is on Motion No. 278. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

(The House divided on Motion No. 278, which was negatived on the following division:)

(division No. 1052)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel de Savoie</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>Chétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafon</td>
<td>Desrochers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—16</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Belanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benoit</td>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaikie</td>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadman</td>
<td>Collet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collet</td>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockrill</td>
<td>Drouin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
<td>Eggleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggleton</td>
<td>Hanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanger</td>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
<td>Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td>Lastewka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys</td>
<td>Mancini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancini</td>
<td>McCormick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMullan (Edmonton West)</td>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Robillard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robillard</td>
<td>Scott (Fredericton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>Shephard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>Vautour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vautour</td>
<td>Whelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whelan</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel de Savoie</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>Chétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafon</td>
<td>Desrochers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—15</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>Abrams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belanger</td>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonin</td>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collet</td>
<td>Collet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
<td>Drouin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockrill</td>
<td>Eggleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggleton</td>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
<td>Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td>Lastewka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys</td>
<td>Mancini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancini</td>
<td>McCormick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMullan (Edmonton West)</td>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Robillard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robillard</td>
<td>Scott (Fredericton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>Shephard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>Vautour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vautour</td>
<td>Whelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whelan</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 281 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 282. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4630)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 282, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1054)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
<td>de Savoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
<td>Marceau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
<td>Benoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
<td>Blais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard (Témiscamingués)</td>
<td>Blaiske</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloutier</td>
<td>Collette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotler</td>
<td>Desjardins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Villers</td>
<td>Dockrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drouin</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Érard</td>
<td>Eggleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendron (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
<td>Gendron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
<td>Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
<td>Labrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyes</td>
<td>Lacombe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney</td>
<td>McLellan (Edmonton West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mifflin</td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickard (Ontario Centre)</td>
<td>Saada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robichaud</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (Fredericton)</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Division No. 1055)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
<td>de Savoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
<td>Marceau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benoit</td>
<td>Benoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
<td>Bertrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard (Témiscamingués)</td>
<td>Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloutier</td>
<td>Collette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotler</td>
<td>Desjardins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Villers</td>
<td>Dockrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drouin</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Érard</td>
<td>Eggleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendron (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
<td>Gendron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
<td>Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
<td>Labrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyes</td>
<td>Lacombe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney</td>
<td>McLellan (Edmonton West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (Winnipeg Centre)</td>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mifflin</td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickard (Ontario Centre)</td>
<td>Saada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robichaud</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (Fredericton)</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Government Orders

Szafron
Vautour
Wasylycia-Leis
Wood—47

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoepner
Kilgour
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 282 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 284. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4630)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 284, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1055)
Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 284 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 287. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

(4635 )

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 287, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1056)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur

Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)

de Savoye

Fournier

Lalonde

Marchand

St-Hilaire

Nays

Adams
Belanger

Bélair
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

Bégin

Desjardins

Duncan

Eggleston

Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)

Harvey

Hill (Mackay)

Keys

Mclellan (Edmonton West)

Mills (Red Deer)

Price

Scott (Fredericton)

Shepherd

Strahl

Ur

Wasylycia-Leis

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 287 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 290. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4640 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 290, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1057)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur

Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)

de Savoye

Fournier

Lalonde

Marchand

Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—15

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Belanger

Bélair
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

Bouin

Copp

Devillers

Duncan

Easter

Hanger

Hernon

Hubbard

Karygiannis

Laiberte

Maloney

McCollan (Edmonton West)

McMillan

O’Reilly

Reed

Scott (Fredericton)

Vautour

Wood—41

Abbott
Belair

Benoit

Benoit Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

Benoit

Cadman

Desjardins

Dockrill

Earle

Eggleston

Harvey

Hernon

Hubbard

Hubbard

Jackson

Keys

Lastewka

Maccoll

McCollan (Edmonton West)

McMillan

O’Reilly

Reed

Scott (Fredericton)

Vautour

Wood—41

Abbott
Belair

Benoit

Blaiske

Cadman

Desjardins

Dockrill

Earle

Eggleston

Harvey

Hernon

Hubbard

Hubbard

Jackson

Keys

Lastewka

Maccoll

McCollan (Edmonton West)

McMillan

O’Reilly

Reed

Scott (Fredericton)

Vautour

Wood—41

Abbott
Belair

Benoit

Blaiske

Cadman

Desjardins

Dockrill

Earle

Eggleston

Harvey

Hernon

Hubbard

Hubbard

Jackson

Keys

Lastewka

Maccoll

McCollan (Edmonton West)

McMillan

O’Reilly

Reed

Scott (Fredericton)

Vautour

Wood—41
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibault): I declare Motion No. 290 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 292. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 292, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1058)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
<td>Canuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chretien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
<td>de Savoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
<td>Loubier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marceau</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belair</td>
<td>Benoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
<td>Blaisie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonin</td>
<td>Cadman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpes</td>
<td>Desjardins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuVilliers</td>
<td>Dockrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggerton</td>
<td>Fry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
<td>Hanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Herton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Macleod)</td>
<td>Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Kaetuk-Lindell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyes</td>
<td>LaBerte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasnierka</td>
<td>Maloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td>McLellan (Edmonton West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McTague</td>
<td>Mufflin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills (Red Deer)</td>
<td>Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
<td>O'Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)</td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Saada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (Fredericton)</td>
<td>Serff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strahl</td>
<td>Szabo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vachon</td>
<td>Vautour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasylycia-Leis</td>
<td>Wood—52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the taking of the vote:

Mr. Ghislain Fournier: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I actually did vote on this motion; I rose, but I did not hear my name. The clerk turned around. I would like to know if my vote has indeed been recorded.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibault): Yes, your vote has been recorded.

Mr. Gérard Asselin: Madam Speaker, to prevent this from happening again, I suggest that the member rise to vote when it is his turn to do so. This would eliminate the problem. It is the third time the member rises on a point of order to have his vote recorded.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibault): I do not think this is a point of order.

(The House divided on Motion No. 294, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1059)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
<td>Canuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chretien (Frontenac—Mégantic)</td>
<td>de Savoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marceau</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government Orders

NAYS

Members
Abbott
Alcock
Belanger
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Copp
Dockrill
Earle
Finlay
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Harvey
Hubbard
Jackson
Keyes
Lastewka
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Normand
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Reed
Solomon
Strahl
Vanour

Abbott
Alcock
Belanger
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Copp
Dockrill
Earle
Finlay
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Harvey
Hubbard
Jackson
Keyes
Lastewka
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Normand
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Reed
Solomon
Strahl
Vanour
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 294 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 299. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on Motion No. 299, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 1060)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Belhumeur
Chillet (Fontenac—Mégantic)
Desrochers
Girard-Bujold
Laurin
Marcoux
St-Hilaire

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
de Savoye
Fournier
Lalonde
Loubier
Marchand
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—16

(Division No. 1061)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Belhumeur
de Savoye
Fournier
Lalonde
Loubier
Marchand
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—15

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 299 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 300. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on Motion No. 300, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 1061)
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NAYS

Members

Abbott  Adams
Alcock  Baker
Barnes  Belair
Benoit  Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bouin  Cadman
Casson  Choutier
Desjardins  DeVillers
Dockrell  Earle
Fry  Finlay
Hubbard  Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jackson  Herron
Keyes  Karetak-Lindell
Kraft  Lariberte
Lastrack  Laflamme
McCormick  Millin
Mills (Red Deer)  Myers
Normand  O'Reilly
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  Price
Proulx  Reed
Scott (Fredericton)  Solomon
St-Julien  Szabo
Tories  Vandezande
Vautour  Wasylycia-Leis
Wood  —51

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson  Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 300 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 301. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

● (4700)

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 301, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1062)

YEAS

Members

Asselin  Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Beaudoin  Cadman
de Savigny  Deschene

NAYS

Members

Adams  Alcock
Baker  Barnes
Belair  Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  Blaikie
Bouin  Cadman
Casson  Choutier
Desjardins  DeVillers
Dockrell  Earle
Fry  Finlay
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)  Herron
Jackson  Karetak-Lindell
Keyes  Lariberte
Kraft  Laflamme
Lastrack  Laflamme
McCormick  Millin
Mills (Red Deer)  Myers
Normand  O'Reilly
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)  Price
Proulx  Reed
Scott (Fredericton)  Solomon
St-Julien  Szabo
Tories  Vandezande
Vautour  Wasylycia-Leis
Wood  —49

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson  Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 300 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 302. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

● (4700)

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 302, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1062)
Government Orders

(Division No. 1063)

YEAS

Members

Asselin           Canuel           Fournier          Laurin          Marceau          St-Hilaire
Bellehumeur     Desrochers        Girard-Bujold     Loubier         Marchand        Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—12

NAYS

Members

Adams           Alcock           Anders           Belair          Blaike          Bonin            Casson
Barnes          Barnes           Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac) Blaikie         Cannis          Clouthier       Collenette
Béland           Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac) Blaikie         Cannis          Clouthier       Collenette
Blaikie          Casson
Bonin            Blaike
Béland           Blaike
Blaikie          Béland
Bonin            Béland
Blaikie

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson         Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 302 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 303. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4710)

(The House divided on Motion No. 303, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1064)

YEAS

Members

Asselin           Canuel           Fournier          Laurin          Marceau          St-Hilaire
Bellehumeur     Desrochers        Girard-Bujold     Loubier         Marchand        Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—12

NAYS

Members

Adams           Alcock           Anders           Belair          Blaike          Bonin            Casson
Barnes          Barnes           Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac) Blaikie         Cannis          Clouthier       Collenette
Béland           Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac) Blaikie         Cannis          Clouthier       Collenette
Blaikie          Casson
Bonin            Blaike
Béland           Blaike
Blaikie

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson         Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 303 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 304. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:
The House divided on Motion No. 304, which was negatived on the following division:

**Division No. 1065**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
<td>Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Marceau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA YS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Alcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anders</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélaire</td>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryden</td>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannis</td>
<td>Casson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouthier</td>
<td>Collette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjardins</td>
<td>Dockrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
<td>Elley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finlay</td>
<td>Fry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
<td>Grewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaffer</td>
<td>Karetak-Lindell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karygiannis</td>
<td>Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laliberte</td>
<td>Maloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td>McLellan (Edmonton West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNally</td>
<td>Millan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
<td>Phinney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Scott (Fredericton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
<td>Torresy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanier</td>
<td>Vautour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasylcy-Leis</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIRED MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 304 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 305. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on Motion No. 305, which was negatived on the following division:

**Division No. 1066**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canuel</td>
<td>Desrochers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Marceau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA YS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Alcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anders</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélaire</td>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryden</td>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannis</td>
<td>Casson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouthier</td>
<td>Collette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjardins</td>
<td>Dockrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
<td>Elley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finlay</td>
<td>Fry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
<td>Grewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaffer</td>
<td>Karetak-Lindell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karygiannis</td>
<td>Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laliberte</td>
<td>Maloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td>McLellan (Edmonton West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNally</td>
<td>Millan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normand</td>
<td>Phinney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Scott (Fredericton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
<td>Torresy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanier</td>
<td>Vautour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasylcy-Leis</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIRED MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 305 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 306. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 306, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1067)

