



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 137 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Tuesday, March 4, 1997**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

## CONTENTS

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

The House of Commons Debates are also available on the  
Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

**Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 10 petitions.

\* \* \*

### INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

**Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the parliamentary delegation to the Canada-France Interparliamentary Association, which attended the 27th annual meeting of the association held in Ottawa, Vancouver and Victoria from October 9 to 16, 1996.

There were three topics on the agenda of the working sessions: the information highway, social security and the environment. Four aspects of the latter were examined: environmental problems relating to the agri-food industry, to energy use, to urban transport, and the transnational aspects of environmental problems. The meeting was a success.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Mr. Bill Graham (Rosedale, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

relating to Bill C-81, an act to implement the Canada-Chile free trade agreement and related agreements.

[*Translation*]

The committee has examined the bill and agreed to report it with amendments.

#### TRANSPORT

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ)** moved:

That the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Transport, tabled on Wednesday, February 12, 1997, be concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in the House today to speak to this motion. The sixth report of the Standing Committee on Transport was about the need to reinvest as quickly as possible in our national highway network.

• (1010)

As you know, back in 1993 a report that was endorsed almost unanimously by federal, provincial and territorial transport ministers recommended reinvesting in our national highway network. This is important because, with the free trade agreement, new communications networks and increase in trade with the Americans, one of the major tools we need is an adequate highway network.

The work that went into this report included a strictly non-partisan search for new financing methods. That the federal government has failed to act since that time is mainly a matter of availability of funding. That being said, our committee tried to find new ways and received suggestions on the subject, including one under the heading "Public/Private Partnerships".

This method of financing reverses the risk factor attached to highway construction, which is a rather interesting point. In the past, when the government decided to build or renovate a highway, it had to find the money, make it available and award the contract to a contractor so he could build the highway, which tied up government money for a long time. As you know, there are times, and that is the case now, when money is not available.

The new financing approach based on private and public partnerships is a way to transfer the risk. It is up to the promoter, the highway construction company that decides to invest in a highway to find the appropriate financing, partners and other promoters, and they do this because the government says: "If you build the

*Routine Proceedings*

highway, we will guarantee financing for the next 30, 40 or 50 years, as soon as the highway is built”.

What is attractive about this kind of financing is that during construction, which could easily take two, three or four years—financing is provided by the construction company and not by the government. This can be an opportunity to get several major projects moving.

The transport committee travelled across Canada to conduct consultations on the relationship between trade, tourism and transportation. We realized that a major overhaul was required, that Canada's network of highways needed considerable work, and this type of financing would make it possible.

The other interesting point in public/private partnership funding is that, unlike in past years when the builder tended to work as quickly as possible, to save as much as possible and to build a road that would be adequate for the next few years, while the cost of road repairs in the future and the fact that there were faults in the construction were somewhat less of a concern, given that, once the work on the road was approved, he was relieved of his responsibilities.

Under the new system, as the road builder is the road owner, like a good homeowner he will have to make sure that his property is in tip-top shape. Developers and builders will be obliged to build roads that are more solid and that will last longer, because they will not have to invest in repairs after 10, 15 or 20 years, as is the case at the moment.

I find this approach very interesting, and I wanted to point it out to make it clear that solutions are possible and that the official opposition can act constructively when it is possible to do so.

This type of funding was not invented by the transport committee nor, necessarily, by those who made the presentation. It has already been tried out in a number of countries, where a more satisfactory and permanent highway network has been built.

What is interesting in the report as well is that provincial jurisdictions were taken into account throughout the report and in the recommendations. This has not always been the case in the past. The official opposition had to be very vigilant during the preparation of the report to make sure that the government did not maintain a paternalistic and centralizing attitude.

We understand very well that several provinces feel they cannot afford to invest in such highways, because we must bear in mind that it is the federal government which has taxation powers. It is important that this be done according to jurisdiction, and this is why—in view of the criteria established by the committee and the suggestion regarding the new funding arrangements—we believe this step is so significant.

• (1015)

We would have liked the Minister of Finance to be more explicit in the budget regarding his support of those projects. When he appeared before the committee, he encouraged us to explore the situation, to study it in more detail, but this is a sector where government decisions are urgently needed. As I said earlier, this is not a matter of committing funds for the short term. It is a matter of determining whether the selected projects are worthwhile.

I made suggestions that were included in the committee's report recommending that a number of innovative pilot projects be undertaken across Canada in the next five or ten years.

For instance, one pilot project could be undertaken in a very densely populated area, on a particularly busy stretch of the Canadian highway system. As well, pilot projects could be undertaken in regions where traffic is much lighter, but they would still have a major economic impact.

For example, after road 185 between Rivière-du-Loup and Edmundston, New Brunswick, which is part of the Trans-Canada highway, was upgraded some 20 years ago, there was a substantial increase in truck traffic, and now this stretch of road is very busy. Security is even becoming a problem.

I think it would be interesting to do an experimental project on this section of highway, in that part of Quebec, to see if a partnership with the private sector could work and how the government and the private sector could agree on a way to pay for the leasing of the upgraded highway.

Economically, this is important since, in fact, all trade between New Brunswick and Ontario goes through highway 20, which only goes up to Rivière-du-Loup. It does continue up to New Brunswick, but not as a four lane highway. There would be some interesting work to do in this area. No matter what the status of Quebec is, whether it becomes a sovereign state or remains part of Canada, this type of project would benefit the Canadian economy as a whole. It would also benefit those who use the road on a regular basis.

In a rural area like ours, in the Témiscouata region, this road has a significant economic impact. It allows all regular road users to get from one place to another. Today in various municipalities, people live in fear of the truck they see coming in their rear view mirror and of the dangerous situations they have to face. Unfortunately, the high number of accidents is proof that there is a need to act quickly in this area.

This pilot project would be worthwhile as it would stimulate economic activity. This pilot project would also be worthwhile because it would take place in an area less densely populated than

*Routine Proceedings*

major centres like Montreal, Toronto, or Quebec City, but it would still be significant for the people living there.

It is important for all small and medium size businesses to have access to the American market in a timely fashion. If you recall, not too long ago there was a railway running along the road. The tracks have been removed, putting additional pressure on the road system. Unfortunately it would not be possible today to build the railway tracks again, but it would be possible to ensure that the road network benefits from the new partnership program between the public and the private sectors, which would put us several years ahead compared to more traditional financing. If tomorrow we in Canada tried to meet all traditional road upgrading needs, we could not do it for lack of financial resources. Therefore, we must be creative and offer new suggestions like the one before us.

The wood industry in particular would benefit from this project, since processing of raw materials is on the rise. There is room for manufactured products on the U.S. market, and transportation costs are becoming an important factor in North American competition.

• (1020)

This is often the element that will make the difference between a profitable contract, an adequate bid in reply to a request for proposals, and withdrawing from the market. Therefore, when the federal government proposes a penalizing reform like the employment insurance reform in a region like ours, one way to compensate for its negative impact is to diversify the economy through the infrastructure.

A few years ago, Quebec sovereignists were not so well informed on all aspects of rail, air and sea transport. But since the Bloc Québécois has been in Ottawa, we have realized that it is imperative to link the different transportation modes. That is why an idea as original as the one proposed in the sixth report of the transport committee should be promoted, should get a chance to be tried out in pilot projects, as recommended in the committee's report.

I hope that one of the first places where such a pilot project will be implemented will be on the stretch of road between Rivière-du-Loup and Edmundston, because that section really meets all the requirements to determine if joint funding by the private and the public sectors could be worthwhile.

All this, in the end, to give to the economies of our regions the best possible tools of development. The federal government has often said that Quebec gets more in transfer payments than it contributes. Quebecers react to this by recalling the years when they depended on unemployment insurance. This is something often mentioned by the federal government, but something we do no longer want any part of. What we want is the money we pay in federal taxes to come back to us in constructive ways, as invest-

ments which would allow our regions to be competitive while co-operating with neighbouring regions.

Northern New Brunswick would surely benefit from a project like this one which would facilitate the transfer of materials from one part of Canada to another. It is the same principle as the gas pipeline which comes from Quebec City and goes through Rivière-du-Loup on its way to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. When such projects are realized, everyone comes out a winner.

To conclude, I would like to restate that the official opposition supported the testing of partnerships between the public and private sectors in the area of transportation. We believe that it is a solution for the future and we would like the federal government to state its final position as quickly as possible and to launch projects which would prove that it is not simply window dressing, but that it will implement the recommendations of the parliamentary committee so they can lead to concrete benefits. It would really benefit the whole of the Canadian economy, given that transportation infrastructures in this country have always been important means of development, and we have to reinvest in that area in innovative ways.

I would like to ask that the report of the Standing Committee on Transport, tabled February 12, be concurred in. Once this is done, the federal government could propose projects which would stimulate regional economies and allow them to face the challenges of the 21st century.

**Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I commend my learned colleague for his, I dare say, masterly speech. He never ceases to amaze me; he is an expert on everything, and we realize it.

However, I would like him to give a few extra details concerning this partnership approach, because I did not fully understand how it will be funded. What kind of funding will be used? I would like our colleague to tell us a little more about the funding. I would also like to know whether the transport committee, which he was a member of, looked at marine transportation for heavy, surplus and off size goods.

I would like to know if the committee talked about trying to bring back coastal shipping, formerly used in Quebec to carry goods from Montreal to Gaspé or from Montreal to the Lower North Shore, for example, because it would spare our roads.

• (1025)

**Mr. Crête:** Mr. Speaker, as for the first part of the question about funding, I believe it would go like this: a consortium of highway builders makes a proposal to the government regarding sites identified by the government as sites to be funded. Instead of asking the government to pay to have the highway built and, therefore, own it, the consortium takes it upon itself to raise the

*Routine Proceedings*

necessary funding. The consortium goes to the government and says: "Tell us what terms we can expect to operate under in the future—basically, how much will the rent be for the next 20, 30 or 40 years—and we will raise funds accordingly, to ensure completion of the highway".

From the government's point of view, this approach has the advantage of not costing a penny during the three to five years it takes to build it. The consortium will pay for that part of the project. It will certainly be paid back as part of long term financing, but this type of funding can help boost to some extent the economy or development in the industrial sector.

It has never been tried in Canada. In the past, there have been experiments in the United Kingdom, for example, and a similar project was carried out in the maritimes. Canada should have seven or eight of these sites to assess the benefits over a five- or ten-year period.

The second part of the question concerns shipping. The committee has undertaken a major review of the relationships between transport, trade and tourism. Because of the urgent need for action in that area, it has focused much more on highways than anything else.

Just the same, we have heard people from various sectors who had all sorts of suggestions to make. People involved in tourism have told us that, at present, the highway system in Canada does not promote the development of tourism across Canada versus the U.S. competition.

In Quebec for instance, we have been reminded of the fact that the federal government still has not done anything about casinos on cruise ships. The tourism industry and the shipping industry in Quebec have been making representations for years to be able to operate casinos onboard cruise ships while on the St. Lawrence river. This would be a plus in terms of tourist attractions. The government has been dragging its feet on this issue for quite a while. Representations were made to that effect.

Another aspect of the consultation process concerns Bill C-44 regarding ports reform. Currently, communities along the river, and everywhere in Canada, are very concerned about what will happen to these ports. We were told that the ports would be turned over to the private sector and to local interests. What will be the conditions governing this transfer? Will the facilities be in such a condition that their service life will make them attractive when they are transferred? All this is not very clear.

Bill C-44 has been shelved. We wonder why the government is now delaying this legislation, after putting pressure to have it reviewed at report stage, last fall. Maybe the government realized, after seeing our proposed amendments, including on the status of Canada port authorities and on other issues, that its bill was not up to date and that some additional work was required.

The first thing that comes to mind about this tour is that, in the past, Quebec suffered a great prejudice because of the shared jurisdiction in the transport sector between the federal and provincial governments. Quebec has jurisdiction over highways and was able to take action in that area, but a large part of the province's budget was eaten away in the process.

This was done at the expense of the development of an integrated transport strategy. In Canada, no one has put in place an integrated strategy that would enable us to know when to rely on marine transportation, for example, or when to use trains, road carriers or air carriers. The result is that we are now faced with totally absurd situations that could have been avoided, had there been only one level of government involved in these areas.

This is the primary conclusion I come to after that tour. As the opposition's transport critic, I see a similarity between what is happening in this sector and in the manpower sector. Things will work only once the provinces have full jurisdiction over this sector. This is important because, as in other areas, we are stuck with duplication problems and with the fact that it is impossible, for a government that does not have full and sole responsibility, to develop strategies that would include all of these areas.

• (1030)

Therefore, the transport committee has more work to do. However, Quebecers will have to clearly express their will at the next election and say that, in this sector as in others, our province urgently needs to have full and sole jurisdiction, until sovereignty is achieved.

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval-Centre, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, spring will be here soon, because, as I noticed while driving in this morning, there sure are a lot of potholes out there. I think my colleague's comments on the transport committee's report are most timely.

The hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup mentioned a pilot project, the first of its kind, that would go from Rivière-du-Loup up to Edmunston. He also talked about the jurisdictions that would be involved.

I have not forgotten my geography. Since Edmunston is located in New Brunswick and Rivière-du-Loup in the province of Quebec, I would like my hon. colleague to describe for us what an ideal public/private partnership would be, if this pilot project is approved, of course.

**Mr. Crête:** Mr. Speaker, indeed, throughout the drafting of this report, the Bloc Québécois was careful to ensure that the various jurisdictions were taken into consideration. We already have funding mechanisms and agreements can eventually be reached between the provincial government and the federal government.