YEAS

Members

Asselin Belleville
Canuel Desrochers
Fournier Girard-Bujold
Laurin Loubier
Marceau Marchand
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Rimouski-Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Adams Alcock
Anders Baker
Belair Bernier (Tobique-Mactaquac)
Bélanger Bonin
Bryden Calder
Cannis Caplan
Casson Clouthier
Collenette Desjardins
Dockrill Earle
Elie Finlay
Godin (Acadie-Bathurst) Grewal
Harris Herron
Jackson Jaffer
Karetak-Lindell Karygiannis
Kelgér (Stormont-Dundas-Charlottenburgh) Laliberte
Maloney McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West) McCully
Mifflin Normand
Phinney Price
Proctor Reed
Scott (Fredericton) Solomon
St-Julien Szabo
Tinsley Vanclief
Wayte (Edmonton) Waple
Wayne (Edmonton) Wood—50

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (St. John’s) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 307, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1068)

YEAS

Members

Asselin Belleville
Canuel Desrochers
Fournier Girard-Bujold
Laurin Loubier
Marceau Marchand
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Rimouski-Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Adams Alcock
Anders Baker
Belair Bernier (Tobique-Mactaquac)
Bélanger Bonin
Bryden Calder
Cannis Caplan
Casson Clouthier
Collett Karygiannis
Dockrill Earle
Finlay Godin (Acadie-Bathurst)
Grewal Gruending
Harris Herron
Jackson Jaffer
Karetak-Lindell Karygiannis
Kelgér (Stormont-Dundas-Charlottenburgh) Laliberte
Maloney McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West) McCully
Mifflin Normand
Phinney Price
Proctor Reed
Scott (Fredericton) Solomon
St-Julien Szabo
Tinsley Vanclief
Wayte (Edmonton) Waple
Wayne (Edmonton) Wood—50

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (St. John’s) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 306 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 307. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 307 lost.
Mr. Ghislain Fournier: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I do not know whether it is because I am not a tall person, although I am a rather large one, but I did not hear the clerk mention my name when the votes were recorded. Was my vote in fact recorded?

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Yes, your vote was indeed recorded.

The next question is on Motion No. 308. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4730)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 308, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1069)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Laurin
Loubier
Marceau
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—12

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blahie
Brown
Bryden
Calder
Cannis
Caplan
Casson
Cloutier
Collette
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Earle
Finlay
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Grundling
Harris
Herron
Jackson
Jaffer
Karygiannis
Kelher (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottetown)
Kraft Sloan
Laflèche
Maloney
McConnell
McDowall
Mifflin
Normand
Phuney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proctor
Scott (Fredericton)

Government Orders

St-Julien
Tarey
Vauclair
Wanylycia-Leis

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoegger (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 308 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 309. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 309, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1070)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Laurin
Loubier
Marceau
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—12

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blahie
Brown
Bryden
Calder
Cannis
Caplan
Casson
Cloutier
Collette
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Earle
Finlay
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Grundling
Harris
Herron
Jackson
Jaffer
Karygiannis
Kelher (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottetown)
Kraft Sloan
Laflèche
Maloney
McConnell
McDowall
Mifflin
Normand
Phuney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proctor
Scott (Fredericton)

Government Orders

St-Julien
Tarey
Vauclair
Wanylycia-Leis

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoegger (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 308 lost.
Government Orders

Solomon
Torsney
Vautour
Wasylycia-Leis

St-Julien
Vanclief
Wappel
Wood—52

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 309 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 310.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 310, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1071)

YEAS

Members

Bellehumeur
Deutchers
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Marchand
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—11

Camel
Fournier
Laurin
Marcoux
St-Hilaire

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Brown
Canns
Casson
Collenette
Dockrill
Earle
Elley
Grewal
Harris
Jackson
Karetk-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laflriette
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Normand

Anders
Bennett
Bradshaw
Calder
Caplan
Chouinard
Desjardins
Doyle
Eggerton
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending
Herron
Jaffer
Karygiannis
Kraft Sloan
Maloney

Price
Scott (Fredericton)
Solomon
Szabo
Vanclief
Wasylycia-Leis

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 310 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 311. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 311, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1072)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Deschiers
Loubier
Marchand
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)—13

Anders
Baker
Bradshaw
Bryden
Casson
Collenette
Dockrill
Earle
Elley
Grewal
Harris
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kraft Sloan
Maloney

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Brown
Calder
Caplan
Chouinard
Desjardins
Doyle
Eggerton
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending
Herron
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laflriette
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mifflin
Normand

Anders
Blaikie
Brown
Calder
Caplan
Chouinard
Desjardins
Doyle
Eggerton
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending
Herron
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laflriette
McCormick
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 311 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. It is now 11:45 p.m. and, should you ask the House, I am sure you would find unanimous consent to thank the pages who did an excellent job during these long hours. I know some of them will be leaving at midnight, namely Rachelle, Natalie, Greg, Adrienne, Sonja, Cheryl, Mélanie, Eric, Meg and David.

I think we should give them a good round of applause and thank them for their excellent work.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The hon. member is asking that we give a token of appreciation to our pages who will be leaving us in about 15 minutes. I think we all agree with that.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The next question is on Motion No. 312. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Government Orders

(The House divided on Motion No. 312, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1073)

YEAS

Members

Bellehumeur
Camel
Laurin
St-Hilaire

NAYS

Members

Anders
Barnes
Brown
Capi

Collette
Deckrill
Earle
Elley

Gruending
Jackson
Karetnyk-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)

Laiberte
Maloney
McDonough
Normand

Myers
Parrish
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proctor
Price
Proulx
Solomon
St-Julien
Stoffier
Tournay
Wappel
Wood—48

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 312 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 313. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.
Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (4750)

(The House divided on Motion No. 313, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1074)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Bergeron
Desrochers
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Marchand
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis) — 13

NAYS

Members
Anders
Brown
Calder
Casson
Desjarlais
Doyle
Eggleton
Geddes (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending
Jackson
Karzuik-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laliberte
Maloney
McDonough
Miffin
Normand
Phinney
Price
Prout
Solomon
Sara}

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (4755)

(The House divided on Motion No. 314, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1075)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Bergeron
Desrochers
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis) — 13

NAYS

Members
Anders
Bélair
Bélaire
Blair
Brown
Bryan
Calder
Casson
Desjarlais
Doyle
Eggleton
Geddes (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gruending
Jackson
Jordan
Karzuik-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Laliberte
Lastewka
McCorquodale
McDonough
McHarg
McNeil
Meerrated
McKenzie
Meighen
McMurtry
Miller
Mlynski
Moffat
Myers
Phinney
Price
Prout
Sekora
Stoffler
Sara}

The next question is on Motion No. 315. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Actin Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 314 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 315. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 315, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1076)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
<td>Camel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Marceau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)</td>
<td>Turp—15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anders</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
<td>Blaikie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair Blaikie</td>
<td>Casson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
<td>Casson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collenette</td>
<td>Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
<td>Dockrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggleton</td>
<td>Grewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
<td>Grenier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruending</td>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Jaffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Kenney (Calgary Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karygiannis</td>
<td>Kraft Sloan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lastewka</td>
<td>Lastewka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMullan (Edmonton West)</td>
<td>McMillan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Normand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P znajdują</td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>Proulx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (Fredericton)</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoffer</td>
<td>Szabo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Vautour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wappel</td>
<td>Wasylycia-Leis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>—49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I declare Motion No. 315 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 316. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 316, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1077)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
<td>Camel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Laurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Marceau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)</td>
<td>Turp—15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Anders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
<td>Blaikie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronin</td>
<td>Bonwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder</td>
<td>Casson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
<td>Collenette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouthier</td>
<td>Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullen</td>
<td>Dockrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjarlais</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td>Eliey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggleton</td>
<td>Grewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
<td>Grenier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruending</td>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Jaffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Kenney (Calgary Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karygiannis</td>
<td>Kraft Sloan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lastewka</td>
<td>Lastewka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMullan (Edmonton West)</td>
<td>McMillan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Normand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P玩家朋友</td>
<td>Proulx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (Fredericton)</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoffer</td>
<td>Vautour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Wasylycia-Leis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>—58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata
Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 316 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 317. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4805)

(The House divided on Motion No. 317, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1078)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Desrochers
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Marchand
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Bellehumeur
Camuel
Fourier
Guimond
Marcoux
St-Hilaire
Turp—14

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Belisle
Bonin
Bryden
Caplan
Collette
Davies
Doyle
Eggleton
Fry
Grewal
Herron
Jaffer
Karentik-Lindell
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)
Lalonde
Laliberte
Maloney
Mackinnon
McDonaugh
Mifflin
Normand
Piney
Pratte
Prior
Reed
Solomon
Torsney
Vautour
Wayly via-Leis

Anders
Barnes
Bennett
Bonwick
Calder
Casson
Collette
Davies
Earle
Elley
Fry
Harris
Jordan
Karentik-Lindell
Karygiannis
Kraft Sloan
Laliberte
Maloney
McDonough
Mifflin
Normand
Piney
Protest
Proulx
Reed
Roper
Stoffer
Vancleef
Wappel
Wood—58

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Heeppner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 317 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 318. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4810)

(The House divided on Motion No. 318, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1079)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Desrochers
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Marchand
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Bellehumeur
Camuel
Fourier
Guimond
Marcoux
St-Hilaire
Turp—15

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anders
Baker
Belisle
Bonin
Bryden
Caplan
Collette
Davies
Doyle
Eggleton
Fry
Grewal
Herron
Jaffer
Karentik-Lindell
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)
Lalonde
Laliberte
Maloney
Mackinnon
McDonaugh
Mifflin
Normand
Piney
Pratte
Prior
Reed
Roper
Stoffer
Vancleef
Wappel
Wood—51

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 318 lost.
The next question is on Motion No. 319. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 319, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1080)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Desrochers
Gagnon
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé)
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Marchand
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp—17

NAYS

Members

Adams
Barnes
Bonin
Bouchard
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Collenette
Davies
Dion
Earle
Elley
Harris
Jaffer
Kangashelm
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Maloney
McDonough
Minnis
Norman
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proulx

Anders
Bélair
Bouin
Bryan
Cloutier
Cullen
Desjardins
Doyon
Eggleton
Grewal
Herron
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
McCornick
McNally
Myers
Phinney
Pratt
Proulx

Scott (Fredericton)
Solomon
Sorrento
Vautour
Waylycia-Lois

Sekora
Stoffer
Vanclief
Waples
Wood—56

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 319 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 320. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 320, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1081)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Desrochers
Gagnon
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé)
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Marchand
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp—17

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Bélair
Bouin
Bryan
Cloutier
Cullen
Desjardins
Doyon
Eggley
Grewal
Herron
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
McCornick
McNally
Myers
Phinney
Pratt
Proulx

Anders
Barnes
Blaike
Bryan
Casson
Collenette
Cullen
Desjardins
Dion
Earle
Elley
Grewal
Herron
Jaffer
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Laliberte
McCornick
McNally
Myers
O’Reilly
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 320 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 321. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Division No. 1082

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Bégin-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guimond
Marcoux
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matane)

Members

Belhumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspésie)
Cabinet
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Marchand
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tuip—17

NAYS

Members

Anders
Bélanger
Blackie
Bryan
Caplan
Clouthier
Cinuzzi
DeVillers
Doloreux
Elgie
Gawley
Jordan
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)
Kraft
Maloney
Myers
Phinney
Proctor
Provenzano
Scott (Fredericton)
Stoffer
Torsney
Wappel

Members

Baker
Bennett
Bonin
Calder
Casson
Collenette
Cullen
Dion
Earle
Foy
Jaffer
Karygiannis
Kelly (Edmonton Southeast)
LaLiberte
McNally
Normand

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 321 lost.