As was mentioned in a feature article published in *Le Journal de Montréal* last week, the Government of Quebec is open to this kind

*Routine Proceedings*

of experiment and since governments all have money problems, they are ready to welcome some new action plans.

As for the pilot project from Rivière-du-Loup to Edmunston, what is needed is an agreement between the provincial government and the Government of Canada to experiment with this kind of project. Since we are dealing with the Trans-Canada Highway, the federal government has some say in the matter. If such an agreement is reached, business people will set up a financing consortium for this kind of project.

I intend to ask some of the stakeholders who took part in similar projects in other countries to come here and see how such a project could work, so that we can elaborate a concrete proposal in the months to come, before the next elections, in such a way that all the parties involved will have the opportunity to express their views on the relevance of these projects.

\* \* \*

[English]

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the House do now proceed to the orders of the day.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

• (1115)

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

(Division No. 230)

**YEAS**

Members

Adams  
Anawak  
Assadourian  
Bakopanos  
Bélanger  
Bernier (Beauce)  
Bodnar

Alcock  
Arseneault  
Augustine  
Bélair  
Bellemare  
Bertrand  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)

Brushett  
Calder  
Catterall  
Collenette  
Comuzzi  
Culbert  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Easter  
Fewchuk  
Finlay  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Graham  
Harvard  
Hubbard  
Iftody  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lee  
MacDonald  
Maloney  
McGuire  
Murphy  
Nault  
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peric  
Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Proud  
Richardson  
Robichaud  
Serré  
Sheridan  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
Telegdi  
Thalheimer  
Valeri  
Verran  
Walker  
Whelan

Bryden  
Campbell  
Cohen  
Collins  
Crawford  
Cullen  
Discepola  
Dupuy  
English  
Finestone  
Gaffney  
Godfrey  
Grose  
Hopkins  
Ianno  
Keyes  
Kirkby  
Lastewka  
Lincoln  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)  
McCormick  
Mitchell  
Murray  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patri  
Peters  
Pillitteri  
Regan  
Rideout  
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)  
Shepherd  
Simmons  
Steckle  
Szabo  
Terrana  
Torsney  
Vanclief  
Volpe  
Wells  
Zed—98

**NAYS**

Members

Ablonczy  
Asselin  
Bachand  
Bellehumeur  
Bergeron  
Bhaduria  
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)  
Brien  
Chatters  
Crête  
Dalphond-Guiral  
Debien  
Duceppe  
Duncan  
Fillion  
Gauthier  
Godin  
Grubel  
Guimond  
Hart  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Hoepfner  
Johnston  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Loubier  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)  
Mercier  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Paré  
Picard (Drummond)  
Ramsay

Althouse  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Bélisle  
Benoit  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Blaikie  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Canel  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Cummins  
de Savoye  
Dubé  
Dumas  
Epp  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Gilmour  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Guay  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hayes  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Jacob  
Landry  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Marchand  
Ménard  
Meredith  
Nunez  
Penson  
Pomerleau  
Ringma

*Government Orders*

Sauvageau  
Silye  
Stinson  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Williams—73

Schmidt  
Speaker  
Strahl  
Venne

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Barnes  
Clancy  
Deshaies  
Lalonde  
Lefebvre  
St. Denis

Bonin  
Davialt  
Hickey  
Langlois  
Phinney  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** I declare the motion carried.

**Mr. Hill (MacLeod):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since the tobacco legislation is so important I would like to know why there is not a single member of the cabinet present. I believe there is a rule or—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** I am sure the hon. member for Macleod knows that it is improper to refer to absence of members.

---

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[*English*]

**TOBACCO ACT**

## BILL C-71—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

**Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.)** moved:

That in relation to Bill C-71, an act to regulate the manufacture, sale, labelling and promotion of tobacco products, to make consequential amendments to another act and to repeal certain acts, 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 stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

• (1120)

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

• (1205)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 231*)

**YEAS**

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Anawak	Arseneault
Assadourian	Augustine
Bakopanos	Bélair
Bélanger	Bernier (Beauce)
Bertrand	Bodnar
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Culbert
Cullen	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Dion
Discepolo	Dromisky
Duhamel	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)	Grose
Harvard	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knutson	Lastewka
Lee	Lincoln
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney	Manley
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	Mifflin
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Pettigrew
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Robichaud	Robillard
Rock	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Simmons
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wells	Whelan



*Government Orders*

Young

Zed—120

## NAYS

## Members

Ablonczy	Althouse
Asselin	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Canuel
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	de Savoye
Debien	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Epp
Fillion	Forsth
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier
Gilmour	Godin
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Guay	Guimond
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Hayes	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jacob	Johnston
Landry	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier	Marchand
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Nunez
Paré	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Ramsay
Ringma	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Silye	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Venne
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams—78

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to.)

## CONSIDERATION RESUMED OF REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from February 21, consideration of Bill C-71, an act to regulate the manufacture, sale, labelling and promotion of tobacco products, to make consequential amendments to another Act and to repeal certain Acts, as reported (with amendments) from the committee; and of Motions Nos. 1, 3, 8, 26 and 29.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we resume consideration of report stage of Bill C-71. With the guillotine the government just imposed on this bill, we

unfortunately have only today's sitting to try to explain to Canadians what the situation really is right now.

Thus, for the benefit of our viewers and in the hope that the government will finally understand, I remind the House that the Bloc Québécois supports 80 per cent at least of this bill. We are not ashamed of saying it out loud and clear: we agree with 80 per cent of this bill.

This having been said, I want to stress an extremely important matter. The government is missing the whole point with this bill, since it does not recognize in the first clause that tobacco is a hazardous, highly addictive and potentially lethal product. That is what should appear in clause 1 if the government were really being consistent.

But no, the government refuses to do that because it would then have to crack down on tobacco and, eventually, to declare it an illegal substance, thus losing billions of dollars in taxes. That is where the problem lies. When the time comes to collect money, the government has no problem with tobacco, but when the time comes to let tobacco companies give money for cultural and sports events, especially in Montreal, which receives half of the sponsorship money, the government claims that its duty is to protect children's health.

To protect children's health, the government would first have to control tobacco. The government should be able to force tobacco companies to reduce the nicotine content of their cigarettes.

With its insidious measures and fallacious arguments, the government has brought us to a dead end because, in the past ten years, it has financed tobacco producers to help them make tobacco more addictive. Consequently, a young person who starts smoking today needs another cigarette after an hour and a half. That is what tobacco companies have decided. A smoker cannot go for more than an hour and a half without having a cigarette. That is how long he can go before having a nicotine fit. We even see people who, unfortunately, have to slip out; even though they work on the sixth floor, they rush downstairs to light up outside the building because they cannot wait more than an hour and a half. That is the problem.

• (1210)

The government should stop doing that, recognize that tobacco is a dangerous product and force tobacco companies, which are mostly located in Ontario, to reduce the nicotine content of their cigarettes.

If it controlled tobacco products, the government could then regulate access to these products and control tobacco advertising, but it should not ban sponsorships because this is a dead end for the government. There is not one serious study that shows a direct cause-and-effect relationship between tobacco advertising and smoking.

*Government Orders*

I would really like to know how a young person can see the Rothmans logo on Jacques Villeneuve's car zooming by at 240 kilometres an hour. One must really have good eyesight to see the words Rothmans, Players or du Maurier at those speeds. One must have really sharp eyesight. The ban on sponsorship will really put us into trouble.

I repeat that tobacco should be a controlled substance, it should be declared a dangerous product under the Food and Drugs Act. This should be the first step, but the government refuses to take it.

The second step should be to regulate the inspection process. There should be standards setting the maximum nicotine and tar content. Instead of that, the government chose to spend millions of dollars to try to show us that unidentified packages or plain packages would prevent people from smoking. The clever ones lost no time in designing even more attractive packages.

Complete and effective legislation would first control the product and its publicity; not ban it, but control it, control the sale of cigarettes. We have been saying for a long time that there should be effective coercive measures against people who sell cigarettes to children, one cigarette at a time.

In her magnificent letter, Senator Hervieux-Payette said that when she was chairperson of a school board in a Montreal suburb, she fired some employees who sold cigarettes to kids. As some editorials pointed out this morning, we must first take certain measures before falling into the trap of exaggeration or, worse, extremism.

Sales must, therefore, be controlled. We need some coercive measures. For example, the convenience store owner who sells cigarettes to children, one cigarette at a time, could be fined \$5,000 for the first offence, \$10,000 for the second offence and, for a third offence, he would lose his permit to sell cigarettes. If it is a hazardous product, a permit should be required to sell it, and there should be someone monitoring permits.

Access to tobacco should also be monitored. The government has gone overboard: it is forcing convenience stores to conceal their displays. We saw cases where a special gadget is required that only store employees can operate in order to release a pack of cigarettes. In bars, cigarettes are hidden from view so that no one can buy them. We have seen some completely ridiculous situations.

In an effective bill, the government will first make sure it has good controls in place, and then proceed to take action. Controls must come before action. Behaviour can be dealt with later. The best way to influence the behaviour of young children is through proactive measures that build esteem and encourage.

It is extremely important not to tell young children that they may not do something, because as soon as you do, what is the first thing a child or an adolescent wants to do? The very thing he was told

not to do beckons to him. Rather than set restrictions, it is better to tackle behaviour.

Rather than spend \$3 million to fund research centres, the government should take this money and put together kits promoting health, exercise, outdoor activities, anything to keep people from taking up smoking.

• (1215)

Then, the environment has to be tackled. Yesterday evening, we heard how Toronto had gone to some ridiculous lengths. Smoking has apparently been banned in washrooms because they are located in the wrong part of the restaurant.

It must be possible to alter the product. The government must alter the product in order to make it less dangerous and less addictive. It is extremely important that people be aware of the difference between the cigarettes smoked in the past and those available today.

The Liberal government is showing a great weakness in its inability to come up with a global perspective on the hazards of the product, smoking behaviour and the social and physical environment in which all those concerned are evolving: smokers, non-smokers, merchants, health stakeholders, tobacco companies and distribution networks. There must be recognition at the social, political and legislative level that the hazards and addictiveness of tobacco products take priority over banning sponsorships.

**Mr. Bernard Patry (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-71 today because this issue is very close to my heart.

We all know about the harmful effects of smoking. The correlation between smoking and various forms of cancer affecting the lungs, the throat, the mouth, the larynx, the digestive tract, the stomach and the colon has been more than scientifically proven. The increased risk of heart disease among smokers is also a well known fact.

Today, however, I would like to examine this issue from another point of view, namely the effect of second hand smoke on the health of non-smokers, particularly on the health of children. But first of all, I would like to talk briefly about the history of smoking.

In his book entitled *Le tabagisme*, Professor Bertrand Dautzenberg tells us that in ancient times, the Greeks and the Romans smoked the pipe, or rolled leaves sometimes, but they did not smoke tobacco because it did not exist. They smoked pear tree leaves, eucalyptus leaves and other plants.

In America, tobacco smoking goes back more than 3,000 years, both in South America and in the Mississippi Valley. Pipes dating back to 1,000 B.C. have been found in South America. The natives called that plant "petum". The name tobacco comes either from

the island of Tobago in the Lesser Antilles where it was cultivated or from the name the natives gave their pipes.

Tobacco, as used by the Incas and the Aztecs during important religious ceremonies, also had the virtue of appeasing hunger and overcoming fatigue. It was also used as a medicinal plant either by itself or in conjunction with coca leaves or other plants.

At this stage, it is important to clarify the terminology because smoking produces three types of smoke. The best known is called mainstream smoke, and it is the smoke that is inhaled by the smoker when he or she draws on the cigarette. Then there is sidestream smoke, which is released into the environment when the smoker is not drawing on the cigarette. Finally, there is second hand smoke, which is exhaled by the smoker.

We have to ask ourselves the following question: which of these different types of smoke, mainstream, sidestream or second hand, is the most harmful? The answer is this: the most toxic type of smoke is the sidestream smoke that is released into the environment, because it undergoes an aging process before it is inhaled. What does the aging of smoke mean? It means that while the cigarette is burning in an ashtray, for example, certain substances such as carbon monoxide decompose and these altered substances are found in greater quantities in side stream smoke than in mainstream smoke.

• (1220)

And what are the effects of these substances on our health and our children's health?

Taking carbon monoxide as an example, everyone knows it decreases the amount of oxygen going to peripheral tissues, but how many people know that benzene is related to the development of acute lymphoblastic leukemia?

Moreover, how many people know that the concentration of nicotine is two to three times greater in sidestream smoke than it is in mainstream smoke? One often wonders how much one can smoke daily without harming other family members, especially children. This is hard to say, because there are different definitions of harm, and many factors involved.

It is easily understood that the smaller the room nonsmokers have to share with smokers, the greater the risk to them. The most dangerous places are on the job and in a car. Yes, a car. One of the first studies in this area, if not the absolute first, dates back to 1981 in Japan, when Professor T. Hiramata proved unequivocally the harmful effects of cigarette smoke on nonsmokers.

Why a study in Japan? First of all, because the Japanese live in very close quarters, more often than not a single room, and at the time of the study a poorly ventilated one. Second, because only 15 per cent of Japanese women smoke, one-fifth of the figure for men:

### *Government Orders*

75 per cent. The study findings demonstrated that lung cancer among nonsmoking women was proportionate to the husband's smoking habit. Women whose husbands smoked were twice as likely to have cancer as women whose husbands did not.

The focus of these studies was lung cancer, but it is most interesting to note that the same study also showed an increased incidence of breast cancer and leukemia in these same couples. All studies agree on this; 330 Canadians died in 1996 from lung cancer caused by someone else's smoking.