Mr. Yvan Loubier: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like you to clarify certain rules for us. Earlier, the clerk called out the names of several Liberal members who were not standing in their place. I would like you to tell us what the rule is. Do members have to rise so their votes can be recorded or does the clerk call out their names automatically even though they are sitting down? That was the case for at least seven Liberal members earlier. Can you clarify that rule for us?

The Deputy Speaker: I am sure the only votes that are counted are those of members who are standing in their place when the division is taken. I will look more closely to make sure that this is the case. I thank the member for his vigilance.

Mr. Yvan Loubier: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be preferable to start all over again in this case. I saw at least ten Liberal members who were sitting down but whose names were called out by the clerk with those opposing the motion.

An hon. member: A procedural error has occurred.

Mr. Yvan Loubier: There were at least ten of them.

The Deputy Speaker: I am certain that the clerk counted the members only when they were standing in their places. I am sure that is always the case. We do not want to recount the vote at this point.

I believe that the procedure is correct, and we can proceed to the next question, which is on Motion No. 322.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.
And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 322, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1083)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Bégin—Gaspé

BERGERON (Bonaventure) BERNIER (Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guimond
Marchand
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—16

NA Y S

Members

Adams
Baker
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaike
Bodin
Bélair
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)
Blyden
Calder
Caplan
Colinne
Clouthier
Collenette
De Villers
Cullen
Dion
Doyle
Earle
Elley
Fry
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Harris
Jaffer
Jodlin
Karyyianis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton West)
Kraft
Laliberte
Maloney
Mclain
Proctor
Price
Scott (Fredericton)
Solomon
Stoffer
Szabo
Vanclief
Wood—47

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

HOEPPNER
NUNZIATA

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(Division No. 1084)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Bégin—Gaspé

BERGERON (Bonaventure) BERNIER (Gaspé—)
Desrochers
Fourier
Gagnon
Guimond
Loubier
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—19

NA Y S

Members

Adams
Baker
Bélair
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blyden
Calder
Caplan
Colinne
Clouthier
Collenette
De Villers
Cullen
Dion
Doyle
Earle
Elley
Fry
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Harris
Jaffer
Jodlin
Karyyianis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton West)
Kraft
Laliberte
Maloney
Mclain
Proctor
Price
Scott (Fredericton)
Solomon
Stoffer
Szabo
Vanclief
Wood—46

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

HOEPPNER
NUNZIATA

Mr. Odina Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am glad to see that the clerk has carefully followed the recommendations of the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot and taken the time to identify Liberal members in the House one by one. We are reassured that this parliament is following the rules of democracy.

The Deputy Speaker: We always take the suggestions of the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot very seriously.

The next question is on Motion No. 323. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?
Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 323 lost.

I must caution the hon. member for Calgary West who displayed a sign during the voting. He must know that is quite contrary to the rules and I know he would want to comply with the rules in every respect.

The next question is on Motion No. 324. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 324, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1085)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Berceron
Canuel
Desrochers
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Blair
Brenier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bonin
Calder
Casson
Collenette
Davies
Dion
Earle
Fry
Grewal
Herron
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton South East)
LabiBerte
McDonough
McNally
Pratt
Prior
Proctor
Sekera
Stoffer
Turesney
Van Tou

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton South East)
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 324 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 325. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 325, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1086)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Berceron
Canuel
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guimond
Marchand
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Brenier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bonin
Caplan
Clouthier
Comuzzi
Davies
Dion
Earle
Fry
Grewal
Herron
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton South East)
LabiBerte
McDonough
McNally
Pratt
Prior
Proctor
Sekera
Stoffer
Turesney
Van Tou

Wood—48

Wood—50
March 13, 2000

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 325 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 326. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4845)

(The House divided on Motion No. 326, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1087)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Bertrand (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Canuel
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guimond
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp—20

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Belair
Bouin
Caplan
Chouliere
Cullen
DeVillers
Earle
Fry
Grewal
Jafer
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
McDonough
Phinney
Proctor
St-Julien
Staib
Vanclief
Wood—43

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoeppner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 326 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 327. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4845)

(The House divided on Motion No. 327, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1088)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Bertrand (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Canuel
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guimond
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—19

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Belair
Bouin
Caplan
Chouliere
Cullen
DeVillers
Earle
Fry
Grewal
Jafer
Karygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
McDonough
Phinney
Proctor
St-Julien
Staib
Vanclief
Wood—45
Government Orders

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anderson (Edmonton Southeast)</th>
<th>Heeppner</th>
<th>Nunziata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 327 lost.

I have to advise the hon. member for Calgary West that if he persists in his disobedience of the Chair’s instructions I will have his vote removed and discounted.

The question is on Motion No. 328. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4850)

(The House divided on Motion No. 328, which was negatived on the following division:

**Division No. 1089**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cailin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destouches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcoux</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouthier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deVillers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karetak-Lindell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenney (Calgary Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathbre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLellan (Edmonton West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenzano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 328 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 329. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4855)

(The House divided on Motion No. 329, which was negatived on the following division:

**Division No. 1090**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cailin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destouches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcoux</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouthier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deVillers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karetak-Lindell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenney (Calgary Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathbre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLellan (Edmonton West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenzano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 329 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 330. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 330, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1091)

**YEAS**

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Canuel
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guimond
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—18

**NAYS**

Members

Adams
Baker
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Calder
Casson
Collet
Cullen
DeVilliers
Dockrill
Earle
Fry
Heron
Karetak-Lindell
Kraft Sloan
Maloney
McNally
Price
Sekora
St-Julien
Szabo
Wood—44

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 330 lost.

The next question is Motion No. 331. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4900 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 331, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1092)

**YEAS**

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Canuel
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guimond
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

**NAYS**

Members

Adams
Baker
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blyden
Caplan
Cloutier
Cullen
DeVilliers
Dockrill
Earle
Fry
Heron
Karetak-Lindell
Kraft Sloan
Maloney
McNally
Price
Proulx
Sekora
St-Julien
Szabo
Wood—45
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 331 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 332. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 332, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1094)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Ires-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Baths
Brien
Cardin
Caron
Fournier
Guimond
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Missis)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Bélair
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bouin
Cook
Cullen
Davies
Doyle
Dyck
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 332 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 333. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 333, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1094)
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 333 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 334. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 334, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1095)

YEAS

Asselin
Bergeron
Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Calvet
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Marchaud
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matane)

Members
Bellemeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)
Brien
Cauchon
Deschênes
Gagnon
Guimond
Marchand
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp—21

NAYS

Adams
Baker
Bennett
Blondin-Andrew
Bryden
Caplan
Colle-Nette
Davies
Dion
Fry
Jaffer
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Centre)
Kenney (Edmonton Southeast)
Maloney
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Myers
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proctor
Scott (Fredericton)
St-Julien
Staebel

Members
Anders
Beauchamp
Bevilacqua
Bouin
Calder
Chouinard
Comuzzi
Devillers
Earle
Garin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jordan
Krynuk
Kristjánis
Kylger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Laliberté
McMurry
McNally
O’Reilly
Pratte
Proulx
Solomon
Stoffel
Wood —44

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoepner
Nunziata

(The House divided on Motion No. 335, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1096)

YEAS

Asselin
Bergeron
Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Calvet
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Marchaud
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp—20

NAYS

Adams
Baker
Bennett
Blondin-Andrew
Bryden
Caplan
Colle-Nette
Davies
Dion
Earle
Garin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jaffer
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Centre)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Maloney
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Myers
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proctor
Scott (Fredericton)
St-Julien
Staebel

Members
Anders
Beauchamp
Bevilacqua
Bouin
Calder
Chouinard
Comuzzi
Devillers
Earle
Garin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jaffer
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Centre)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Maloney
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Myers
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proctor
Scott (Fredericton)
Stoffel
Wood —44

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoepner
Nunziata

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 334 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 335. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 335, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1095)
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 335 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 336. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4920)

(The House divided on Motion No. 336, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1097)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Bergeron (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)
Brien
Brien (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)
Cardin
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guimond
Marceau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bevilacqua (Blondin-Andrew)
Bonin
Calder
Chouinard
Comuzzi
DeVillers
Doyle
El应付
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Heron
Jordan
Kanygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
McCormick

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 336 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 337. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4925)

(The House divided on Motion No. 337, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1098)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Bergeron (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)
Brien
Brien (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)
Cardin
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guimond
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bevilacqua (Blondin-Andrew)
Bonin
Calder
Chouinard
Collette
Collette
Dion
Earle
Fry
Gendron
Gendron (Acadie—Bathurst)
Heron
Jordan
Kanygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
McLellan (Edmonton West)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 337 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 338. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4930)

(The House divided on Motion No. 338, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1099)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Bergeron (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)
Brien
Brien (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)
Cardin
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guimond
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bevilacqua (Blondin-Andrew)
Bonin
Calder
Chouinard
Collette
Collette
Dion
Earle
Fry
Gendron
Gendron (Acadie—Bathurst)
Heron
Jordan
Kanygiannis
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
McLellan (Edmonton West)
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 337 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 338. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 338, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1099)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Crette
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp—20

NAYS

Members

Anders
Baker
Bennett
Béjar
Blainville
Bonin
Calder
Comuzzi
Devillers
Doyle
Elsley
Fry
Grewal

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 339 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 339. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 339, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1100)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Crette
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp—20

NAYS

Members

Anders
Baker
Bennett
Béjar
Blainville
Bonin
Calder
Comuzzi
Devillers
Doyle
Elsley
Fry
Grewal
Government Orders

Cullen
Doon
Earle
Finlay
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Harron
Karetk–Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Maloney
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proulx
Sekora
Stoffer
Torsney
Wood—49

YEAS

Asselin
Bergeron
Bres–la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Cardin
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guindon
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski–Matin)  

Members

Bellehumeur
Berger (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)
Biggar
Cabinet
Côté
Foureau
Girard–Bujold
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp—21

NAYS

Adams
Baker
Brenette
Brilhac
Brown
Caplan
Cullen
DeVillers
Doyle
Elley
Grewal
Herron
Karetk–Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Maloney
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Proulx
Sekora
Solomon
Szabo
Torsney
Vautour

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoepner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 339 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 340. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(4935 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 340, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1101)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Bres–la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Cardin
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guindon
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski–Matin)  

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 340 lost.

[Translation]

I must say that I have heard certain remarks about the Speaker’s ears.

An hon. member: His ears?

The Deputy Speaker: Yes, his ears, because I usually have no difficulty hearing the yeas and the nays. But I have to say that, tonight, each time I determined that the yeas had it, the result of the vote showed the opposite. That has been going on since I came in at midnight.

I am afraid of making too many mistakes. That is why I have to listen very carefully. As members know, I always try to do it in a non-partisan manner.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 341. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.
And more than five members having risen:

• (4940)

(The House divided on Motion No. 341, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1102)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Brien
Cardin
Desrochers
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Bellehumeur
Bigras
Cambel
Côté
Gagnon
Guimond
Marchand Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Bennett
Blais
Bonin
Calder
Casson
Cullen
Dion
Earle
Finlay
Grewal
Herron
Karanick-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
McCormick
Mifflin
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Price
Prozt
Sekora
Stoffier
Torsney

Anders
Belair
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bryden
Caplan
Comuzzi
Davies
Earle
Fry
Fry
Harris
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Maloney
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McLellan (Edmonton Southeast)

O'Reilly
Pratt
Proctor
Scott (Fredericton)
Szafo
Vautour

48

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Heeppner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 341 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 342. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (4945)

(The House divided on Motion No. 342, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1103)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Brien
Cardin
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guimond
Marchand
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Bellehumeur
Bigras
Cambel
Côté

Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Bennett
Blais
Bonin
Calder
Casson
Cullen
DeVillers
Earle
Fry
Grewal
Harris
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Maloney
McLellan (Edmonton West)

McLellan (Edmonton Southeast)
Maloney
McNally
Mifflin
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proctor
Scott (Fredericton)
Szafo

44

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Heeppner
Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 342 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 343. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.
**Government Orders**

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

- (4950)

(The House divided on Motion No. 343, which was negatived on the following division:)

*(Division No. 1104)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
<td>Biggras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
<td>Côté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimond</td>
<td>Loubier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marceau</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp—22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Anders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevilacqua</td>
<td>Blaisie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blondin-Andrew</td>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryden</td>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
<td>Casson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comuzzi</td>
<td>Cullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elley</td>
<td>Finlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fy</td>
<td>Grewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Karetak-Lindell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenney (Calgary Southeast)</td>
<td>Kildour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Shaw</td>
<td>Laliberte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney</td>
<td>McCormick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLellan (Edmonton West)</td>
<td>McNally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milling</td>
<td>O'Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (Fredericton)</td>
<td>Sekota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>Stuffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabo</td>
<td>Torsney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vautour—47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson     | Hoepner                  |
| Kiev (Edmonton Southeast) | Nunziata                |

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 343 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 344. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

- (4955)

(The House divided on Motion No. 344, which was negatived on the following division:)

*(Division No. 1105)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
<td>Biggras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
<td>Côté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimond</td>
<td>Loubier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marceau</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp—22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Anders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevilacqua</td>
<td>Blaisie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blondin-Andrew</td>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryden</td>
<td>Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
<td>Casson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comuzzi</td>
<td>Cullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td>Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elley</td>
<td>Finlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
<td>Grewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaffer</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karetak-Lindell</td>
<td>Kildour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)</td>
<td>Laliberte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td>McNally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt</td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuffer</td>
<td>Szabo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torsney—47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIRED MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Hoeppner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 344 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 345. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

(The House divided on Motion No. 345, which was negatived on the following division:)

#### (Division No. 1106)

**YEAS**

- Asselin
- Bergeron
- Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
- Brien
- Cardin
- Desrochers
- Gagnon
- Guimond
- Marcoux
- Sauvageau
- Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
- Turp—22

**NAYS**

- Adams
- Baker
- Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
- Blondin-Andrew
- Calder
- Casson
- Davies
- Don
- Earle
- Finlay
- Grewal
- Jaffer
- Karetak-Lindell
- Kilgour (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottetown)
- Laliberte
- McLellan (Edmonton West)
- Mifflin
- Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
- Price
- Proulx
- Stoffer
- Tourney—43

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

- Anderson Hoeppner | Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) | Nunziata |

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 345 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 346. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

(5000 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 346, which was negatived on the following division:)

#### (Division No. 1107)

**YEAS**

- Asselin
- Bergeron
- Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
- Brien
- Cardin
- Desrochers
- Gagnon
- Guimond
- Marcoux
- Sauvageau
- Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

**NAYS**

- Adams
- Baker
- Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
- Bigras
- Carignan
- Crête
- Fouquier
- Girard-Bujold
- Loubier
- Marchand
- St-Hilaire
- Turp—21

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carignan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fouquier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenney (Calgary Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laliberte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenney (Calgary Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLellan (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proulx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourney—40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 346 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 347. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 347, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1108)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Benoit (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)
Bergeron
Biggar
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Brien
Brisé
Cardin
Dessrochers
Fournier
Guimond
Marchand
Marchand (Lac-Saint-Jean)
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anders
Baker
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Chouinard
Comuzzi
Davies
Devillers
Dion
Dockrill
Doyle
Earle
Ellery
Finlay
Godbout (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Harris
Jackson
Jaffer
Jordan
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Maloney
McNally
Mifflin
McNally
Pettit
Proulx
Proctor
Price
Proctor
Proulx
St-Julien
Stoffer
Szafo
Toruskey
Vaillant—43

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 347 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 348. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 348, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1109)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Benoit (Bonaventure—Gaspé)
Biggar
Bigras
Brien
Cardin
Crête
Dessrochers
Fournier
Guimond
Marchand
Marchand (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anders
Baker
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Caplan
Casson
Chouinard
Comuzzi
Davies
Devillers
Dion
Dockrill
Doyle
Earle
Finlay
Godbout (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Harris
Jackson
Jaffer
Jordan
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laliberte
Maloney
McNally
Mifflin
McNally
Pettit
Proulx
Proctor
Price
Proctor
Proulx
St-Julien
Stoffer
Szafo
Toruskey
Vaillant—38
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PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 348 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 349. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(5010)

(The House divided on Motion No. 349, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. IIII)

YEAS

Members

Anders
Bellemare
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Canuel
Crête
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

YEAS

Members

Anders
Bellemare
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Canuel
Crête
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Grewal
Guimond
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Bellofatto
Bennett
Bradshaw
Calder
Cimino
De Villers
Dockrill
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jackson
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Maloney
Mifflin
Proctor
Solomon
Stoffer
Torsney
Wood—37

NAYS

Members

Adams
Bellofatto
Bennett
Bradshaw
Calder
Cimino
De Villers
Dockrill
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jackson
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)
Maloney
Mifflin
Proctor
Solomon
Stoffer
Torsney
Wood—37

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 349 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 350. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(5015)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 350, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. IIII)

YEAS

Members

Anders
Bellemare
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Canuel
Crête
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Grewal
Guimond
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

YEAS

Members

Anders
Bellemare
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Canuel
Crête
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Grewal
Guimond
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Bellofatto
Bennett
Bradshaw
Calder
Cimino
De Villers
Dockrill
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jackson
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)
Maloney
Mifflin
Proctor
Solomon
Stoffer
Torsney
Wood—37

NAYS

Members

Adams
Bellofatto
Bennett
Bradshaw
Calder
Cimino
De Villers
Dockrill
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jackson
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)
Maloney
Mifflin
Proctor
Solomon
Stoffer
Torsney
Wood—37
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 350 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 351. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 351, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1112)

YEAS

Members

Anders
Bellemur
Bélair
Bergeron
Bryden
Casson
Davies
Dockrill
Earle
Jackson
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laflèche
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Milingual
O'Reilly
Pratt
Proulx
Solomon
Stoffler
Vaucouleurs
Wood—37

Belair
Bélair
Beri
Bryden
Casson
Davies
Dockrill
Earle
Grewal
Jackson
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Laflèche
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Milingual
O' Reilly
Pratt
Proulx
Solomon
Stoffler
Vaucouleurs
Wood—42

NAYS

Members

Adams
Bélair
Beri
Bryden
Casson
Davies
Dockrill
Earle
Grewal
Jackson
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Laflèche
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Milingual
O' Reilly
Pratt
Proulx
Solomon
Stoffler
Vaucouleurs
Wood—42

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bélair
Beri
Bryden
Casson
Davies
Dockrill
Earle
Grewal
Jackson
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Laflèche
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Milingual
O' Reilly
Pratt
Proulx
Solomon
Stoffler
Vaucouleurs
Wood—42

NAYS

Members

Adams
Bellemur
Bélair
Beri
Bryden
Casson
Davies
Dockrill
Earle
Grewal
Jackson
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Laflèche
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Milingual
O' Reilly
Pratt
Proulx
Solomon
Stoffler
Vaucouleurs
Wood—42
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 352 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 353. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 353, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1114)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anders</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bes-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok</td>
<td>Bigras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
<td>Caron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
<td>Casson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschêres</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Grewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marceau</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Belair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
<td>Bégin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
<td>Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Bourque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockrill</td>
<td>Boyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
<td>Bruneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
<td>Burwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenney (Calgary Southeast)</td>
<td>Cantin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
<td>Caron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney</td>
<td>Casson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNally</td>
<td>Casson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Dio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phinnery</td>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Doyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proulx</td>
<td>Elgie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>Elgie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoffer</td>
<td>Elgie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanier</td>
<td>Elgie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood—41</td>
<td>Elgie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 353 lost.

• (5025)

The next question is on Motion No. 354. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 354, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anders</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
<td>Bigras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
<td>Casson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caron</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulet</td>
<td>Grewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marceau</td>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Matane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp—18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Belair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
<td>Bégin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
<td>Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Bourque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockrill</td>
<td>Boyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
<td>Bruneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
<td>Burwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenney (Calgary Southeast)</td>
<td>Cantin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
<td>Caron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney</td>
<td>Casson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNally</td>
<td>Casson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Dio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phinnery</td>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Doyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proulx</td>
<td>Elgie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>Elgie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoffer</td>
<td>Elgie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanier</td>
<td>Elgie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood—38</td>
<td>Elgie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 354 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 355. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(5030)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 355, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1116)

YEAS

Members

Anders
Bellehumeur
Bérubé (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Canuel
Desrochers
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Marchand
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp —18

NAYS

Members

Adams
Bégin
Bélair (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Caplan
Cloutier
Dion
Doyle
Elie
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laflèche
Mark
McNally
O'Reilly
Price
Proulx
Scott (Fredericton)
St-Julien
Turner
Vauclair

PAIRED MEMBERS

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 355 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 356. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 356, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1117)

YEAS

Members

Anders
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bérubé (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Canuel
Crette
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp —23

NAYS

Members

Adams
Baker
Bélair
Bérubé (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bryan
Casson
Casson
Davies
Dockrill
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laflèche
Maloney
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally
McNally
Phinnery
Proctor
Provenzano
Solomon
Stoffer
Vanclief
Wood —42

Vauclair

Price

Provenzano

Scott (Fredericton)

Solomon

Vauclair

Wood —43

Vauclair

Price

Provenzano

Scott (Fredericton)

St-Julien

Turner

Vauclair
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 356 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 357. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 357, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1118)

YEAS

Members
Anders
Bélanger
Bigglas
Canuel
Crette
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Marceau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members
Adams
Belair
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Calder
Chouinard
Devillers
Dockrill
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laiberte
Mark
Myers
Pett
Proctor
Scott (Fredericton)
Solomon
Stoffer
Vanier
Wood — 41

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 357 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 358. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 358, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1119)

YEAS

Members
Anders
Bélanger
Bigglas
Canuel
Crette
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Marceau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

NAYS

Members
Adams
Belair
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blondin-Andrew
Bradshaw
Casson
Clouthier
Davies
Dockrill
Elley
Jackson
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laiberte
Maloney
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Phinney
Price
Proctor
Provenzano
Scott (Fredericton)
St-Julien
Turp

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Government Orders

Torsney Vanclief
Vauteur Wood—48

PAIRED MEMBERS
Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 358 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 359. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(5045 )

Before the taking of the vote:

The Deputy Speaker: I understand that the hon. the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and Status of Women is suffering from a sore back and has asked if she can vote from her seat. I will arrange for her vote to be counted in subsequent votes if she nods indicating her intention to vote from her seat.