I will close on my favourite topic: children. We all have young children or young grandchildren. Here are the facts: cigarette smoke is directly linked to all forms of respiratory disease, from pneumonia, to bronchitis, bronchiolitis, asthma and ear infections. How so? The child inhales nitrous oxides, which increases the sensitivity of its lungs. Children's contact with second hand smoke can have major and serious consequences for the quality of life of our young people in the short, medium and long term.

In fact, children of pre-school age are the most at risk. They are often sick and are much sicker than children were 25 years ago. The phenomenal increase in asthma, for instance, is very disturbing. When children have ear infections, daycare is often blamed, but it has now been proved that the smoke from parents' cigarettes is as much to blame, if not more so, than daycare, with consequences such as future learning disabilities, operations, and so forth.

In concluding, I would like to say that the purpose of my speech today is not only to support this bill unreservedly but also to try and make the Canadian public aware, through my humble contribution, of the very real and harmful effects of second hand smoke and especially of the beneficial impact of a healthy environment.

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would first like to point out some very sad facts about Parliament. I note that, in the case of such an important bill, it does not matter what our viewpoint is, we are in Parliament, and in a democracy the best way to oppose an idea is to propose a better one. Today, however, we can take no pride in the fact that the government and the members opposite chose an authoritarian and dictatorial measure that provides very little for freedom of ideas and discussion: the guillotine.

• (1225)

I would like to remind our viewers of what a guillotine means in parliamentary terms. Applying a guillotine limits the time for the proceedings. At the end of the time set aside for debate, whether all the members wishing to speak have spoken or not, the question is put.

The issue of tobacco and its relationship to public health is a complex one. I think our colleague from Rimouski—Témiscouata summed it up well when she said that we in the official opposition

*Government Orders*

support the objectives sought in general terms, we support about 80 per cent of them.

Bills have objectives and this is why we asked those drafting them to follow policy and use legal terminology in wording the objectives. We agree that it is unacceptable, in 1997, for some 40,000 people to take up smoking, which will ultimately kill them.

We are also aware that smoking is more than just a personal responsibility. If smoking were merely a personal matter, the lawmaker would probably not be concerned and we would not be having today's debate. We also recognize that the community has a responsibility, because the health system pays out hundreds of millions of dollars.

However, there is a discrepancy between the objectives and the means proposed to achieve them. Not only is there a discrepancy, but there is somewhat of a paradox in the fact that the government, while trying to solve a problem, or at least while trying to contribute to solving it, is going to jeopardize major sports and cultural events.

I believe one cannot remain unaffected by what is going on in this industry. I will take Montreal as an example. As you know, Montreal is a favourite venue for cultural and sports events. It is a well known fact. Indeed I believe the member for Saint-Hyacinthe is an avid consumer. In the summer he can be seen wearing a T-shirt and bermuda shorts, casual and yet serious, attending the jazz festival, the Francopholies, and what not. I believe he does not miss any.

**Mr. Loubier:** Oh no, I do not.

**Mr. Ménard:** I say it again, he is always welcome in Montreal.

As you know the sponsoring industry is one that plans ahead. We are not talking about short term planning, a few weeks ahead of time. To give you an idea of the order of magnitude we are talking about, the tobacco industry sponsors a number of sports and cultural events to the tune of close to \$60 million.

If the government had been serious, if it had behaved professionally, if it had been consistent in its objectives—there might well exist a link between smoking and advertising on the site of sports events, but what we are saying is that, at the moment, it has not been rigorously proven. This link has not been scientifically established. Although we might suspect there is one.

Just imagine if, as legislators, we were to pass legislation on the basis of approximations, speculations, without sufficient data to support the measures. We are now presented with a bill which, ultimately, could put several sports and cultural events at risk. Why are we concerned? I am concerned first of all as a Montrealer. I think it bears reminding that there are some institutional partners

who usually do not dabble in politics. As we speak, there is great effervescence in Montreal. People are in the streets. Not only are they marching, they have the support of several extremely important partners. I am thinking for example of the Convention and Tourism Bureau of Greater Montreal.

● (1230)

The convention and tourism bureau's mandate is to promote tourist activities, not public health. It is not an agency operating in Parliament. Why did it find it appropriate to break silence and join the people who, a few minutes ago, decided to close their businesses and take to the streets of Montreal? It decided to keep silent, but at the same time, to speak volumes down in the street, because this bill is unreasonable.

It is not unreasonable from a public health perspective. Of course we are in favour of any measure aimed at reducing tobacco use. However, for a democrat, the end never justifies the means. It is not true that in order to fight against smoking we have to threaten whole areas of our cultural industry.

Why did the government not provide for a transition period? Why did it not propose some financial compensation? It is too easy to ban, to prohibit without guaranteeing that it will not have a major financial impact.

The jazz festival is an international event. People from all corners of the world come to Montreal to listen to jazz music because that festival's reputation is well established. Out of the festival's total budget of \$9.5 million, approximately \$2 million come from tobacco sponsorships.

Parliament is not the only place there are fireworks you know; the Benson and Hedges international fireworks competition draws an international jury. I think the parliamentary secretary is well aware of that reality. There is a budget of \$1.4 million for the fireworks, of which \$1 million comes from sponsorship.

Then there is the Just for Laughs festival, of which *Les parlementeries* are obviously the finest example; a number of hon. members in this House should stand for election to that bogus parliament: they would surely win.

**Mr. Dubé:** More so the people opposite.

**Mr. Ménard:** As the hon. member for Lévis said, more so the people opposite. The Just for Laughs festival has a budget of \$10 million, of which \$1 million is provided by sponsorship. The summer festival in Quebec City has a budget of \$4.5 million, of which \$500,000 comes from sponsorship. Is there a nicer area than the capital of Quebec to spend your summer? Every summer, I make a point of spending a few days there, meeting different people and enjoying varied activities.

*Government Orders*

We must set the record straight. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the parliamentary secretary, who is here in the House, that we support any measure that will reduce smoking.

I have never smoked and I have tried to convince my close relatives to stop smoking. Let me thank my mother and father who stopped smoking two years ago. It is not easy to stop smoking, because there is a dependency involved. The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot stopped smoking four years ago. In our environment, we know of individuals who have succeeded, and they are to be cited as examples.

We know that nicotine creates a dependency. The hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata reminded us that manufacturers, producers have played on this dependency; this clearly shows that it is not easy to stop smoking. Smoking is a plague that causes intoxication.

It is all fine and well to be concerned about it in terms of health, but for goodness sake we should not try to solve a problem by creating another one. The minister will find the official opposition supportive, in matters of public health needs, but we ask him to provide for transition mechanisms and to help the industry by making available to it some other mechanism whereby the activities can continue. I think this is reasonable.

If this bill is passed, Montreal will go through another economic crisis, and we have a duty to deny our support to anything that could lead to that.

[*English*]

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today to speak on the bill. I would like to raise a few important notices.

• (1235)

Three years ago the government had an ideal opportunity to do something about the horrendous smoking situation. We were faced with the terrible situation of smuggling occurring primarily in Quebec.

The government, however, chose to take a path that compromised the lives of Canadian children at the expense of political gain and of political courage. It chose to lower the taxation and cost of cigarettes in an effort to address the smuggling issue.

In terms of decreasing the smuggling of tobacco, that issue was addressed because it decreased. However the cost was the increase in consumption and the increase in the number of young people smoking by the amount of a quarter of million every single year.

Over the last three years the government by lowering the price of cigarettes introduced a quarter of a million new children to cigarette smoking every single year, or 750,000 children over the last three years, half of whom will die prematurely and virtually all of whom will suffer diseases, mortality and morbidity at a rate much higher than Canadians who do not smoke.

The smuggling issue is an interesting one. Smuggling not only involves tobacco. It also involves guns, drugs, people, alcohol and cigarettes. The amount of cigarettes smuggled was all that was decreased. The conduits of smuggling existed as they do today. The solution we proposed three years ago would have effectively decreased the consumption of cigarettes and would have addressed the smuggling issue.

Our proposal was to bring the export tax to where it was in 1992. The Conservative government of the day brought in an export tax of \$8 per carton. In six weeks smuggling of cigarettes plummeted almost 70 per cent. The tobacco companies, fearful of a decrease in their profits, said if the government of the day did not remove that export tax they would leave the country.

What happened? The Conservative government of the day buckled under pressure of the tobacco companies, removed the export tax, and consumption went right back up. The smuggling issue was not addressed. If we put on a tobacco export tax smuggling will go down.

Also the law should be enforced. No one speaks about the people who live in these areas, many of whom are on aboriginal reserves on the Quebec-U.S. border. No one speaks about law-abiding innocent individuals living on these reserves who have to put up with thugs engaged in the movement and trafficking of illicit cigarettes as well as alcohol, weapons and drugs. Much of this is tied into criminal gangs in the United States. It is not run by law-abiding people. It is run by thugs and crooks.

The single most important thing we could do is decrease consumption. I do not care about the issues of sponsorship or education. Education is important but unless people have been living in a cave for the last 30 years they know smoking is bad for their health. Smoking is addictive and smoking kills. It is not a problem of education. Cost is the single most important determining factor in consumption, particularly in children. There is ample scientific evidence showing that the supply and demand curve for consumption is very elastic in price.

To decrease consumption tobacco taxes should be what they were before January 1994. In that way consumption will decrease. Revenues to the government will increase and health care costs will go down. It is unlike any other tax. We are a party firmly in favour of decreasing taxation.

Tobacco presents a different situation. If tobacco taxes can be what they were as of January 1994, consumption will go down. Costs to the taxpayer will go down in terms of health care costs. By lowering the taxation rate government revenues have gone down and the costs to the taxpayer have escalated dramatically in terms of health care.

• (1240)

With respect to the sponsorship issue the members of the Bloc Québécois like to trumpet, let us call a spade a spade. I do not think anyone in the House has been deluded into thinking for one moment that tobacco companies are sponsoring the Grand Prix and

*Government Orders*

the Players International Tennis Championship out of the goodness of their hearts.

The tobacco companies sponsor events like the Montreal Jazz Festival, the Players International Tennis Championship and the Grand Prix so that children will take up cigarette smoking. The only reason any company invests in advertising is so that people will buy their product. The product in this case is a cancer causing, debilitating, addictive substance called tobacco.

There is ample evidence to show in countries such as New Zealand, Great Britain and France tobacco sponsorship has been banned from sports and arts and cultural festivals. The festivals did not decline or go away. Rather they thrived because they found sponsors in other areas.

There is no reason to believe that cultural and sporting events would leave Canada. Where would they go? Would they go to the United States? I think not. The United States is in the process of banning tobacco advertising in sponsorship and cultural events. Will they move to Europe? Of course not because it is banned in most countries there. Where will they go?

It is a false promise trumpeted by the tobacco companies that cultural and sporting events will leave Canada because tobacco companies are not allowed to sponsor them. They will not leave Canada.

The government can propose some alternative solutions to ensure cultural events survive quite nicely, perhaps by using some interim funding from tobacco taxes. By increasing the taxes we would decrease consumption, particularly among children.

Education about tobacco, alcohol, and marijuana and other drugs including solvents is very important. Money from tobacco taxes could be applied to early childhood education to educate children in Kindergarten that smoking, drinking, solvents, cocaine, pot and heroin are all very bad and can ruin their lives.

If the government proposed that along with its provincial counterparts a co-operative and productive situation would result. There would be a decrease in consumption of tobacco without compromising the lives of Canadians and without compromising our sports and cultural events. We are sensitive to that and believe the proposals put forward in the past will ensure cultural events continue and the consumption of tobacco decreases.

In closing, three years ago the government had an opportunity to address the smoking epidemic in our midst. Instead of making the situation better it made it worse by making cigarettes more affordable for the children of our great nation. It is a terrible legacy to leave Canadians. It is the single worst piece of legislation affecting the health of Canadians I can remember in the last 35 to

40 years. I cannot think of a piece of legislation that has been more damaging to the health and welfare of Canadians than what the government did back in February 1994.

Amendments can be made today in the House. However the government needs to have the courage to stand up to the smoking lobbyists and tobacco companies and say "We are not going to take it anymore. We are going to address this health epidemic. We are going to do it for the betterment of all Canadians".

• (1245)

The proposals are out there. We and other Canadians have proposed them. Now take it and use it.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I usually rise to say I am pleased to participate in the debate on whatever bill is before us at the time but, in this case, I must say I am not so pleased to speak on a bill that is a direct attack on and which threatens the very existence of cultural and sports events, particularly in Quebec.

This is a bill befitting fundamentalists. All this time, we thought the rise of fundamentalism was centred in the Muslim world; we must recognize that we need not look any further than this place to find fundamental fundamentalism. The minister who introduced this bill that may well kill cultural events like the Montreal Jazz Festival and sports events like the Montreal Grand Prix car race is the same minister who, a little over one year ago, had the brilliant idea of legislating to prevent us from eating and producing raw milk cheese in Canada. There is a limit.

One would think this minister turned into the ayatollah of the House of Commons: he wants to run our lives, preventing us from doing this, that and the other. What kind of society will this make? Where are the ministers and members from Quebec when they see a minister from Atlantic Canada jeopardizing an important part of Montreal's economy? Where are they? Where is the Minister of Finance and member for LaSalle—Émard? He has been absent since the start of our debate on this issue and, every time it is raised, he runs away and hides in the back.

Where is the Minister of Labour and hon. member for Saint-Léonard, our great defender of parmesan cheese? When his parmesan cheese was attacked, he was outraged. Where is he today, while the Jazz Festival, the Just for Laughs Festival, the Montreal Grand Prix and the Trois-Rivières Grand Prix are being put on the line? Where is the great upholder of civil liberties? He is probably eating spaghetti sprinkled with parmesan cheese. He has traded away all the major cultural and sporting events held in Montreal—\$30

million out of the \$60 million spent by Canadian sponsors—, all that for a spoonful of parmesan cheese.