(The House divided on Motion No. 359, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1120)

YEAS
Members
Anders Asselin
Bellehumeur Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar Brien
Canada Cardin
Céte Desrochers
Fournier Gagnon
Girard-Bujold Grewal
Guimond Loubier
Marchand Sauvageau
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis) Turp—23

NAYS
Members
Adams Baker
Bélair Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac) Bevilaqua
Blondin-Andrew Bonin
Bradshaw Brown

Calder Cason
Clouthier Cullen
Davies DeVilliers
Dion Deckrill
Doyle Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst) Jackson
Karstad-Landell Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh) Laliberte
Kilgour Mark
McComiskey McLean (Edmonton West)
Méfimlin Phinney
Price Proctor
Provenzano Scott (Fredericton)
Sokora Solomon
St-Julien Stoffe
Telegdi Torsney
Vanclief Wood—44

PAIRED MEMBERS
Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 359 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 360. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(5050 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 360, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1121)

YEAS
Members
Anders Asselin
Bellehumeur Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar Brien
Canada Cardin
Céte Desrochers
Fournier Gagnon
Girard-Bujold Grewal
Guimond Loubier
Marchand Sauvageau
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis) Turp—23

NAYS
Members
Adams Baker
Bélair Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac) Bevilaqua
Blondin-Andrew Bonin
Bradshaw Brown
The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 360 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 361. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(5055 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 361, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1122)

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béliveau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadieux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carignan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coteau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coteau-Boudreau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cournoyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coteau-Jacques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagné</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagné</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gérin-Lajoie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giguère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bélanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giroir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girouard</td>
</tr>
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Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

● (5100 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 362, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1123)

YEAS

Members
Anders
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar
Cardin
Côté
Déroche
Gagnon
Glew
Loubier
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—22

NAYS

Members
Adams
Bennett
Bonin
Bradshaw
Cassé
Cullen
DeVillers
Dockrell
Earle
Golin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lablache
Maloney
McCormick
McNally
Myers
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proctor
Provenzano
Sekora
St-Julien
Szabo
Tourney

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 362 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 363. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

● (5105 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 363, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1124)

YEAS

Members
Anders
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar
Cardin
Côté
Gagnon
Guimond
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—20

NAYS

Members
Adams
Bennett
Bonin
Bradshaw
Clouthier
Cullen
DeVillers
Dockrell
Earle
Golin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lablache
Maloney
McCormick
McNally
Myers
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proctor
Provenzano
Sekora
St-Julien
Szabo
Tourney

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 363 lost.
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 363 lost.

Before we get to the hon. member’s point of order, I want to do a point of order of my own. This is the rule: Members have to be in the House when I put the question to vote. If members are not in the House when I put the question, they do not vote. No cell phones are allowed, not even behind the curtain. We will leave our domestic animals at home. I understand the hon. member over there has had special dispensation not to rise. If any other member wishes it, send me a note. On a point of order the hon. member for Repentigny.

[Translation]

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When I rose to vote, you very clearly heard—the whole House heard—absolutely disgraceful remarks which I will not repeat here, because it would show a lack of respect for the House. I know that it is 3 a.m., but people may and should be watching.

I ask the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke to withdraw his words and to show that he knows how to behave properly in the House.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am sure the hon. member would be quite happy to withdraw the words. I have already made a point of admonishing the hon. member in the House. The hon. member for Pembroke.

Mr. Hec Clouthier: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to a four legged animal called a donkey. If the hon. member took it the wrong way I apologize.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I did not ask you to dig the hole any deeper, I just asked you to withdraw the words. Either you will withdraw the words or you will not.

Mr. Hec Clouthier: I will withdraw the words, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The next question is on Motion No. 364. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(5110)

(The House divided on Motion No. 364, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1125)

YEAS

Adams

Bennett

Blondin-Andrew

Borozak

Clouthier

Cummins

Dion

Doyle

Fey

Jackson

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Labertea

Lawther

McKean

McConnell

Mifflin

Phinney

Proctor

Provenzano

Sekora

St-Julien

Szabo

Torsney

Members

Bellehumeur

Bertrand

Bonin

Casey

Cullen

Davies

Dekertt

Earle

Goddin (Acadie—Bathurst)

Kurekie-Ledell

Knutson

Lastea

Lunn

Mark

McNally

Obhrai

Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)

Prout

Scott (Fredericton)

Salmon

Stoffer

Telegd

Wood—46

NAYS

Members

Adams

Bennett

Blondin-Andrew

Borozak

Clouthier

Cummins

Dion

Doyle

Fey

Jackson

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Labertea

Lawther

McKean

McConnell

Mifflin

Phinney

Proctor

Provenzano

Sekora

St-Julien

Szabo

Torsney

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Nunziata

Heepner

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 364 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 365. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.
Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(5115)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 365, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1126)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Bigras
Cardin
Destrochers
Gagnon
Guimond
Marceau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matagami)
Turp—22

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Binnie
Côté
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matagami)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Bakopanos
Baker
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Borotuk
Calder
Casey
Clouthier
Cullen
Cummins
Davies
Dion
Dockrill
Doyle
Earle
Fry
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Jackson
Jennings
Kareniuk
Kareniuk
Kareniuk
Lunn
Maloney
Mark
McNally
McNally
Obhrai
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proulx
Provenzano
Sekora
St-Julien
Subba
Wood—48

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 365 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 366. 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 House divided on Motion No. 366, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1127)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Bigras
Cardin
Destrochers
Gagnon
Guimond
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matagami)
Turp—21

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Binnie
Côté
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Matagami)

NAYS

Members

Bakopanos
Bakopanos
Bertrand
Bonin
Bryden
Casey
Cullen
Davies
Doyle
Fry
Heron
Jackson
Kareniuk
Kareniuk
Kareniuk
Lunn
Maloney
Mark
McNally
McNally
Obhrai
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proulx
Provenzano
Sekora
St-Julien
Subba
Wood—50
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 366 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 367. 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:

(5120)

(The House divided on Motion No. 367, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1128)

YEAS

Members
Anselin
Bergeron
Bri
cardin
Desch
ger
Gagnon
Gouin
Marce
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Big
cr
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Loubier
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Côté
Desch
ger

Guimond

Loubier

Sauvageau

Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Turp—21

NAYS

Members
Bakopoulos
Bertrand
Boun
Bradshaw
Calder
Coutlier
Cummins
Dion
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Knu
ton
Lowther
Mark
McNally
Obhrai
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proud

Bakopoulos
Bertrand
Bou
Bradshaw
Casey
Coutlier
Cummins
Dion
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lateur
Lowther
Maloney

Bakopoulos
Bertrand
Boun
Bradshaw
Casey
Coutlier
Cummins
Dion
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lateur
Lowther
Maloney

Bakopoulos
Bertrand
Boun
Bradshaw
Casey
Coutlier
Cummins
Dion
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lateur
Lowther
Maloney

Bakopoulos
Bertrand
Boun
Bradshaw
Casey
Coutlier
Cummins
Dion
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lateur
Lowther
Maloney

Bakopoulos
Bertrand
Boun
Bradshaw
Casey
Coutlier
Cummins
Dion
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lateur
Lowther
Maloney

Bakopoulos
Bertrand
Boun
Bradshaw
Casey
Coutlier
Cummins
Dion
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lateur
Lowther
Maloney

Bakopoulos
Bertrand
Boun
Bradshaw
Casey
Coutlier
Cummins
Dion
Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lateur
Lowther
Maloney
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 368 lost.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you will find unanimous consent for what I am now proposing.

As the pages have been doing an excellent job—since midnight we have a new group—I think the House should thank them for a job well done.

I am going to name them, something that we rarely do—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am sure all hon. members join the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm and the other members of his caucus in recognizing the wonderful job that the pages do.

[Translation]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, we ask your permission to name the pages so that history will remember them, just as we named the pages who were here before midnight.

They are Annick, Kaija, Sonya—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

[English]

Some hon. members: No,

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Unfortunately today I said that there would be no editorial comment.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 369. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 369 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 370. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed to 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:

(5135)

(The House divided on Motion No. 370, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1131)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asselin</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
<td>Bigra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien</td>
<td>Camel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côté</td>
<td>Desrochers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
<td>Guimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Marcoux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Sauvagrange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
<td>Tremblay (La-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Bakapanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Bertrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blondin-Andrew</td>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borotnik</td>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryden</td>
<td>Caccia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder</td>
<td>Casey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan</td>
<td>Cullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummins</td>
<td>Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeVilliers</td>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockrill</td>
<td>Doyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle</td>
<td>Eglinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fry</td>
<td>Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karetak-Lindell</td>
<td>Kenney (Calgary Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyes</td>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lastewka</td>
<td>Lowther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lann</td>
<td>Maloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Milliken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phinney</td>
<td>Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt</td>
<td>Procator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privitt</td>
<td>Provostizano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>St-Julien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart (Brant)</td>
<td>Stewart (Northumberland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinson</td>
<td>Stoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanbo</td>
<td>Torresy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood—53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIRED MEMBERS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Hoepner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
<td>Nursewata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): That is a novel idea. Perhaps it is one that would have to go to procedure and House affairs. I am having enough trouble keeping things straight as it is. I will pay particular attention to the noes, though.

(5140)

The question is on Motion No. 371. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(5140)

(The House divided on Motion No. 371, which was negatived on the following division:)

[Translation]

Mr. Yvan Loubier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We have been voting for thirty hours or so now. I just noticed a common practice in this House, namely that the Chair first asks those in favour of the motion to say yea or oui, and then those opposed to say nay or non.

We realize that this practice gives an undue advantage to the no side, since when we yell yea first, the no side can adjust the level of decibels according to ours.

We were wondering whether, for the sake of justice, fairness, and democracy—

Some hon. members: And clarity.

Mr. Yvan Loubier: —and for the sake of clarity so dear to our Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and distinguished university professor, the Chair could start with those opposed to the motion and then go to those in favour of the motion for the remainder of the votes.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 370 lost.
Government Orders

(Division No. 1132)

YEAS

Members
Asselin, Bellehumeur
Bergeron, Bigras
Brien, Crête
Cardin, Fournier
DeGroh, Girard-Bujold
Guignon, Loubier
Marchand, Sauvageau
St-Hilaire, Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp—21

NAYS

Members
Baker, Bakopanos
Bennett, Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew, Bonin
Borotusk, Calder
Caccia, Cullen
Casey, Davé
Charbonneau, Dion
Cummins, Doyle
DeVillers, Earle
Dockrill, Fry
Dromisky, Herron
Eggleton, Jennings
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst), Jackson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River), Jordan
Karetak-Lindell, Kenney (Calgary Southwest)
Keys, Lowerer
Lastewka, McCormick
Mark, McElheran
Mifflin, Pettigrew
Pagtakhan, Proctor
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex), Provenzano
Solomon, St-Julien
Stewart (Brant), Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson, Torsney
Wood—57

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson, Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast), Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 371 lost.