Where is the hon. member for Outremont and Secretary of State in charge of the Federal Office of Regional Development for Quebec? We do not hear him anymore. Where is the great defender of Montreal's economy? He is also in hiding. He has been brought to heel.

This is unacceptable. During the second mandate of the Trudeau government, there were 74 Liberal nitwits in the House and today we have a bunch of nitwits, Liberals again, who are afraid to get up and defend those who voted for them.

This is no small affair. They are jeopardizing events such as the Just for Laughs Festival, the Montreal Grand Prix, the Trois-Rivières Grand Prix, of which my colleague, the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, is an ardent supporter, the Montreal and Toronto film festivals, the Montreal and Vancouver jazz festivals, the Benson & Hedges International, the Players Tennis International, and many other cultural and sporting events which are held in Quebec and in Canada.

In Montreal alone, cultural events represent 2,000 jobs. Given the unemployment rate in Montreal right now, this is disgraceful. Quebec's Liberal members across the way, the 1996-97 crop, should be ashamed of themselves for not speaking up against this bill, for not asking the Atlantic Ayatollah to withdraw such an fundamentalist bill. Soon, Quebecers and Canadians will have to ask permission just to walk.

How could they introduce such a bill?

• (1250)

It reminds me of the measures taken during the prohibition. It is a return to a terrible ultra-conservatism that must be rejected. This government behaves like a dictatorship. It tells us what to eat, what to drink and what to listen to. Canadians have had enough of these absurd measures. This bill is totally and utterly ridiculous.

For the public to mobilize so quickly, as we saw yesterday and as we will see today in Montreal and in Toronto, this legislation has to be utterly ridiculous.

We are not talking about peanuts here. For the Montreal jazz festival, a \$1.5 million sponsorship is at stake, at a time when the government is making deep cuts in the budgets for the poor and the unemployed. Now, it will put 2,000 people out of work in Montreal, just like that. This really takes the cake.

The same goes for the fireworks festival, which stands to lose a \$1 million sponsorship. Where will organizers find the money? It will be the end of this event in Montreal. The Just for Laughs festival will also lose \$1 million in sponsorships. And we all know that money does not grow on trees.

### *Government Orders*

Through such a senseless bill, the government is cutting off funding for major events which generate up to \$200 million in direct and indirect benefits. In the Montreal area alone, about \$200 million a year and 2,000 jobs are at stake.

This is a second-rate fundamentalist government. Soon, because of the government's actions, Montreal's unemployment rate will continue to grow instead of decreasing. This is unacceptable.

Where is the Minister of Human Resources Development, the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel, who makes it a point of honour to rise and supposedly stand up for Quebec? Where is when we are discussing this bill?

Our favourite constitutionalist minister—

**Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac):** He is with Guy Bertrand.

**Mr. Loubier:**—where is the hon. member for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville now? Where is this great champion of Quebec and of territorial integrity? Where is he? He is not speaking. And our Minister of Labour, where is he?

The economy of Montreal and the economy of a large part of Quebec are being devastated by this government. This bill is totally unacceptable. My colleagues and I are ready to go all the way because we cannot understand how the government could introduce this bill, how it could deliberately jeopardize all cultural and sports events sponsored by tobacco companies.

We will never accept this bill and we are ready to fight to the bitter end to defend the interests of Quebec and those of its workers. That is why it is so important for the population to continue to mobilize against it and to let this fundamentalist government know of their opposition. It takes a ridiculous government, with such ridiculous ministers as the health minister, to introduce such ridiculous bills as this one. How could the government agree to implement this bill?

You can count on us. Quebecers, and especially the 2,000 workers who depend on the many cultural and sports events held in the Montreal area, can count on the Bloc Québécois. We will stand up for them with all our energy.

**Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, just like my colleague for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot has just said, this is one of the rare occasions when I am not pleased to take the floor to deal with a bill. This bill will be really detrimental to the economic health of Quebec, and to the well-being of an important part of the Canadian economy, the Montreal area, more particularly during the summer tourist season.

Like my colleague for Rimouski—Témiscouata, I think it is very important to stress, as a first point in any speech, that the Bloc Québécois supports part of Bill C-71, and indeed most of it.

*Government Orders*

• (1255)

Like all Canadians, the Bloc Québécois takes to heart the health of Canadians and Quebecers and would like to protect the young from smoking and being hooked on cigarettes.

The Bloc Québécois has supported the principle of this bill because it thought wise amendments would be made and tangible improvements would make the bill more palatable for communities. But that was not to be. The intent of Bill C-71 should have been to prevent the promotion of smoking among our kids. What kind of prevention does this bill provide? The bill could have proposed a partial ban on cultural and sports sponsorships instead of a total ban.

I would really like to see the government party tabling a study in this House showing how many young Canadians started to smoke after watching the fireworks from the Jacques-Cartier bridge. Or how many youngsters took up smoking after watching a tennis match at the new Du Maurier stadium or at the old Jarry park? Nobody was ever able to prove young people started smoking after attending such events and nobody ever will.

I would also like to know what the Liberal Party's objectives are, with such a bill, in terms of a decrease in the number of young smokers 3, 4 or 5 years down the road. If, at this point in time, 10,000 young people take up smoking every month, and this is a figure I just made up, what impact will the new bill have on the number of young people who will stop smoking in the years to come because of the ban? Will we have 2,000 or 3,000 fewer smokers than we have now? They will not tell us, because, first of all, they do not know, and second, there will not be any decrease.

Instead of focusing on prevention, education and awareness, the bill neglects these issues in favour of a type of coercion that is totally off the mark. They are not targeting the people who take up smoking, but rather hitting on those who benefit from the sponsorship.

The sponsors have a very important 1 per cent share of the market. The Bloc Québécois and I believe that tobacco companies use their ads to target those who have a favourite brand. If you smoke a specific brand of cigarettes and you attend a sponsored event, you may be tempted to switch brands, and in my view that is why tobacco companies sponsor these events. But will people be tempted to take up smoking, that is another matter. Thus, those we want to target are the tobacco companies and sports and cultural events, not young people as originally intended.

The Bloc Québécois opposes Bill C-71 at third reading simply because the primary objective—to prevent smoking among young Quebecers and young Canadians—will not be achieved. But there is more. Our Liberal colleagues probably did not watch television this afternoon and see the success of the protest in Montreal. All

retailers and stakeholders in the Greater Montreal area were asked to let business come to a symbolic stop between twelve noon and 12.15 p.m. to show what Montreal could look like after the act comes into force.

The operation was a tremendous success. These people are not sovereignists or wicked separatists. They are restaurant owners, hotel operators, taxi drivers, people from all walks of life who benefit from these sponsorships, from the economic benefits generated by tourist attractions and events like the Grand Prix and the fireworks.

The demonstration was a great success. People with very different interests got together to try and make the government understand that its bill does not make any sense, especially for the people in Montreal but also for those in Toronto and Vancouver.

• (1300)

Moreover, they are saying: "It is nothing by a smoke screen. The Montreal Grand Prix will stay in Montreal and it will only change names. It will not be called the Players Grand Prix anymore". Again this morning, we heard the Grand Prix promoter say on television that, contrary to what the Liberals are saying, it is not true that the Grand Prix will simply change names and major sponsors. Perhaps it will be called the Cottonelle Grand Prix. But it remains to be seen whether this company will agree to sponsor the Grand Prix.

If, for example, milk producers—who now sponsor the Tour de l'île—decided to sponsor another event that lost the sponsorship of a tobacco company, the subsequent shift in sponsorships would indirectly affect the cultural and sporting events currently benefiting from the current arrangements. The affected events will either disappear or lose money to other events and activities. There will be an indirect impact on sporting and cultural events.

Therefore, I believe that the Bloc Québécois has clearly showed that Bill C-71 does not achieve its main purpose, which is to prevent young people from starting to smoke. The reason we will be voting against this bill is simply that, unlike the Liberals, we care about the health of Canadians and that the Liberals are missing the mark with this bill. It is not because we are not concerned about or interested in health. We were told that this bill was mainly about health. This is not the case, but it will have an impact on the economic health of sports and cultural events.

I began by asking how many children started smoking after watching the Benson & Hedges fireworks. I think that there are not many and the Liberal Party could not introduce them to us. Let us see who the other sponsors could be. The major banks were mentioned. They already sponsor some events. They do not sponsor the events we are talking about here because they do not have a direct interest in them. The pool of potential sponsors is



*Government Orders*

already spread thin. The government wants us to believe that there will be other sponsors, but it could not prove it.

Demonstrators gathered very quickly, and the Bloc Québécois has noticed that, in spite of its agreement in principle to protect the health of Canadians, the government does not have the will to protect it at the present time. For all these reasons, the Bloc Québécois and all the people of Montreal have until Thursday—we have been gagged because the government does not want to let us speak—to express their opposition and try to knock some sense into the government members across the way and the ministers from the Montreal area, who will have to justify their decision in the next election.

When people see the unemployment rate go up and when students lose their summer jobs because the events no longer exist, we will go to the ridings of the Minister of Human Resources Development and the Minister of Immigration, we will go to the riding of Outremont, which is represented by the hon. cigar-smoking minister who tried to express his opposition but was rebuffed by the majority of his colleagues, to explain to the people why Montreal went downhill after this bill was passed.

It is still time because we have 48 hours left to make the Liberal members understand that their bill, in its present form, does nothing for the health of Canadians, but is detrimental to the economic health of Montreal. That is why we will vote against this bill.

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great interest and passion that I want to side with my friend and colleague, the member for Lévis, who has made a superhuman effort this week to bring the present government to change its mind in spite of the firm commitment made by the health minister, who invited Canadians to vote against his party if he did not succeed in having Bill C-71 adopted before the next elections.

• (1305)

I must pay tribute to the member for Lévis because, once again, this government is picking on Quebec when things are going well. Quebecers have adopted a philosophy that this government seems to be doing everything it can to destroy.

The best example of that was ten months ago, when the same health minister wanted to ban the importation and production of raw milk cheese in Canada, knowing that Quebec accounted for 90 per cent of raw milk cheese consumption and production.

The labour minister, the member for Saint-Léonard who is of Italian origin, realized from his seat in the House that his friend, the health minister, wanted to deprive him of his parmesan cheese imported from Italy. The government changed its mind on that issue and it will do the same on Bill C-71 because at this very

moment, in Montreal, all the people who count have joined forces to save their cultural, sports and artistic events.

I made a list of ten or so events that are threatened by this bill and I would like to read them to you: the Montreal Grand Prix, the Benson and Hedges fireworks, the jazz festival, the Trois-Rivières Grand Prix, the Festival Just for Laughs, the Valleyfield and Ville-Marie regatta, the Quebec summer festival and the international tennis championships in Montreal. Do you know that tobacco companies invest some \$60 million a year to support these kinds of events which, without such sponsorship, could not exist? Of these \$60 million, \$30 million are spent in Quebec.

Is it just a coincidence that this Liberal government is picking on Quebec once again? I doubt it. Yesterday, the Prime Minister said in the House that it was to save lives in Canada, because 40,000 people die every year from smoking, and increasing numbers of young people are taking up smoking at a very early age.

Mr. Speaker, through you, I ask the Prime Minister, and I look him in the eye as I ask the question, if he really wants to help our young people, why does he not make sure that his own regulations are enforced in his country? Cigarettes must be sold to adults only, to people 18 years of age and older. Do you know how many inspectors there are to enforce this law in Canada? There are 40. Since Quebec represents one quarter of the population, it should have 10 of these inspectors, if it is not unfortunate. Ten inspectors to check whether cigarettes are being sold to those under 18 years of age.

Yesterday, I asked how many establishments had been found breaking the law in the last five years. Government members were unable to tell me. They were probably ashamed to give me the figure. There are regulations that are not even being enforced, and they want to introduce other legislation, other regulations that will privatize, I was going to say deprive Quebec of major events and, to top it all, that will eliminate several thousand jobs, jobs that are often held by students.

• (1310)

In 1993, along with the promise to scrap the GST, did the government not have as one of its slogans “jobs, jobs, jobs”? The unemployment rate has been hovering around 10 per cent for over 40 months now. Month after month, since this government took office, unemployment remained at the same level. It is really the first time since the economic depression of the 1930s that unemployment has reached 10 per cent, with 1.5 million unemployed. Bill C-71 will probably cause 2,000 more unemployed workers, although everybody agrees that the fact Jacques Villeneuve has a cigarette logo on his clothes will not induce youngsters to smoke.

Indeed, our good old Prime Minister was proud to have his picture taken with Jacques Villeneuve under a Players sign. He was hoping this picture would go around Canada. He was not reluctant

*Government Orders*

to be photographed just in front of an ad for Players. This shows his double standards.

The member for Brome—Missisquoi, in the Eastern Townships, said he tried to convince the banks to take over from the tobacco companies. We checked, and he made only one call to one Ottawa office. This is really not serious. Today, the banks told us that this was definitely out of the question, because they are not active in this field.

The member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot who spoke before me referred to the fact that there used to be 74 nitwits from the Liberal Party, and now there are 20 such nitwits from Quebec, not one of whom will rise in defence of Quebec's interests, but fortunately, since she does not have to answer to the Prime Minister, Senator Céline Hervieux-Payette is getting ready to oppose Bill C-71 in the Senate, and has asked her colleagues not to support this bill. We hope that the Prime Minister will backtrack or that this bill will die on the Order Paper, because of the coming general election.