The question is on Motion No. 372. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

And more than five members having risen:

● (5145)

(The House divided on Motion No. 372, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1133)

YEAS

Members
Asselin, Bellehumeur
Bergeron (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok), Bigras
Brien, Crête
Cardin, Fournier
Girard-Bujold, Label
Marchand, Sauvageau
St-Hilaire, Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp—22

NAYS

Members
Baker, Bakopanos
Bennett, Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew, Bonin
Borotusk, Calder
Caccia, Cullen
Casey, Davé
Charbonneau, Dion
Davé, Doyle
Dockrill, Earle
Eggleton, Fry
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst), Jennings
Hill (Prince George—Peace River), Jordan
Karetak-Lindell, Kenney (Calgary Southwest)
Keys, Lowerer
Lastewka, McCormick
Mark, McElheran
Mifflin, Pettigrew
Pagtakhan, Proctor
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex), Provenzano
Solomon, St-Julien
Stewart (Brant), Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson, Torsney
Wood—58

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson, Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast), Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 372 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 373. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(5150)

(The House divided on Motion No. 373, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1134)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeon
Berger (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)
Brien
Cardin
Desrochers
Dion
Guindon
Loubier
Marchand
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Augustine
Bakopanos
Borotnik
Caccia
Charbonneau
Cummins
DeVillers
Dockrill
Eakin
Fry
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lowney
Maloney
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
Michell
Obhrai
Petigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proctor
Provenzano
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Turner

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoegner
Nunziata

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 373 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 374. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(5155)

(The House divided on Motion No. 374, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1135)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeon
Berger (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok)
Brien
Cardin
Desrochers
Gagnon
Guindon
Loubier
Marchand
Sauvevaugan
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

NAYS

Members

Augustine
Bakopanos
Borotnik
Bouin
Bradshaw
Caplan
Chan
Cloutier
Davies
Dion
Doyles
Eggleton
Heron
Jackson
Keys
Lantewka
Lunn
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mifflin
O’Reilly
Pagnikhan
Phinney
Proulx
Solomon
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffel
Wilfert—36

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoegner
Nunziata

Maloney
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mifflin
Government Orders

Mitchell
Oblitai
Petigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Proctor
Provenzano
Solomon
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Wilfert—55

O'Reilly
Paddah
Phinney
Prairie
Proulx
Saada
Stout (Brant)
Stinson
Tosney

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 374 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 375. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(5200)

(The House divided on Motion No. 375, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1136)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Béliveau
Bigras
Bonin
Bouchard
Caplan
Chan
Cloutier
Dion
Doyle

NAYs

Members

Augustine
Baker
Blondin-Andrew
Boroski
Buhr

(Opposition)

Asselin
B binds
Béliveau
Bigras
Bonin
Bouchard
Caplan
Chan
Cloutier
Dion
Doyle

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 376, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1137)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Béliveau
Bigras
Bonin
Bouchard
Caplan
Chan
Cloutier
Dion
Doyle

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 376, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1137)
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 376 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 377. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 377, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1138)

YEAS

Augustine
Baker
Blondin-Andrew
Brong特点
Caccia
Caplan
Chat
Chouhier
Dion
Doyle
Eggleton
Fry
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jordan
Keys
L'Amour
Maloney
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
Mitchell
Paradis
Phinney
Praz
Provenzano
Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer
Torsney

NAYS

Augustine
Baker
Blondin-Andrew
Brouton
Caccia
Caplan
Chat
Chouhier
Dion
Doyle
Eggleton
Fry
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jordan
Keys
L'Amour
Maloney
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
Mitchell
Paradis
Phinney
Praz
Provenzano
Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer
Torsney

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 377 lost.

The question is on Motion No. 378. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 377, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1138)

YEAS

Asselin
Bergeron
Iles de la Madeleine—Pabok
Ives
Carlin

NAYS

Asselin
Bergeron
Iles de la Madeleine—Pabok
Ives
Carlin
Government Orders

• (5210 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 378, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1139)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Cardin
Desrochers
Dumas
Gagnon
Guay
Lebel
Marechal
Ménard
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—28

NAYS

Members

Augustine
Bakopanos
Blondin-Andrew
Borotnik
Caccia
Caplan
Chan
Clouthier
Dion
Doyle
Éggleton
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lunn
Mark
Martin (Wanapitei Centre)
McLellran (Edmonton West)
Obhrai
Paradis
Phinney
Pratt
Proulx
Provenzano
Rock
Solomon
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)

Hoepner
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 378 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 379. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

• (5215 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 379, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1140)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Cardin
Dubre (Levis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Loubier
Marchand
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—28

NAYS

Members

Augustine
Bakopanos
Blondin-Andrew
Borotnik
Caccia
Caplan
Chan
Clouthier
Dion
Doyle
Éggleton
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lunn
Mark
Martin (Wanapitei Centre)
McLellran (Edmonton West)
Obhrai
Paradis
Phinney
Pratt
Proulx
Provenzano
Rock
Solomon
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Wilfert

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 378 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 379. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

• (5215 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 379, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1140)
March 13, 2000

COMMONS DEBATES

4679

Government Orders

Doyle
Eggleton
Fly
Heron
Jordan
Keyses
Lawther
Maloney
Martin
Mills
Ohbrai
Paradis
Phinney
Proctor
Prouzenko
Sekora
Shepherd
Stewart
Stinson
Saab
Wilfert
Earle
Folco
Godbout
Hill
Karatik-Louied
Kilgour
Mark
McLellan
Mitchell
Pattakhan
Petigrew
Pratt
Prout
Rock
Sgro
Salmon
Stewart
Stoffer
Tassé
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 379 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 380. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(5220)

(The House divided on Motion No. 380, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1141)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Béliveau
Bettger
Bergeron
Bourinette
Bourin
Boucher
Boulanger
Boulard
Boulet
Bouchard
Bouchard
Bousquet
Bourassa
Bouchard

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Cardin
Côté
Dubé (Lévis—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Guindon
Loubert
Marchand
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)


NAYS

Members
Augustine
Baker
Bennett
Bonin
Butte
Caplan
Chan
Chauveau
Dion

Axworthy
Bakopoulos
Blondin-Andrew
Booak
Cacica
Carey
Charbonneau
Cummings
Dockrell


PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 380 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 381. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(5225)

(The House divided on Motion No. 381, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1142)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Béliveau
Bettger
Bergeron
Bourinette
Bourin
Boucher
Boulanger
Boulard
Bouchard
Bouchard
Bousquet
Bourassa
Bouchard

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Cardin
Côté
Dubé (Lévis—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Guindon
Loubert
Marchand


Government Orders

MINARD Rocheleau
SAUVAGEAU St-Hilaire
TREMAY (Lac-Saint-Jean) Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—30

NAYS

Members
Assadourian Augustine
Axworthy Baker
Bakopanos Bennett
Blondin-Andrew Bonin
Bonin
Borotsik Caccia
Caplan Catterall
Charbonneau
Choutier Cummins
Dion Dockrill
Earle
Eggleton Folco
Fry Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Harvard Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River) Ianno
Jordan Kaetelk-Lindell
Keys Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lanus
Maloney Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard) McLean (Edmonton West)
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) Mitchell
Obhrai Pagtakan
Paradis Pettigrew
Phinney Pratt
Proctor Proulx
Provenzano Rock
Sekora Sgro
Solomon Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland) Stinson
Stoffer Szabo
Tory Wilfert
Whelan Wood —63

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 381 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 382. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:
Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 383, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1144)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Bélisle
Bigras
Carnel
Desrochers
Dumas
Gagnon
Giguère
Girard-Bujold
Lalonde
Léger
Marchand
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bélisle
Bigras
Carnel
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Fournier
Guimond
Laurin
Marceau
Marceau
Sauvageau

NA YS

Members
Assadourian
Axworthy
Blair
Bonin
Caccia
Catterall
Charbonneau
Dion
Farley
Folco
Giguère
Harvard
Hill
Keeyes
Leslie
MacAulay
Mark
Mills
Obrai
Paradis
Phinney
Richardson
Solomon
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szafran
Ur
Wood

Augustine
Baker
Blondin-Andrew
Boromik
Casey
Chain
Cummins
Dockrill
Eggerton
Fry
Godin (Acadie-Bathurst)
Herron
Lamo
c
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laflamme
Lalonde
Lebel
Ménard
Perron

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Hoeppner
Nunziata

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 383 lost.

● (5235)

The next question is on Motion No. 384. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 384, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1145)

YEAS

Members
Asselin
Bélisle
Bigras
Carnel
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Fournier
Guimond
Laurin
Marceau

NAYS

Members
Assadourian
Axworthy
Bonin
Caccia
Catterall
Charbonneau
Dion

Augustine
Baker
Blondin-Andrew
Boromik
Casey
Chain
Cummins
Dockrill
Eggerton
Fry
Godin (Acadie-Bathurst)
Herron
Lamo
c
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Laflamme
Lalonde
Lebel
Ménard
Perron

[English]

The House divided on Motion No. 384, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1145)
Government Orders

Dockrill Doyle
Earle Fry
Folco Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gagliano Ianno
Karetak-Lindell<br>
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Lowther
MacAulay<br>
Mark<br>
McLellan (Edmonton West) O'Reilly
Paradis<br>
Phinney<br>
Sekora<br>
Stewart (Brant) Stinson
Stoffer<br>
Turner<br>
Wood—53

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner<br>
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 384 lost.

The question is on Motion No. 385. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

• (5245 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 385, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1146)

YEAS

Asselin Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Belchamber Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspe—Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Biggar
Cabinet
Chéticamp (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie Deschênes
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dufour
Guay
Lafond
Lebel
Méauzé
Méthot
Métivier
Reichert
St-Hilaire

Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne —32

NAYS

Assadourian Augustine
Axworthy Baker
Bakopanos Bélair
Bonin Boz座
Caccia
Casey
Cummins
Dockrill
Earle
Folco
Gagliano
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Ianno
Keyes
Lowther
MacAulay
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard) McCormick
Mitchell
Pagtahan
Petigrew
Proctor
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stinson
Szabo
Ur

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner<br>
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 385 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 386. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

• (5250 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 386, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1146)
### Commons Debates

#### March 13, 2000

**(Division No. 1147)**

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigras (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ménard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergne—41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assadourian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catterall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaudhier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Érée</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Prince George—Peace River)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obhrai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phinney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Denis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood—59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** I declare Motion No. 386 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 387. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members: Agreed.**

**Some hon. members: No.**

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

**Some hon. members: Yea.**

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

**Some hon. members: Nay.**

In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

**(Division No. 1148)**

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigras (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ménard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergne—41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assadourian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catterall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaudhier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Érée</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Prince George—Peace River)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obhrai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phinney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Denis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** I declare Motion No. 387, which was negatived on the following division:

**(Division No. 1148)**

**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:

**(Division No. 1148)**

**YEAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigras (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ménard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvageau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergne—41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assadourian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catterall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaudhier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Érée</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (Prince George—Peace River)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obhrai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phinney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Denis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** I declare Motion No. 387, which was negatived on the following division:
**Government Orders**

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

| Anderson (Edmonton Southeast) | Hoeppner |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) | Nunziata |

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 387 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 388.

(5255)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 388, which was negatived on the following division:)

**Division No. 1149**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarie</td>
<td>Asselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand (Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>Bellehumeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
<td>Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Bigras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bès-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok</td>
<td>Camille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binet</td>
<td>Chéticoustic—Mégantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Céler</td>
<td>de Savoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehén</td>
<td>Deschênes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubé (Lévis—Chaudière—Bécancour)</td>
<td>Duchesne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas</td>
<td>Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnon</td>
<td>Girard-Bujold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin (Châteauguay)</td>
<td>Guay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay</td>
<td>Lafon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
<td>Lebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loubier</td>
<td>Marcoux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand</td>
<td>Ménard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>Perron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard (Drummond)</td>
<td>Plamondon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochon</td>
<td>Sauvé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Hilaire</td>
<td>Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)</td>
<td>Turp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venne—42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assadourian</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axworthy</td>
<td>Baksh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bélair</td>
<td>Belanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Bonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borotusk</td>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 388 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 389. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

(5300)

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 389, which was negatived on the following division:)

[Translation]
(Division No. 1150)

**YEAS**

Members

- Alarie
- Bachand (Saint-Jean)
- Bergeron
- Bigras (Boréale—Pabok)
- Bernier
- Berger (Bonaventure—Gaspé)
- Beliveau
- Coteau (Chaudière—Sainte-Anne)
- Deschênes
- Dubé (Levis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
- Dumont
- Gagnon
- Girard-Bujold
- Godin (Châteauguay)
- Guay
- Guimond
- Laurin
- Martin (Beauport)
- Marchand
- Mercier
- Picard (Drummond)
- Rochefort
- Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
- Venne—41

**NAYS**

Members

- Assadourian
- Augustine
- Bélanger
- Bennett
- Bonin
- Boucher
- Cottrel
- Crevier
- Cunniff
- Desrochers
- Dion
- Doyle
- Dumond
- Duhamel
- Duguid
- Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
- Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
- Jennings
- Karetak-Lindell
- Konrad
- Lessard
- Leung
- Maltais
- Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
- McEwan
- Myer
- O'Reilly
- Papaikhan
- Pettigrew
- Provenzano
- Richardson
- Robillard
- Robichaud
- Rock
- Gagnon
- Harvard
- Jennings
- Kilgour
- Lastewka
- Lincoln
- Lunn
- Maloney
- Mark
- Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
- Milian
- Mitchell
- O'Reilly
- Pagpasahlan
- Pettigrew
- Provenzano
- Robillard
- Scott (Fredericton)
- Sygo

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

- Anderson
- Kilgour (Edmonton East)
- Hooe
- Numita

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 389 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 390. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

- (5310)

(The House divided on Motion No. 390, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1151)

**YEAS**

Members

- Alarie
- Bachand (Saint-Jean)
- Bergeron
- Bigras (Boréale—Pabok)
- Bernier
- Berger (Bonaventure—Gaspé)
- Beliveau
- Coteau (Chaudière—Sainte-Anne)
- Deschênes
- Dubé (Levis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
- Dumont
- Gagnon
- Girard-Bujold
- Godin (Châteauguay)
- Guay
- Guimond
- Laurin
- Martin (Beauport)
- Marchand
- Mercier
- Picard (Drummond)
- Rochefort
- Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
- Venne—42

**NAYS**

Members

- Assadourian
- Augustine
- Bélanger
- Bennett
- Bonin
- Boucher
- Cottrel
- Crevier
- Cunniff
- Desrochers
- Dion
- Doyle
- Dumond
- Duhamel
- Duguid
- Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
- Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
- Jennings
- Karetak-Lindell
- Konrad
- Lessard
- Leung
- Maltais
- Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
- McEwan
- Myer
- O'Reilly
- Papaikhan
- Pettigrew
- Provenzano
- Richardson
- Robillard
- Scott (Fredericton)
- Sygo

**Government Orders**

**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:**

- (5310)

(The House divided on Motion No. 390, which was negatived on the following division:)

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

- Anderson
- Kilgour (Edmonton East)
- Hooe
- Numita

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 389 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 390. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

Solomon        St. Denis
Steckle        Stewart (Brant)
Stoffer        Torsney
Ur             Wood—72

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson      Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 390 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 391. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Yea.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(English)

(The House divided on Motion No. 391, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1152)

YEAS

Members
Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Cahier
Chétic (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Desrochers
Doucet
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Lalonde
Leduc
Marcoux
Ménard
Peron
Plamondon
Savard
Turp

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Biggar
Cardin
Cliche
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Gagnon
Gaudreault
Lombier
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Venne—38

NAYS

Members
Assadourian
Acsworth
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bennett
Bradshaw
Caccia
Chamberlain
Chétic (Saint-Maurice)
Dion
Doyon
Dubé
Eigletal
Gagliano
Harvard
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lasteuwka
Lincoln
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Myers
Obhrai
Paradis
Petitgrew
Provenzano
Robillard
Sekora
Shepherd
St-Denis
Stinson
Torsney
Wood—73

Bellemare
Boulerice
Boortusk
Bulte
Casey
Chan
Cummins
Dockrell
Drominsky
Earle
Folco
Gedim (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jordan
Keyes
Konrad
Leung
Levesque
Maloney
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Miffin
Mitchell
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Peric
Phinney
Richardson
Rok
Sgro
Salmon
Steele
Stoffer
Ur

PAIRED MEMBERS

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 391 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 392. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Yea.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(English)

(The House divided on Motion No. 392, which was negatived on the following division:)

Members
Anderson
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

Assadourian
Augustine
Acsworth
Baker
Bakopanos
Beaucier

Bellemare
Boulerice
Boortusk
Bulte
Casey
Chan
Cummins
Dockrell
Drominsky
Earle
Folco
Gedim (Acadie—Bathurst)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jordan
Keyes
Konrad
Leung
Levesque
Maloney
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Miffin
Mitchell
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Peric
Phinney
Richardson
Rok
Sgro
Salmon
Steele
Stoffer
Ur
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 392 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 393. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 393, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1154)

**YEAS**

Members

Alarie Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean) Bellehumeur
Bergeron Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Pabok) Bigras
Cardin Céline (Frontenac—Mégantic) de Savoie
Côté Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) Duceppe
Dumas Fournier Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay) Guay
Guimond Lalonde
Laurin Loubier Ménard
Marchand Mercier Peron
Picard (Drummond) Plamondon
Rocherlean Sauvageau
St-Hilaire Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp Venne—41

**NAYS**

Members

Assadourian Augustine
Awkward Bakopanos
Bélair Bellemare
Bennett Borotsik
Bradshaw Bulte
Caccia Cannis
Chamberlain Casey
Christien (Saint-Maurice) Clouthier
Cummins Dion
Doyle Dromisky
Duhamel Earle
Egginton Fiset
Gagné Gagnon
Harvard Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Ianno Jennings
Jordan Kenain-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kondra Lasang
Lincoln Lowther
Lunn Malhi
Maloney Mandy
March Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre) Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick Millban
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) Myers
Mulroney Obieau
Pagan Paradis
Peric Pettigrew
Phinn Phinov
Richardson Robillard
Rock Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora Shepherd
Solomon St. Denis
Steckle Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson Stoffer
Taranay Ur
Wood—73

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Anderson Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

**Government Orders**

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

And more than five members having risen:

(5325 )

(The House divided on Motion No. 393, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1154)
Government Orders

Earle
Folco
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Harvard
Ianno
Jordan
Keyes
Konrad
Lincoln
Lowther
Malhi
Manley
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Myers
Obear
Peric
Phinney
Richardson
Rock
Sokora
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Torsney
Wood—75

Brien
Cardin
Cléry
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Gagnon
Galinis
Galinis (Châteauguay)
Gauthier
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rochefort
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski)—Miris
Vanasse—42

Cabinet

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Béliveau—Gaspé

Commons Debates
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The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 393 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 394. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed to the motion 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 House divided on Motion No. 394, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1155)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Asselin

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Béliveau

Bergeron
Bernier (Monarville—Gaspé)

Béliveau—Gaspé
Bigras

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 394 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 395. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.
March 13, 2000
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The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

● (5335)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 395, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1156)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Cardin
Côté
Debien
Dube (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Marcoux
Ménard
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp

Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Christian (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Deschamps
Duceppe
Gagnon
Golin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleur
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Maloney
Mark
Matthews
Mufflin
Murray
O’Brien (Labrador)
Olthuis
Parrish
Peterson
Piliftteri
Provenzano
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Turner
Vanclief
Wood

NAYS

Members

Assadourian
Bakopanos
Belair
Bellemare
Bototuk
Bryden
Caccia
Casey
Chabot
Chéticamp (Saint-Maurice)
Codere
ExVillers
Doyle
Earle
Eggerton
Gigliano
Gray (Windor West)
Herron
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lauriakwa
Lincoln
Lunn
Manley
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nafti
O'Reilly
Patkakan
Peric
Pettigrew
Proulx
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Singh
Solomon
St Denis
Steele
Stinson
Stasob
Ur
Whelan

Augustin
Beaumier
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Canuel
Cantin
Cassidy
Cassidy
Champlain
Charbonneau
Châteauguay
Châteauguay
Châteauguay
Chéticamp (Saint-Maurice)
Cordell
Cussen
Cummings
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion

Munday
Mark
Matthews
Mufflin
Murray
O’Brien (Labrador)
Olthuis
Parrish
Peterson
Piliftteri
Provenzano
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Turner
Vanclief
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson (Edmonton—Southeast)
Kilgour (Edmonton—Southeast)
Nunziata

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 395 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 396. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

● (5340)

(The House divided on Motion No. 396, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1157)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brient
Cardin
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête de Savoie
Debien
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Fournier
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay
Guimond
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Loubier
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleur
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp

Asselin
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Christian (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Deschamps
Duceppe
Gagnon
Golin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleur
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Maloney
Mark
Matthews
Mufflin
Murray
O’Brien (Labrador)
Olthuis
Parrish
Peterson
Piliftteri
Provenzano
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Turner
Vanclief
Wood

NAYS

Members

Assadourian
Bakopanos
Belair
Bellemare
Bototuk
Bryden
Caccia
Casey
Chabot
Chéticamp (Saint-Maurice)
Codere
ExVillers
Doyle
Earle
Eggerton
Gigliano
Gray (Windor West)
Herron
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lauriakwa
Lincoln
Lunn
Manley
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nafti
O'Reilly
Patkakan
Peric
Pettigrew
Proulx
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Singh
Solomon
St Denis
Steele
Stinson
Stasob
Ur
Whelan

Augustin
Beaumier
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Canuel
Cantin
Cassidy
Cassidy
Champlain
Charbonneau
Châteauguay
Châteauguay
Châteauguay
Chéticamp (Saint-Maurice)
Cordell
Cussen
Cummings
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion
Dion

Munday
Mark
Matthews
Mufflin
Murray
O’Brien (Labrador)
Olthuis
Parrish
Peterson
Piliftteri
Provenzano
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Speller
St-Julien
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Turner
Vanclief
Wood

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:

● (5340)

(The House divided on Motion No. 396, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1157)
Government Orders

Cardin Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Côté de Savoie
Dehien Deschênes
Dube (Levis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) Duceppe
Dumas Fouquier
Gagnon Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay) Guay
Guimond Lafon
Laurin Lebel
Loubier Machand
Ménard Mercier
Perron Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon Rochefleur
Sauvageau St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp Vennie—41