The Minister of Health made a commitment three months ago, saying that if he could not get that bill passed, he invited all Canadians to vote against the Liberal Party of Canada. I am going to top that. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I invite all Canadians, especially Quebecers, to teach a lesson to this political party, which almost reflects badly on Quebec. The little guy from Shawinigan is saying that he will go and take the pulse of his riding in the taverns and the shopping centers. I invite him to go to Shawinigan this weekend and, if he has the time, to stop off in Trois-Rivières on the way to find out what people think of him now, how people rate him. I think his popularity is at its lowest point.

I therefore invite the Minister of Health and the Prime Minister to backtrack. Admitting they made a mistake, as they did in the case of the raw milk cheese, will improve their public image.

• (1315)

I just need another ten seconds to conclude. During a press conference in Montreal last Sunday, the Minister of Labour said they were going to solve the tobacco problem, then the liquor problem. His colleague, the hon. member from right across the river, the President of the Treasury Board, did not agree. He told his distinguished colleague not to overdo it on the liquor issue, that they were going to lose too many votes. They are going to deal first with the tobacco problem. This just goes to show how they are running the country now. They are just coasting along, which is nothing for Canadians to be proud of.

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that we are at the report stage of Bill C-71. Bills have a first reading and a second reading—and let

us keep in mind that, with Bill C-71, the government saw to it that there was no debate on second reading; it was referred directly to committee. Now they are trying the same thing on for size at report stage, putting a gag on us. We will have a time limit for discussing this vital matter.

In the streets of Montreal, Trois-Rivières and Quebec City, people are questioning the government's desire to put an end to virtually all of the major cultural and sporting events with tobacco company sponsorship. It is important not to use this issue as fodder for stirring people up. It must be kept in mind that the Bloc Québécois voted in favour of the principle of this bill at second reading. The Prime Minister said yesterday that he no longer understood Bloc members, that we should be more openminded. When a bill is debated on second reading, it must be realized that it is the principle that is being addressed.

True, we believe measures to protect the health of Quebecers and Canadians are important. Perhaps 80 per cent of the bill concerns things we consider important, particularly measures relating to the power to regulate tobacco products, measures relating to access to products, packaging and promotion. There are a number of measures the Bloc Québécois supports, but there are some which need more work by members who should do some original thinking on the subject and perhaps go back to committee to look at some solutions to the sponsorship question. It is not true that there is a straightforward solution such as the one contained in the bill.

For instance, the jazz festival, with a total budget of \$9.5 million, receives \$1.5 million in sponsorship fees, which is 15 per cent of its budget. Today, 15 per cent often means the difference between cancelling an event or not, or guaranteeing that it offers quality programming and can attract a satisfactory audience. In the case of the fireworks, sponsorship fees represent \$1 million out of a budget of \$1.4 million. Clearly, without that sponsorship the event could be in serious trouble. The Festival Just for Laughs has \$1 million in sponsorship fees out of a budget of \$10 million. The Festival d'été de Québec gets \$500,000 out of a budget of \$4.5 million.

In each case, banning sponsorship or imposing conditions that will scare away sponsors will have the same result. So we are certainly not saying that we are against the health of Quebecers and Canadians and that we do not care about our children's health. Of course we want everyone to be healthy, and we realize that it is important for our quality of life. It is also important in economic terms, because prevention saves a lot of money in the long run.

Today, however, at the report stage we must consider amendments or proposals that would make this bill a piece of viable legislation, something sound that would pass the test of time but not at the expense of the people who have the jobs that would

*Government Orders*

disappear as a result of this decision. There are other aspects in the bill that deserve far more attention than they are getting right now, and there certainly should be no time limitation in this respect, and I am referring, for instance, to the matter of regulatory powers.

We should learn from the legislation passed during the past 15, 20 or 30 years, where the government basically tried to make up our minds for us, to regulate everything so people would no longer have to make up their own minds. I think people have realized there is no future in this approach, that there are no answers. We need an approach that emphasizes educating the public so that people can consider the various options and are free to do what they think is best.

• (1320)

Sometimes, reversing the onus of proof is not necessarily a wise decision. Some more fine tuning is necessary in that respect.

Why is the government putting a gag on this debate? It is now early March. There will be three weeks of debate between now and Easter, so we would have enough time to do a thorough job and end up with a bill everyone can be proud of. Let us not forget that, during debate at second reading, there was a fairly extensive agreement in principle, but there are problems that have yet to be resolved, that are still on the table. I would not like anyone to say that we are voting against the bill because we oppose the fact that the government wants to improve the health of Quebecers and Canadians. That is not the issue at all.

The issue is how to go about creating a law that improves the health of Canadians or is likely to, without doing so to the detriment of events that create jobs and provide people with reasonable situations? We cannot take away with one hand what we are giving with the other. There has to be a balance, and the bill is not satisfactory in this regard.

How can we go about finding other solutions in the area of sponsorship? Are there other forms of sponsorship we could consider, which would be attractive and sure of a market for the future? Could a support fund be set up and used? Could there be an extension so that businesses had the time to adapt and make adjustments? Could the \$20 million used over the past year in the flag campaign not be set aside for this purpose? If this money were put in a fund to lessen the impact on sponsors so events could be held, would this not be a solution?

We may not have all the solutions right now, but one of them is not rushing this bill through, without examining things carefully and seeing how to go about protecting sporting and cultural events, especially those in Quebec. You may know that out of the \$60

million invested in sponsoring this kind of event in Canada \$30 million go to Quebec.

Is it chance, is it an unfortunate result, or is it a lack of sensitivity to Quebec's concerns, a lack of caring on the part of the present government? In any case, the result is that these cultural and sports events with economic spinoffs mostly in Quebec will be affected by this bill, which in turn will have a very negative impact on jobs.

Montreal is a city rich in cultural events and tourist attractions throughout the summer. They are held one after the other, creating non-stop economic spinoffs. The measures provided by this bill will result in adjustments of such magnitude that some events might have to be cancelled. We are not trying to stir up trouble when we say that we must give it more thought. We must review the situation and try to find solutions.

The Bloc Québécois has asked the Minister of Health and the Minister of Canadian Heritage to offer financial measures in compensation and to act as politicians responsible for their actions, but we have had no response from the health minister, who has been stonewalling all the demands from the Bloc and other witnesses with similar requests.

What is the reason for such pigheadedness? Why is it so urgent to find a short term solution to this problem? This we cannot ascertain for the moment, but to conclude I will invite the government to think about the political impact of the steps it is taking now. Today it saw in the streets of Montreal and elsewhere the ire directed at its bill. I believe this is an argument it will listen to even if it does not want to listen to other more economic ones.

For all these reasons, I urge the government to think twice about this, to change its position and offer solutions that will allow sports and cultural events to survive and have an adequate economic impact in the years to come.

• (1325)

**Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House to speak to Bill C-71, the Tobacco Act. This gives me the opportunity to explain to constituents in the riding of Châteauguay where my party and I stand on this bill.

Concerning the principle of this bill, as we have said many times, we voted for it at second reading. Indeed, I feel it is important to inform and educate people and eliminate the subliminal propaganda aimed at children. We know that tobacco use has an impact on the health of Quebecers and Canadians. That is why the Bloc Québécois gave its approval in principle at second reading, as long as changes were made to the way the products could be displayed in the stores, that the regulations were tabled immediately and that more leeway was given for sponsorships, but this is not the case.

*Government Orders*

We intend to vote against this bill at third reading. While we support the principle of regulating the use of tobacco, we do not agree with the measures associated with signs, particularly with regard to sponsor identification. We also have a problem with the future regulations, because they give the minister too much leeway in the implementation of this bill and the way the products are to be displayed in the stores does not meet our demands.

As I was saying, the negative impact of tobacco use on the health of Quebecers and Canadians has been proven and demonstrated. This Liberal government is mistaken if it thinks that banning sponsorships is the solution. Moreover, we know that many Liberal members, and also senators, have their doubts about the bill this government is getting ready to pass. However, they do not have enough backbone to defend Quebec.

The government must be really out of touch to think that smokers will give up their habits if Benson & Hedges stops funding the fireworks. How can it imagine that non-smokers will start smoking simply because events such as the Grand Prix in Montreal are sponsored by tobacco companies? We do not need advanced courses in marketing to understand that sponsorships are an extra advertising tool for the brand, and not for the decision to start smoking.

Would it be dreaming in technicolour to think, as the labour minister told Liberals gathered in Quebec City last weekend, that other sponsors could take over from the tobacco companies? That will not happen and, contrary to what the minister said, it is not blackmail on the part of tobacco companies. We, in the Bloc Québécois, believe that several international events are threatened.

I would like to give us more food for thought in debating this bill. Little has been said about the therapeutic aspect of the various cultural and sports events sponsored by tobacco companies. Has consideration been given to how beneficial these events bringing the people of Quebec together can be? These are excellent opportunities for communities from various backgrounds to meet at one given place to share each in their own way experiences that are often quite meaningful.

• (1330)

Often, families and other groups that make up Quebec's society get together for such events. There is no doubt that all these events provide a break from routine, rest and entertainment. It would be most unfortunate that such festive reunions would be killed in the name of ensuring the well-being of Quebec's society. The Minister of Health should be sensitive to this reality, because it affects the mental health of an entire community.

Let us not delude ourselves into thinking that we will be able to undo the harm done after losing the only Formula I Grand Prix race in North America. Bear in mind that, in stubbornly rushing this bill through, the Liberals are forgetting their promise for jobs, jobs,

jobs. I agree with my hon. colleague from Rimouski—Témiscouata, who suggested that the Minister of Health was out of touch with the reality and economy in Quebec and that the Prime Minister should get involved.

Is there anyone in this government who takes Quebec's interests to heart? I hope to see Liberal members from Quebec rise for the first time to oppose this bill that will seriously affect Quebec's economy.

Do not tell us that this bill has the support of the people of Quebec. It is not true. For example, a SOM-*Le Soleil* poll conducted last December showed that close to three quarters of the adult population in the Quebec City region were opposed to the provisions contained in this bill. Moreover, at noon today, merchants from downtown Montreal held a protest against this bill, which will adversely affect the restaurant, tourism and business industries. The Montreal Chamber of Commerce stated its opposition to the Liberal government's bill by calling it a fundamentalist measure.

We must say it loud and clear to Quebecers: this bill goes beyond the laudable goal of fighting tobacco consumption. It will directly affect Montreal's sports and cultural events. It will make them disappear, thus eliminating a whole industry in the city's economy.

This is a sad record for a government that is about to call a general election. Chances are the upcoming polls will be very revealing for the Bloc, which really looks after the interests of Quebecers. The bill also reflects a favourite tactic of this Liberal government. I am referring to the postponement, until after the general election, of certain irritants such as the implementation of clauses 24(2) and 24(3) on sponsorship. This is a tactic frequently used by the Minister of Finance, and it most certainly inspired his colleague, the Minister of Health.

Even though some measures are being postponed, international events such as the Montreal Grand Prix will be in jeopardy as early as this year, because of certain clauses of the bill dealing with issues such as broadcasting and communication media.

For all these reasons, I will oppose the bill at third reading, and I urge all members to do likewise. We will vote against this bill at third reading.

[English]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I believe the hon. member for Macleod wishes to speak to group 2. 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 of the motion will please say ye.

*Government Orders*

**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 motion stands deferred.

• (1335)

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 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 Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

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 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 Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 26 and 29.

We will now go to Group No. 2.

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.)** moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-71 be amended by adding after line 14 on page 4 the following:

“8.1 No young person shall obtain or attempt to obtain a tobacco product in a public place or in a place to which the public reasonably has access.”

**Hon. Douglas Peters (for Minister of Health, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-71, in Clause 12, be amended by replacing lines 43 and 44 on page 4 and lines 1 and 2 on page 5 with the following:

“where the device is in

(a) a place to which the public does not reasonably have access; or

(b) a bar, tavern or beverage room and has a prescribed security mechanism.”

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-71, in Clause 12, be amended by replacing line 2 on page 5 with the following:

“that is activated before each transaction or that is in a place to which young persons are not permitted by law to have access.”

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.)** moved:

Motion No. 30

That Bill C-71 be amended by adding after line 33 on page 17 the following:

“45.1 Every young person who contravenes section 8.1 is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$75.”

He said: Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate that this bill is not perfect. Reformers strongly object to time allocation. There is no way that anti-democratic action should take place in this House.

I have a couple of other objections for the record. The regulations that will follow this bill will not be subject to parliamentary scrutiny. I object to that. I also object to the fact that there was a way to make cigarettes a drug delivery system and to have nicotine restricted in that vein.

My third objection is reflected by my amendments. The law states that it is illegal to sell tobacco to youths, and so it should be. The fines are substantial. However, the onus is all on the shopkeepers. They must check for identification. They take all the flack. They must police our kids for us. Who actually intends to break the law? The shopkeepers in this situation are innocent.

The youth who comes into the store and who looks 17 does not get very much time from the shopkeeper, but the youth who comes in and who looks 22 but is actually 17 puts the shopkeeper in jeopardy. I believe, as do most shopkeepers, that there should be some onus placed on the youths who break the law. They are the individuals who come to the shops to break the law.

It is done with alcohol. The underage youth comes in to buy a beer. Do we charge the vendor? Of course not. We charge the youth for doing something illegal. The youth gets charged with illegal

*Government Orders*

possession, and we certainly do not go after the individual who sold the beer to the youth.

This amendment recognizes that a youth under 18 purchasing tobacco is the culprit in the equation and suggests a small fine for the youth breaking the law. Obtaining and attempting to obtain should be discouraged by a penalty. Those are the amendments I put before the House.

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to address this motion. Maybe I can address a few issues that have been raised so far in the debate. I draw members' attention to the motions before the House which I will comment on briefly.

Motion No. 2, moved by the member for Macleod, suggests that it become a criminal offence for young persons to possess or attempt to possess a tobacco product in a public place. Creating such an offence of possession would be contrary to the government's policy approach. As the member indicated, the onus is on the vendor.

• (1340)

We are trying to focus control into the commercial activities of retailers so the onus would rest and vest with the retailer. I suggest that making it illegal for young people to possess tobacco products would subject hundreds of thousands of young people to potential criminal prosecution. That may be the intended objective of some members, but at this stage we want to focus on the commercial relationship that is initiated by the retailer offering this product for sale.

Motion No. 4 has been proposed by the Minister of Health to clarify an amendment put forward in committee. Clause 12 was originally amended in committee to allow the use of vending machines with locking devices to be continued. The amendment now before us clarifies that vending machines with locking devices will be permitted only in a bar, tavern or a beverage room. Cigarette vending machines have been restricted to these locations since the coming into force of the Tobacco Sales to Young Persons Act in 1994 and we want to continue that practice.

The reference to a prescribed security mechanism is preferred to the phrase that is currently proposed "that is activated before each transaction" as expressed in the amendment adopted by the Standing Committee on Health. In this way the government can determine through consultation the most appropriate types of security mechanisms with a view to advancing the objective of limiting youth access.

Motion No. 5, moved by the member for Lévis, would also amend clause 12. The member suggests that vending machines be

allowed to remain in places where youth do not have access, which is one of the venues where prescribed tobacco advertising and sponsorship promotions will be permitted. This amendment should be rejected on the grounds that on occasion youth do gain access to places where they are not permitted to be by law. Obviously the availability of tobacco products through unsupervised transactions poses a more immediate peril than does the appearance of tobacco promotions.

Finally, Motion No. 30 is proposed by the member for Macleod. It would set a maximum fine for young people who are acting as retailers and selling cigarettes illegally to other youth. The member's concern that young persons not be subjected to harsh penalties is addressed by Bill C-71. The bill sets maximums rather than minimum fines. Furthermore, a young offender between the ages of 12 and 18 years of age would be dealt with according to the Young Offenders Act, which provides for the use of alternative measures such as community service.

Mr. Speaker, in my remaining time I would like to address some of the comments made by members opposite on Friday, February 21, during the first part of report stage debate on the bill. On that date the member for Lévis stated that the Bloc shares the objectives of the Minister of Health on the issue. However, both he and his colleagues made statements which point to an opposite position. By the way, it is a position which was raised again earlier this morning in debate.

I believe I am quoting the member for Lévis correctly when he said "that the government shows no compassion, no willingness whatsoever to deal with the issue of sponsorships". The government has proposed an implementation period, so clearly this is incorrect. He said that without the regulations nothing in Bill C-71 can be implemented. This too is clearly wrong and, in fact, false.

The House will be surprised to learn that the member for Drummond is the health critic. She talked about the economic benefits of cultural and sports organizations. She is correct, there are benefits. She forgets that the government has not banned tobacco sponsorship. She overlooks that the government has proposed an implementation period. But more seriously, she and others on her side of the House have ignored the fact that there are 12,000 tobacco related deaths in Quebec each year.

• (1345)

They ignore that there are 38 per cent of Quebecers who are smokers. That average is higher than anywhere else in the country.

Members on this side of the House would like to hear those members' justifications for ignoring that there are 76,000 Quebec youth who take up smoking each and every year. They urge us to do nothing about that statistic.

*Government Orders*

There is a cost. Members will appreciate this in its appropriate context. There is a cost of some \$530 million to the Quebec health care system each year because of tobacco related illnesses. How do members opposite from the Bloc justify their opposition to Bill C-71 in the face of these facts?

On Friday, February 21 the member for Trois-Rivières tried to convince himself that sponsorship promotion does not affect attitudes toward smoking. Obviously he did not consult with the minister for health in Quebec because he has an entirely different view.

He and his colleagues ignore an extensive and growing body of international evidence confirming that young people are aware of and susceptible to promotional practices. It also confirms that it is not possible to promote the brand of cigarette without simultaneously promoting tobacco products and their use.

Members will know that 85 per cent of smokers and 83 per cent of non-smokers in the 10 to 19-year old age group see sponsorship promotion as a way of advertising cigarettes. This is the age group in Quebec starting to smoke at a higher rate than in any other province in the country. Furthermore, sponsorship promotion has been the predominant form of tobacco products promotion in Canada since the advertising ban in 1988.

On February 21 the member from Timiskaming criticized the provisions of Bill C-71 which limit the access of youth to cigarettes. The Bloc must now answer regarding whether or not it is advocating the sale of tobacco products to youth. Let us address that issue.

The member for Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies stood in this House on February 21 and said that everybody recognizes that smoking is not healthy. Great. He said that we must do all that we can to prevent our young people from starting to smoke, but not this.

The member for Berthier—Montcalm said that Quebecers will suffer most from this bill. Quebecers are already suffering the most. If they accept the figures that I have given, in terms of the health component, they should answer their own rhetorical question.

Quebecers smoke more and are dying faster than people in any other region of the country as a result of tobacco induced illnesses. Right now in Quebec there are up to a million citizens who will eventually die of tobacco related causes. The members opposite want to defend a continuation of the status quo. That same member said that cigarettes are good because they put \$3.5 billion into the government's treasury but he did not appreciate that they take out some \$15 billion in direct and indirect costs.

The member for Argenteuil—Papineau said that the government did not take into account the testimony heard before the health committee. How false a misrepresentation that would be.

The committee recommended that the Minister of Health consider an implementation period for the sponsorship promotion restriction. That is before this House today.

The same member reminded the House on February 21 that the Bloc voted for the bill on second reading because it recognized the validity of the government's objectives.

• (1350)

If it did, are the principles of Bill C-71 today less valid than they were in December of last year? Are there fewer Canadians being affected by tobacco than there were last—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I regret the hon. member's time has expired. The hon. member for Lévis.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we have to acknowledge that the parliamentary secretary is quite brave. He at least has the decency to show up in this House. On the Liberal side, he is among the very few who stand up for this bill, or at least try to do so. He is having quite a hard time, because even though we support the objectives aimed at in the 80 per cent of the bill that is justifiable, including the fight against smoking among young people, there are some provisions that are unacceptable and not applicable.

I realize that it is still useful to speak up in this House. The parliamentary secretary did not like certain things the official opposition, Bloc members, said and he is giving us a piece of his mind, and I appreciate this debate we are having. However, I would like for more of his colleagues to show the same courage.

We are dealing with Group No. 2. What is the purpose of these motions? Let me focus more specifically on the amendment we put forward. It is Motion No. 5 concerning clause 12. What does clause 12 say? It deals with vending machines that have a security mechanism.

In the clause by clause consideration of this bill, we managed to convince the parliamentary secretary to approve an amendment and to recognize the fact that, in some public places, a security mechanism with a remote control could be used. It was accepted by the Department of Health, but everything has changed all of a sudden. A wind of change has been blowing on the Department of Health since the arrival of the new minister. They want to regulate everything and they no longer accept what used to be accepted.

In this case as in many others, Quebecers showed some ingenuity, as they often do. They thought of using the same kind of remote control mechanism that is used for a television set. Those who use these remote control mechanisms are called zappers. The same principle was applied to vending machines. An employee could block access to a vending machine and, using this remote control,

*S. O. 31*

could allow the client to buy cigarettes himself by inserting the right amount of money in the machine.

What was the purpose of the bill initially? It was designed to have these vending machines kept in a place to which the public does not have access. Maybe this would not have been a problem in a large restaurant or in a large bar, but imagine what the situation would be in a small country bar with only one employee. According to this bill, if a client asked for cigarettes, the waiter would have had to leave the restaurant or the bar unattended to get cigarettes from a place to which the public does not have access. That is what the bill was designed to do initially.

By putting forward arguments and explaining our point of view, we finally succeeded in making the parliamentary secretary understand that an amendment was necessary. Of course, it seems very difficult for the Liberal Party to accept an amendment proposed by the opposition. They do not think the opposition can be right sometimes. And on the rare occasions where they have to agree with us, they cannot admit that we are completely right. That is why we are raising this issue again in the House at report stage, in front of the television cameras, to say that we may have won on the principle of security by remote control, but let us look, for example, at the situation in a bar where liquor is sold, but it cannot be sold to people under 18 years of age.

• (1355)

The purpose of the bill is to make access to tobacco products more difficult for young people under 18 years of age. Since only people 18 years of age and older are allowed into establishments restricted to adults, why would there be any need to activate the safety mechanism on a vending machine?

In a restaurant, this would be understandable, because young people may go there, accompanied by their parents. But if they have some money tucked away and their parents momentarily lose sight of them, they could buy cigarettes. So, it is understandable in a restaurant, but in a bar where it is prohibited anyway by law, by regulations, by fines or whatever, for a young person under the age of 18 to enter and consume alcoholic drinks, there is therefore less of a need, in our view, for this provision to be included because, ultimately, it departs from the purpose.

We have tried to make the government, the parliamentary secretary, understand this, without success.

When the parliamentary secretary broadened the discussion to include other provisions, reacting to comments from Bloc Quebecois members in particular, it is annoying, because we realize we were right. Members will recall that the government wanted to rush this bill through before the holidays. It put off consideration of the bill for months and then, just before Christmas, a couple of weeks before Christmas, it wanted to ram the bill through.

The Reform members went along with it. They even gave the bill their approval before it was printed, before they had read it.

Imagine. After a member from each party had spoken, the member who had introduced the amendment rose to speak for 30 seconds, after asking that the House pass the bill quickly, before the holidays, with no study or debate.

We in the official opposition suggested that some witnesses be heard by the committee, with the result that the bill was not passed before the holidays. What happened? There was a debate and public pressure made itself felt, with the result that the minister felt obliged to table certain amendments that are an improvement, that spread out the effect, but that shifted the problem. We are used to seeing this government dump things onto the provinces, but now it is dumping—

**The Speaker:** My dear colleague, you are entitled to two more minutes for your speech, if you wish to use them after oral question period.

It being 2 p.m., we will proceed to statements by members.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### CURLING

**Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate my constituent, Jim Packet of Estevan, Saskatchewan, for winning the Saskatchewan Pool Tankard Men's Curling Championship on February 9, 1997, with a 7-6 extra end victory over his opponent.

Mr. Packet, along with third Jeff Mosley, second Dallas Duce and lead Ken Loeffler won the Saskatchewan tankard with a dramatic finish in a thrilling extra end. This means that Packet and his team will be competing at the Labatt Brier in Calgary on March 8, 1997.

I know I speak for all my constituents as well as all the people from the province of Saskatchewan when I wish Jim Packet, Jeff Mosley, Dallas Duce and Ken Loeffler the best of luck at the upcoming brier competition.

\* \* \*

### SMALL BUSINESS

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, small and medium size businesses are creating the majority of new full time jobs in Canada. The Liberal government acknowledges that this is true.

Small and medium sized businesses in a recent survey say the conditions necessary for them to hire more people are increased consumer demand and lower taxes. Lower payroll taxes were cited



*S. O. 31*

by over 40 per cent as a necessary condition for them to hire more workers.

Why then did the finance minister not listen to these views with respect to payroll taxes? He not only failed to reduce payroll taxes. He increased them. A whopping 73 per cent increase in CPP premiums will overwhelm the minuscule reduction in EI premiums. In 1998, for example, CPP premium increases will take three times as much out of the pockets of small business and workers as EI cuts will leave there.

This was a bad budget decision by the Liberals, bad news for job creators and bad news for the unemployed.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**TOBACCO LEGISLATION**

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the more one looks at the Liberal government's tobacco bill, the more one realizes the perverse effects of a piece of legislation which will obviously not attain the intended objective, unless that objective is to damage the Quebec economy.

On top of the millions of dollars Montreal will lose as a result of this hypocritical legislation, there is the domino effect of the Canadian health ayatollah's policy, which will impact upon all regions of Quebec, including Berthier—Montcalm, unfortunately.

During the Montreal Grand Prix weekend, tourists from Japan, Europe and the southern United States come to visit the Gilles Villeneuve museum in Berthierville. The museum, and the local economy, will lose those thousands of tourists from other countries, for if there is no Grand Prix sponsorship, there will be no Grand Prix, no high-profile drivers, no foreign visitors.

Who could possibly believe that there could be any beneficial effects for Montreal and other areas of Quebec when they lose thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars in economic benefits?

This minister needs to be put back on the right track, for he most certainly is not on it at present.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION**

**Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the United States has served notice that it will invoke section 20, the national security clause of the World Trade Organization, to keep the regulatory body from adjudicating a European Union challenge to the controversial Helms-Burton law.

The Americans argue they fear a Cuban invasion and that their national security is threatened. Therefore they will boycott a World

Trade Organization dispute settlement panel struck to examine the trade legitimacy of the Helms-Burton legislation.

If the Americans can use section 20, why does Canada not invoke section 20 to maintain a secure supply of food as a national security issue? Why not invoke section 20 to keep an American attack on our cultural industries at bay, or to ward off an attack on our generic pharmaceuticals, or perhaps most important to protect the eventual invasion by the United States to direct our water from our rivers and lakes into the United States mid and southwest?

If Americans can use section 20 of the World Trade Organization to protect the most powerful military nation on earth from a Cuban invasion, surely we can use the same argument to protect our cultural industries, our food supply, our Canadian—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Fredericton—York—Sunbury.

\* \* \*

**SKY'S THE LIMIT SNOW CHALLENGE**

**Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York-Sunbury, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to act as honorary chair of the 1997 Sky's the Limit Snow Challenge a few weeks ago at Crabbe Mountain near Fredericton. The snow challenge was a huge success with 44 teams of eight taking part in a day of activities that ranged from snow golf to inner tube races.