NAYS

Members
Assadourian Bakopanos
Bakopanos Belair
Beaujoticher Bellefleur
Bélanger Bellemare
Bennett Bonnin
Bradshaw Bryden
Buter Cacalia
Cassin Casey
Chamberlain Chani
Charbonneau Christien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier Codere
Cummins DeVeil
Don Doyle
Drumisky Earle
Egginton Folco
Gagliano Godfrey
Garon (Acadie—Bathurst) Gray (Windsor West)
Harvard Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River) Jennings
Jordan Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Konstad
Lastewka Leung
Lincoln Longfield
Loudier Lunn
Malhi Maloney
Manley Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre) Matthews
McCormick Mifflin
Murray Nault
O'Brien (Labrador) O'Reilly
Ohraij Parish
Peric Peterson
Petitgrew Pilieteri
Provenzano Richardson
Rohbillier Rock
Saada Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora Sgro
Shepherd Solomon
St-Julien St-Denis
St-Julien Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland) Stinson
Stoffel Szabo
Turecek Vancher
Whelan Wilfert
Wood—87

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 396 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 397. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

• (5345)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 397, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1158)

YEAS

Members
Alarie Asselin
Bouchard (Saint-Jean) Bellehumour
Bergeron Bernier (Bouvaute—Gaspé—)
Biron Biggar
Bourassa (Beauport—Mégie) Camel
Cardin Chérim (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Côté de Savoie Deschênes
Dehien Duceppe
Dube (Levis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) Fouquier
Dumas Girard-Bujold
Gagnon Guay
Godin (Châteauguay) Lafon
Guimond Lebel
Laurin Marchand
Marceau Mercier
Ménard Mercier
Perron Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon Rochefleur
Sauvageau St-Hilaire
Sauvageau Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) Vennie—41

NAYS

Members
Assadourian Augustine
Axworthy Baker
Bakopanos Beaumier
Bélanger Bellefleur
Bennett Bennett
Bertrand Blondin-Andrew
Biron Borotuk
Boulton Bradshaw
Brown Bryden
Bulte Caccia
Culver Canny
Culp Caplan

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I declare Motion No. 396 lost.
The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 398.

[5355]

(The House divided on Motion No. 398, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 1159)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Iles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brébier
Curtin
Crête
de Savoye
Desrochers
Duceppe
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Hill (Prince-George—Peace River)
Lalonde
Lebel
Lowther
Marceau
Mark
Mercier
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne—50

NAYS

Members

Assadourian
Axworthy
Bakopanos
Belair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bouin
Boudria
Brison
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Casey
Chambriain
Charbonneau
Cloutier
Collette
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Drouin
Duchesne
Easter
Finlay
Fry
Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Harvey
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmundston Southeast)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Hoepner
Kilgour (Edmundston Southeast)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 397 lost.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I simply want to draw to your attention and that of all the members of this House that the hon. member for Charlevoix has been present in the House since the beginning of the votes, on Monday evening. I salute him on my behalf and on behalf of my colleagues for doing this.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.
Government Orders

Lincoln Longfield
MacAulay Malhi
Maloney Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard) Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Matthews McCracken
McGuire McLellan (Edmonton West)
Mills Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minnna Mitchell
Munay Myers
Nault O’Brien (Labrador)
O’Reilly Paggiatkan
Paradis Parish
Peric Peterson
Petigrew Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex) Pillitteri
Prairie Proud
Proulx Provenzano
Redman Richardson
Robillard Rock
Scott (Fredericton) Sekora
Sgro Shepherd
Solomon Speller
St. Denis St. Julien
Steckle Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland) Stoffer
Szabo Telegdi
Vancilf Whelan
Wilfert Wood—126

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson Hoeppner
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Nunziata

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 398 lost.

[Translation]

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.) 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 yea’s have it.

And more than five members having risen:

- (5405)

[English]

Mr. Scott Brison: Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify something. I inadvertently voted, perhaps because of voting fatigue, with the government on this legislation. I want to make it very clear that I remain fundamentally opposed to the legislation. I voted against the legislation and I continue to be opposed to it.

The Speaker: You voted against.

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

(Division No. 1160)

YEAS

Members

Assadourian Augustine
Axworthy Baker
Bakopanos Beumier
Belair Belanger
Belle mare Bennett
Bertrand Blondin-Andrew
Bonin Bootuk
Boudria Bradshaw
Brown Bryden
Bulte Caccia
Calder Cammis
Caplan Casey
Carter Charbonneau
Christen (Saint-Maurice) Choulier
Codere Collenette
Cullen Cummins
DeVilliers Dhaliwal
Dion Discepola
Dooly Disconcino
Drouin Dromisky
Dunn Duhamel
Easter Eggleton
Finlay Falco
Fry Gagliano
Godbey Goodale
Gray (Windsor West) Guerrini
Harvard Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Haugen Iano
Hintz Jennings
Keyes Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Konrad Knutson
Konrad Lastewka
Leeong Lincoln
Longfield Lowther
Lunn MacAulay
Maloney Malth
Maloney Manley
Mark Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Martin (LaSalle—Émard) Matthews
McCracken McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West) Milla
Minnna Mitchell
Munay Myers
Nault O’Brien (Labrador)
O’Reilly Paggiatkan
Paradis Parish
Peric Peterson
Petigrew Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex) Pillitteri
Prairie Proud
Proulx Provenzano
Redman Richardson
Robillard Rock
Scott (Fredericton) Sekora
Scott (Fredericton) Sgro
Shepherd St. Denis
St. Julien Steckle
Stewart (Brant) Sturgeon
Stewart (Northumberland) Stoffer
Szabo Telegdi
Torsney Whelan
Vancilf Ur
Wilfert Wood—132
Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Alarie
Bouchard (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Canuel
Charlevoix—(Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoie
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Fournier
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Herron
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rochelleau
St-Hilaire
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Verme—48

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brison
Cardin
Côté
Debien
Dockrill
Duquette
Earle
Gagnon
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Guay
Harvey
Lafonde
Label
Marcoux
Ménard
Perron
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

The Speaker: I declare the motion agreed to.

(Motion agreed to)

The Speaker: It being 6.07 a.m., March 15, this House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. later this day pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6.07 a.m.)
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<td>223 negatived</td>
<td>4609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226 negatived</td>
<td>4609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228 negatived</td>
<td>4610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 negatived</td>
<td>4610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 negatived</td>
<td>4611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 negatived</td>
<td>4611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 negatived</td>
<td>4612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239 negatived</td>
<td>4612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 negatived</td>
<td>4613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 negatived</td>
<td>4613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243 negatived</td>
<td>4614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244 negatived</td>
<td>4615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 negatived</td>
<td>4615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 negatived</td>
<td>4616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247 negatived</td>
<td>4616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 negatived</td>
<td>4617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249 negatived</td>
<td>4617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 negatived</td>
<td>4618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 negatived</td>
<td>4619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253 negatived</td>
<td>4619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254 negatived</td>
<td>4620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255 negatived</td>
<td>4620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256 negatived</td>
<td>4621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257 negatived</td>
<td>4621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258 negatived</td>
<td>4622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259 negatived</td>
<td>4623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 negatived</td>
<td>4623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261 negatived</td>
<td>4624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262 negatived</td>
<td>4624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263 negatived</td>
<td>4625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264 negatived</td>
<td>4625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265 negatived</td>
<td>4626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266 negatived</td>
<td>4626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267 negatived</td>
<td>4626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268 negatived</td>
<td>4627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270 negatived</td>
<td>4627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272 negatived</td>
<td>4628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274 negatived</td>
<td>4629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276 negatived</td>
<td>4629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277 negatived</td>
<td>4630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 negatived</td>
<td>4630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281 negatived</td>
<td>4631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282 negatived</td>
<td>4631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284 negatived</td>
<td>4632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287 negatived</td>
<td>4632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 negatived</td>
<td>4633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 negatived</td>
<td>4633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 negatived</td>
<td>4633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 negatived</td>
<td>4639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 negatived</td>
<td>4640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 negatived</td>
<td>4640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 negatived</td>
<td>4641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312 negatived</td>
<td>4641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 negatived</td>
<td>4641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314 negatived</td>
<td>4642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 negatived</td>
<td>4642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 negatived</td>
<td>4643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 negatived</td>
<td>4644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318 negatived</td>
<td>4645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 negatived</td>
<td>4645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 negatived</td>
<td>4646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 negatived</td>
<td>4646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322 negatived</td>
<td>4647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323 negatived</td>
<td>4647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324 negatived</td>
<td>4648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325 negatived</td>
<td>4649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326 negatived</td>
<td>4649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327 negatived</td>
<td>4650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328 negatived</td>
<td>4650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329 negatived</td>
<td>4651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 negatived</td>
<td>4651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331 negatived</td>
<td>4652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332 negatived</td>
<td>4652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333 negatived</td>
<td>4653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334 negatived</td>
<td>4653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335 negatived</td>
<td>4654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motion No. 336 negatived 4654  Mrs. Tremblay 4672
Motion No. 337 negatived 4655  Motion No. 369 negatived 4673
Motion No. 338 negatived 4655  Motion No. 370 negatived 4673
Motion No. 339 negatived 4656  Mr. Loubier 4673
Motion No. 340 negatived 4656  Motion No. 371 negatived 4674
Motion No. 341 negatived 4657  Motion No. 372 negatived 4674
Motion No. 342 negatived 4657  Motion No. 373 negatived 4675
Motion No. 343 negatived 4658  Motion No. 374 negatived 4676
Motion No. 344 negatived 4659  Motion No. 375 negatived 4676
Motion No. 345 negatived 4659  Motion No. 376 negatived 4677
Motion No. 346 negatived 4660  Motion No. 377 negatived 4677
Motion No. 347 negatived 4660  Motion No. 378 negatived 4678
Motion No. 348 negatived 4661  Motion No. 379 negatived 4679
Motion No. 349 negatived 4661  Motion No. 380 negatived 4679
Motion No. 350 negatived 4662  Motion No. 381 negatived 4680
Motion No. 351 negatived 4662  Motion No. 382 negatived 4680
Motion No. 352 negatived 4663  Motion No. 383 negatived 4681
Motion No. 353 negatived 4663  Motion No. 384 negatived 4682
Motion No. 354 negatived 4664  Motion No. 385 negatived 4682
Motion No. 355 negatived 4664  Motion No. 386 negatived 4683
Motion No. 356 negatived 4665  Motion No. 387 negatived 4684
Motion No. 357 negatived 4665  Motion No. 388 negatived 4684
Motion No. 358 negatived 4666  Motion No. 389 negatived 4685
Motion No. 359 negatived 4666  Motion No. 390 negatived 4686
Motion No. 360 negatived 4667  Motion No. 391 negatived 4686
Motion No. 361 negatived 4667  Motion No. 392 negatived 4687
Mr. Bernier 4667  Motion No. 393 negatived 4688
Motion No. 362 negatived 4668  Motion No. 394 negatived 4688
Motion No. 363 negatived 4669  Motion No. 395 negatived 4689
Mr. Sauvageau 4669  Motion No. 396 negatived 4690
Mr. Clouthier 4669  Motion No. 397 negatived 4691
Motion No. 364 negatived 4669  Mr. Bergeron 4691
Motion No. 365 negatived 4670  Motion No. 398 negatived 4692
Motion No. 366 negatived 4671  Motion for concurrence 4692
Motion No. 367 negatived 4671  Mr. Dion 4692
Motion No. 368 negatived 4672  Mr. Brison 4692
Mr. Bellehumeur 4672  (Motion agreed to) 4693
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