While the fresh air, exercise and camaraderie were all wonderful, the best part of the snow challenge was that it raised more than \$50,000 for the New Brunswick Association for Community Living.

The New Brunswick Association for Community Living is a voluntary organization dedicated to advocacy around the interest of persons living with an intellectual disability. It provides training and information and works to change policies and programs to better meet the needs of a range of individuals.

I extend congratulations to all team members, volunteers and organizers for such a successful challenge. It was well done.

\* \* \*

**ARMENIAN COMMUNITY**

**Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Don Valley North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the year 1887 saw the arrival of the first Armenian immigrants in Canada at Port Hope, Ontario. It is an honour to rise in the House today to recognize the 110th anniversary of the Armenian community in Canada.

Canadians of Armenian origin continue to contribute to the life and vitality of this great nation. Congratulations go to all Armenians on 110 years of building their future in Canada.

*S. O. 31*

My ancestral homeland, Armenia, was a victim of a horrible earthquake in 1988. I trust Canadians will rise to the occasion today as they did then in response to the tragic loss of innocent lives and the horrible destruction caused by the recent earthquakes in Iran and Pakistan.

Canadians from all walks of life are witness to the pain and sorrow of the victims of this horrible tragedy and wish them a rapid recovery.

\* \* \*

● (1405)

**CANADA INFRASTRUCTURE WORKS PROGRAM**

**Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 1, I had the pleasure of attending the official opening of the new civic hall and library in the town of Hanover.

The new civic centre and library was made possible through the Canada infrastructure works program which is driven by local priorities and involves all three levels of government.

We have extended the program adding \$425 million to the \$175 million to be spent in 1997, for a total of \$600 million this year.

For those few who question the program may I suggest they examine the quality of life in those countries and communities that have ignored infrastructure. It is not a pleasant sight.

Infrastructure is more than a program to create jobs in the short run. It is an investment in the fixed assets of a country for its long term economic viability. Infrastructure is a bridge to the future.

I congratulate the town of Hanover for its forward looking vision and its commitment to enhancing the quality of life for its citizens.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**TOBACCO LEGISLATION**

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, every year thousands of tourists flock to the Témiscamingue region for the Ville-Marie international regatta, and of course to visit our magnificent region at the same time.

This event has a major economic impact on our region, not to mention the redistribution of profit among local organizations in order to improve the quality of life there.

Alas, the Liberal government is going at it hammer and tongs, threatening the survival of events of this type with its Bill C-71. This bill, in doing away with tobacco company sponsorships, will deprive the international regatta circuit of a major financial partner. And what lies behind such a decision? A desire to encourage young people to smoke less, or a desire to get at Quebec's sporting and

cultural events, the focus of 50 per cent of the tobacco companies' sponsorships?

This is, in fact, just window-dressing, a measure by a government which wants to give the impression that it is concerned about the health of Canadians, and to make people forget the billions of dollars in cuts to health care funding.

I wish to make it clear to the people of Témiscamingue that the Bloc Québécois will continue its battle against this bill and will keep on demanding that the Liberals explain themselves to all parts of Quebec when the next election is held.

\* \* \*

[English]

**PATENT DRUGS**

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker,

When Liberals sat in the opposition bench  
They fought both day and night  
To keep the dreaded free trade bill  
From ever seeing light

They also wanted cheaper drugs  
While in their opposition role  
And so they howled that patent drugs  
Should be under tight control

What a shock the public got  
When the drug review came up  
To find new spin since NAFTA's in  
That drug patents can't be touched

Liberals believe we don't notice  
But voters think a lot  
There is one thing they won't forgive  
And that's the old flip flop!

The public are fed up with this  
There really is no doubt  
And when it come election time  
They'll throw these rascals out.

\* \* \*

**A TOONIE FOR CANADA**

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise in recognition of A Toonie for Canada, a student driven unity initiative in my riding of Burlington.

On February 14 of this year the Hon. Jane Stewart, the Minister of National Revenue, and member for Halton—Peel, Julian Reed, joined with me to celebrate and officially launch this project.

With Burlington resident, Tom Dykes, the staff and students of Notre Dame Secondary School have developed an innovative approach to educating and exciting other young Canadians from coast to coast to coast about national unity.

The Chrétien government has placed a great deal of importance on demonstrating our confidence in Canada and in Canadians, especially young Canadians.

Clearly the students of Notre Dame Secondary School have given us every reason to be confident that young Canadians are more willing than ever to take an active role in reshaping Canada's future.

*S. O. 31*

I ask colleagues to join with me in congratulating these fine young Canadians on their dedication to our wonderful country.

**The Speaker:** I remind members not to use the names of any member of Parliament. While I am on my feet, I might mention that the word ayatollah in certain contexts might not be too favourable.

\* \* \*

**GERRY DONOGHUE**

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Mr. Gerry Donoghue, a veteran of Hill TV journalism who is in the gallery today.

Mr. Donoghue is no stranger to these halls. He has been a cameraman on Parliament Hill for 37 years and has had an admirable career with several news companies.

Having worked in this place since 1959 he has observed the work of eight Prime Ministers and has watched history unfold. He represents the men and women who work with the press in this country. They are the eyes and ears of Canadians in our political institutions and a pillar of our democracy.

Well done, Gerry Donoghue.

\* \* \*

• (1410)

[Translation]

**STATUS OF WOMEN**

**Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, during the 1993 elections, we campaigned on a number of issues and concerns of particular interest for women.

In our red book, we made a commitment to women's health, and I quote: "A Liberal government will add a Centre of Excellence for Women's Health, aimed at effective and equal treatment of women's health issues in the Canadian health care system".

On June 25, our government announced the establishment of five centres of excellence for women's health. These centres are being set up to remedy the grave failures of our research efforts with regard to women's health and of a health care system which does not pay enough attention to the particular needs of women across Canada.

This is only one of our government's many achievements in favour of Canadian women.

\* \* \*

**TOBACCO ACT**

**Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, hundreds of citizens in Trois-Rivières have shown their opposition

to the bill aimed at regulating tobacco sponsorship, and attempted once again to bring to its senses this Liberal government which is jeopardizing the very existence of the Trois-Rivières Grand Prix.

SIDAC members, stores and businesses, suspended their activities for 15 minutes in a show of solidarity because the Saint-Maurice area cannot allow this government to cause the loss of \$10 million in economic spinoffs, of hundreds of jobs, and the loss of international exposure due to the broadcasting of the Trois-Rivières Grand Prix in 141 countries.

Under the guise of public health, a concept it abuses, this government is making a mockery of the freedom of expression and showing its intolerance and shortsightedness by leading people to believe that the disappearance of tobacco sponsorship will be synonymous with an improvement in public health.

This is the reason why people in greater Trois-Rivières are once again condemning the stubbornness of the Prime Minister, although he is from our area, and the fundamentalism of the Liberal government.

\* \* \*

[English]

**JUSTICE**

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a man sexually assaulted his stepdaughter for 12 years beginning when she was a child. An impaired driver caused an accident that killed his friend. A British Columbia man was convicted of abducting and sodomizing a single mother. None of these criminals are serving time in jail, courtesy of the Liberal government's Bill C-41 which has resulted in case after case of criminals walking free.

Now the Liberal's sentencing law is on trial in three provinces. In Alberta nine cases involving conditional sentences have been brought to the top court on both crown and defence appeals; crown prosecutors in B.C. are considering an appeal; and the Attorney General of Ontario has asked for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, all on matters dealing with conditional sentences.

Had the justice minister accepted the advice of the Canadian Police Association, Victims of Violence, the attorneys general and the Reform Party to clearly limit conditional sentencing, he would not once again find his legislation in court.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**TOBACCO ACT**

**Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, tobacco companies are using sponsorship of cultural and sports events to blackmail us in order to prevent the passage of our tobacco legislation.

*Oral Questions*

However, this tactic did not stop more than 300 artists from getting together to form the ACST, which stands for Artistes pour les commandites sans tabac, or artists for tobacco-free sponsorships. The purpose of the group is twofold: first, while the tobacco industry would have everyone believe that the entire artistic community opposes the bill, they are there to prove it wrong. Second, they want to draw attention to the utilitarian side of tobacco sponsorships. Their records show they have much more far-reaching implications. Sponsorships actually sell cigarettes.

These artists realize that, as far as public health is concerned, sponsorships will never take precedence over the health of our young people.

\* \* \*

[English]

**WOMEN'S INSTITUTE**

**Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Middlesex, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if anyone knew about the day to day concerns and hardships of farm women, Adelaide Hoodless did. She was born on a farm near Brantford, Ontario, in 1857, one of 12 children.

Throughout her life she maintained her close connection with the Farmers' Institute. In 1897, at a meeting in Stoney Creek, Ms. Hoodless proposed the organization of a sister group to the Farmers' Institute and a few days later formed the first Women's Institute. The idea spread rapidly and by the early 1900s there were many chapters right across Canada.

• (1415)

The designated day for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Women's Institute in Ontario was February 19, the day Ms. Hoodless was made honorary president 100 years ago in Stoney Creek.

Women's Institutes in the riding of Lambton—Middlesex and in the rest of Canada should be very proud of their achievements. I take this opportunity to extend my heartiest congratulations.

---

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[Translation]

**TOBACCO ACT**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, today in Montreal thousands of people are demonstrating their disagreement with the federal government, which is getting ready to wipe out major sports and cultural events with the anti-advertising provisions contained in the bill.

Although everyone shares the same anti-smoking objectives, it must realize that many people, restaurant owners, hotel operators,

taxi drivers, are convinced they will lose a large part of their earnings if Quebec's cultural and sports events are attacked.

Is the Prime Minister aware that in Montreal alone, I hope the ministers from Quebec across the way are listening closely, \$240 million in spinoffs will disappear because the government is refusing to listen to reason concerning tobacco company sponsorships?

[English]

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member opposite for his question. The fact of the matter remains that over the last number of months we have been very reasonable and very comprehensive in the legislation we are putting forward.

As I am sure the hon. member knows and knows only too well, there is no banning of sponsorships. There is no banning of sponsorship promotion. In point of fact it was his party and this leader who stood in their places and supported the principles on second reading which included the restrictions on sponsorships.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to remind the minister, as I did yesterday, that our political party shares the objective of reducing smoking. What we do not agree with is their desire to kill events in Montreal.

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

**Mr. Gauthier:** I would like to tell the health minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, that Quebecers will never accept a decision that interferes with the entire range of sports and cultural development, particularly that of Montreal and of Quebec. We will not accept it.

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

**Mr. Gauthier:** Did the health minister not hold discussions with his colleagues from Quebec? Did nobody in this government point out to him that, if over 50 per cent of sponsorships go to Quebec, the repercussions of his plan on Quebec will be extremely negative in the short term?

[English]

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, members of all political parties in the House have to listen quite carefully to what the Leader of the Official Opposition says on the subject matter.

So that we have all the facts I will share with my hon. colleague opposite that 36 of the medical associations in la belle province de Québec are in support of the legislation; 24 public health networks in the province of Quebec support the legislation; 140 hospitals in the province of Quebec support the legislation; and 27 anti-tobacco groups in the province of Quebec support the legislation.

*Oral Questions*

When the hon. member stands in his place let him remember that in the province of Quebec in excess of 200 municipal units support the provisions of Bill C-71.

• (1420)

**The Speaker:** At this point I judge the questions to be in order today because they never made mention of the bill which we are debating in the House. I would ask also that in the responses from the government no mention of the bill be brought up.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister can talk all he wants about support but the fact remains that, if he were more aware of what was going in Quebec, he would know that on all the radio stations today, everywhere, Quebecers are protesting against certain provisions of his bill. They would like to get him to listen to reason.

I heard the Minister of Labour say on television: "We will see. Perhaps it will be the end of the world; we will wait and see". Is the government going to run the risk of waiting and seeing Quebec's sports and cultural events destroyed before reacting? Are we once again going to be the victim of a bad decision made by Ottawa much too far away from where we live?

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

[*English*]

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues opposite for that round of applause. I think the tone has been hit by the Leader of the Opposition when he talks about reasonableness.

The fact is the chairman of the Standing Committee on Health heard all the various groups make representation. It was a result of their recommendation, which his party was a part of, that this government had heeded the suggestion of the hon. member, giving him an implementation period.

I want the hon. opposite to reflect on this: "My name is Eric Carsley. My wife, my companion, my best friend for 23 years, died two years ago at the age of 45 from lung cancer that was caused by her smoking". That man is from the province of Quebec. This government stands solidly behind children and people across the country to fight tobacco consumption in this country.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in a letter addressed to Hon. Senator Colin Kenny, Senator Céline Hervieux-Payette, who is not a Bloc Quebecois member—

**An hon. member:** No, she is Liberal.

**An hon. member:** Not yet.

**Mr. Duceppe:** —who is Liberal, writes the following: "If Quebec's sports and cultural activities are to be the guinea pigs of a policy that will not produce its intended effects, I want no part of it". This comment is from Senator Céline Hervieux-Payette, the vice-president of the Liberal election campaign. She definitely did not make it for political expediency.

If the minister will not listen to the official opposition, will he at least listen to a Liberal senator, to the vice-president of the election campaign of a party seeking to win seats outside Quebec, but which seems to have let Quebec and its members down, since 68 per cent of Quebecers are against the Liberals?

[*English*]

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it was precisely for the reasons which were given at the Standing Committee on Health, where all members of different political parties were represented and recommendations came forward in order to provide some reasonableness for an implementation period for arts and cultural groups, that we have followed up on that suggestion.

Furthermore, I think it has to be understood that notwithstanding the date, October 1998, thereafter there is no banning of sponsorships. There is no banning of sponsorship promotion. In point of fact, our bill, as the leader of the opposition has indicated, is indeed very reasonable.

• (1425)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the party in office rejected all the amendments we proposed. It did not want to hear promoters of cultural and sports events—

**An hon. member:** None.

**Mr. Duceppe:** —and had it not been for the Bloc Quebecois, these people would not have been heard. Ask them—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** My colleagues, I am listening very carefully to the questions as they are posed. It is true that today we are debating a certain bill. It is also true that before the question is posed, and I do not know what the question is, if members take me too far down the road in the preamble it would be my intention to intervene.

However, with respect to all members who are raising their voices in question period, I have judged to this point for these questions which are posed to be of a general enough nature that they are acceptable. I am going to permit these questions, providing they do not refer specifically to the bill under discussion today.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]*

**Mr. Duceppe:** Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I am quoting the Hon. Senator, who said: "Give me your support to keep Montreal, which is already plagued by unemployment, from being the big loser regarding this policy".

Did the minister hear the people from Trois-Rivières today, those from Montreal, the cab drivers, the restaurant and hotel owners, the promoters of major cultural and sports events, who said it does not make sense to destroy Montreal's cultural and sports life, to eliminate its cultural and sports events, adding that the government should educate young people about the dangers of tobacco use, instead of going after Montreal's economy and the city's cultural and sports events? Will the minister listen to these people once and for all?

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

*[English]*

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it was precisely for those reasons that many individuals came before the standing committee. That was the rationale we had for the purposes of the implementation period, so that people have the opportunity to adjust to the new regime.

It is quite false for individuals to suggest or to imply that this legislation in any way bans sponsorship or sponsorship promotions. What is being done is that restrictions are being placed on four essential items: the price, the place, the product and the promotion.

I am appalled that a candidate for the leadership of a party would stand in his place and dismiss \$3.5 billion in costs to our health care system and 40,000 lives each and every year. Shame on the Bloc Québécois.

\* \* \*

**PENSIONS**

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, 32 years ago today John Kroeker was fired from the federal civil service for daring to criticize the Pearson government's newly created Canada pension plan.

Mr. Kroeker rightly predicted that the CPP was unsustainable and for that he lost his job. For that he was blackballed by the federal government and labelled a kook. Mr. Kroeker said that the CPP would be broke by the year 2000 without constant and large infusions of cash from Canadian taxpayers.

Will the Prime Minister, who was part of that Pearson government decades ago, admit that Mr. Kroeker was right in 1965 and that his own Liberal government was wrong?

**Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what is wrong is that the Reform Party is wrong about the CPP. We have changed the rules of the CPP.

I have to remind the Reform Party that the CPP is a federal-provincial policy.

• (1430)

It is not just a federal program. To change the CPP requires two-thirds majority of the provinces with two-thirds of the population. We have gone out as a government and got that two-thirds majority. We have the support of the majority of the provinces.

In the Reform Party's proposal for reform, does it have the support of any of the provinces? It has the support of none of the provinces, let alone a two-thirds majority. It does not have the support of any.

We have, also, the support of the Canadian people. The Canadian people want a secure, publicly funded pension program and we have the support of the Canadian people.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that this junior minister talks about having the support of all the provinces on it.

In 1965 Mr. Kroeker stated that the Pearson government simply lured the provinces into the CPP by offering them loans from the fund at amazingly low bargain basement interest rates. No wonder they are keen on the project.

Thirty years later in the 1990s this government is doing exactly the same thing with the provincial governments. Using the CPP as a cash cow for governments was a lousy idea in 1965 and it is a lousy idea now, 30 years later.

Why did the Prime Minister and those in charge of dealing with the provinces right now on this deal lure the provinces into a sweetheart deal at the expense of the Canadian taxpayers who will have to belly up and pay that cash?

The Liberals learned nothing since 1965. Which way will it be, sweetheart deals for the provinces or the best deal for Canadian taxpayers in their retirement?

**Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what we have in the CPP now is the best deal for the Canadian people.

Compared with the Reform Party's absolutely ridiculous proposal with rates of return that are absolutely beyond belief, our proposal is a reasonable proposal. It is a proposal backed by the Canadian people and it is backed by the provinces. It is not a proposal that any of the provinces do not want. It is a proposal that the Canadian people want.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadian young people want to know that there will be a sustainable

*Oral Questions*

plan for them. They would like to earn three times as much through privately funding their own RRSP rather than any CPP plan.

Thirty-two years ago these Liberal politicians called John Kroeker crazy for predicting that CPP was unsustainable without constant payroll tax increases.

In the next 6 years from now alone, premiums will have gone up over 70 per cent and Canadians will be paying a full 10 per cent of their paycheques toward a pension plan that still is not sustainable.

The minister thinks people in the galleries here and across the country are really pleased about this plan of mismanagement of their own money.

Is it not true that the government is hiding the fact that premiums will have to go up again before the Canadian public gets any benefit which these people have promised?

**Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that younger Canadians want to know there is a secure pension plan. This Canada pension plan is that secure pension plan.

What would the Reform Party offer instead? The Reform Party's finance critic said about their own proposals on pension: "I'm kind of reluctant to get into the numbers". Why would he be reluctant to get into the numbers? It is because their numbers do not add up.

Why do they not add up? What would their contribution rate be? Would it be 10 per cent? Would it be 15 per cent? They do not say. How would they honour the commitment to today's seniors, \$18 billion a year and growing? Would they honour those commitments?

If they are going to honour those commitments, where would they find the money? Would they simply renege on those commitments? What do they plan for Canadians who have contributed?

\* \* \*

• (1435)

[Translation]

**TOBACCO ACT**

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

To explain why his government is going to such lengths to unreasonably restrict the sponsorship activities of the tobacco industry, the Prime Minister keeps referring to the health issue. There are other more efficient ways to protect the health of the public. What the Bloc Québécois is against is a ban on sponsorships, because it will be irretrievably detrimental to various sports and cultural events.

Is the Prime Minister aware that the official opposition has supported 80 per cent of the bill, that the Bloc has even moved

more proactive measures to fight smoking among young people and that if the Prime Minister were to agree to sit down with the opposition and event organizers, a solution could be found? Is he aware of that?

[English]

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is precisely for the reasons that the hon. member has referred to that we on this side of the House have accepted the very reasoned amendment which has been put forward by the chair of the Standing Committee on Health, that we have a period of time for the purposes of implementation keeping in mind, as I said previously, that in no way are we at the present time banning sponsorship or banning sponsorship promotion. After the implementation period is over there will still be the opportunity to promote one's product. So we are just restricting the promotion as well as the sponsorship.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, will the minister acknowledge that by trying so hard to save his head before the next election, he is not helping to improve the health of our fellow citizens, but is contributing to the demise of the tourist industry in Montreal, which will only make the people in Montreal and throughout the province of Quebec even poorer?

[English]

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** I have great respect for the honourable member opposite and I want to share with you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member the words of a prominent Quebecer: "Sponsorship is subliminal publicity. People associate cultural products to tobacco brands. It is a very powerful way to push consumption of the product, in particular among youth".

I know the hon. member does not wish to believe me, but perhaps the hon. member will believe the minister of health of the province of Quebec.

\* \* \*

**PENSIONS**

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, first the unsustainability of CPP was blamed on too many baby-boomers, then not enough people having children, then full indexing and disability benefits. Next it will be an act of God.

Now they want to simply continue the status quo, only with double the tax revenue.

The minister says that our numbers do not add up, but what does not add up is Canadians paying \$3,200 a year for a \$9,000 pension 30 years from now. That does not add up. Canadians deserve better than paying more to get less.

*Oral Questions*

Why will the government not dispel the fears of Canadians that CPP will not be there for them and offer individualized tax sheltered accounts for their mandatory CPP tax deductions?

**Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the CPP will be there for Canadians.

Why do Reformers not tell Canadians what their rates will be if they put their plan forth? Why do they not tell Canadians that the pension plan will not be there for the 50 year-olds and over and the present pensioners with their plan? Why do they not tell Canadians that it is going to cost them twice as much for their plan than it is for CPP and it will not secure their future for them?

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians of all age groups want and need to know that they can count on a decent standard of living upon retirement. There is no question of that. However, Canadians have been deceived in the past by successive Liberal-Tory governments about the sustainability of the CPP.

• (1440)

First the rate was 3.6 per cent. Now it is 5.6 per cent. Soon it will be 9.9 per cent. The minister talks about rates. Where is it going to stop? No one seems to know.

The government has proven that it cannot be trusted on the GST promise. What would lead Canadians to believe that it can keep a promise on the CPP?

**Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, was there a question?

The Reform Party misses the point. This reform of the CPP is supported by a majority of the provinces. This is a federal-provincial initiative. The Reform Party has no province supporting its suggestions whatsoever. We are going to secure a firm public pension plan for lower and middle income Canadians, for all Canadians.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**TOBACCO ACT**

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

When the official opposition comes to the defence of sponsorship of sports and cultural events, when it defends the importance of keeping the thousands of jobs that depend on it, the only remark the Prime Minister can muster is that the official opposition is being politically opportunistic.

If the Prime Minister defines opportunism as an attempt to save sporting and cultural events, how does he describe the behaviour of

his own government, which continues to pocket billions of dollars in taxes on tobacco? Is that is not what one would call opportunism?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the member did not reveal how much smoking costs the Quebec economy. In 1991, taxpayers paid \$4 billion because of smoking. This is in addition to the costs involved for all those who die of smoking related cancer or heart conditions.

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, would it not be opportunism to talk about improving health on the one hand and to protect the revenues Canada Post makes from continuing to allow the tobacco companies to advertise by mail on the other?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are talking about productivity. We are talking about jobs. Every year, 12,000 people die in Quebec, unfortunately, from smoking. We are taking action because we agree with Louise Beaudouin, the Quebec minister of culture, who said, and I quote: "I agree that Quebecers' health comes first and foremost" in *Le Soleil* last year.

\* \* \*

[English]

**HEALTH CARE**

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, what hypocrisy. After slashing health care funding to the provinces by 40 per cent, the Prime Minister is meddling in Ontario's affairs when that province is closing a hospital. It is like a business partner that pulls out of the business and still wants to run the thing.

Will the Prime Minister stop interfering in the personal affairs of Ontario when he is directly responsible for the crisis?

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is rather obvious that the Reform Party does not wish to stand in its place and support francophones outside the province of Quebec.

I want to tell the House and the hon. member that the Prime Minister of Canada has every right as a Canadian citizen to voice his opinion, whether in this House or outside. When it comes to defending francophones there is none better than the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada.

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, that is interesting because I went to the hospital this morning and asked the chief executive officer what he thought of the Liberal government's cuts. His comment to me: "If there weren't Liberal government cuts we wouldn't be in the position we are in today".

• (1445)

Where does the problem lie? Listen to this. The government gives \$221,500 to the Society for Canoe Championships. It then



gives \$734,766 to the Majestic Fur Association. Reform would give that money to health care.

Why does the government look after its buddies rather than looking after health care and the hospitals?

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is a great day. We have a representative of the Reform Party standing in the House in an unholy alliance with Michael Harris, the premier of the province of Ontario.

Canadians will not swallow this unholy alliance with the Conservatives in the province of Ontario. The Mike Harris tax break is going to cost in excess of \$5 billion on an annual basis. That is what the province of Ontario is doing with the money.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### TOBACCO ACT

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

Last weekend, his own supporters drew the labour minister's attention to the catastrophic effects this quasi-ban on tobacco sponsorships will have on Montreal's economy. Content with blindly defending his government's position on the matter, he added insult to injury by stating that, once they were through with tobacco, the Minister of Health would probably address alcohol.

Are we to understand from the irresponsible remarks made by the minister that his government is set to take the absurdity of its policies one step further by threatening to ban beer sponsorship of sports events? Does the minister mean to say that someone, somewhere in the federal government is preparing to shut down the Molson Centre or to prevent Labatts from sponsoring the Expos?

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the opposition would have us believe the apocalypse is upon us.

More seriously, I would like to quote someone who, we must agree, is an authority on the organization of the Montreal Grand Prix, Jacques Duval. He sent me a letter by fax yesterday, in which he states clearly the following: "Contrary to what you may think of someone who has been involved with auto racing for many years, I fully support the government policy on the tobacco control legislation.

He concludes by saying: "Media attitude in this issue is deplorable, and the remarks of some journalists are far from objective. I urge you not to yield to a campaign that is starting to look more and more like intimidation".

#### Oral Questions

I think there is no lack of support for the government's action, and we are here to—

**Some hon. members:** Oh!

**An hon. member:** Answer.

**Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ):** Dodging questions is an art, Mr. Speaker.

We will recall that, when the Minister of Health was considering banning raw milk cheese a few months ago, the Minister of Labour rose in the name of common sense. In the name of Montreal's economic health, will a Liberal from Quebec rise in this House today and speak up in its defence?

Will the Minister of Labour dare, once again, to rise and oppose this breach of common sense that will cost Montreal millions of dollars and thousands of jobs?

● (1450)

[English]

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister of Labour, has made many representations. It is because of that kind of quality representation that we have been able to provide an implementation period which will allow a variety of different groups to become accustomed to the new regime.

As I have said before, we are not banning sponsorships and we are not banning sponsorship promotion. Furthermore, if my colleague wishes to make representations to me with regard to banning beer at the Molson Centre I will take it under advisement.

\* \* \*

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a few short weeks ago in a hospital at which I used to work, a 60 year-old gentleman was having heart pain and, indeed, a heart attack. He had to be transferred to St. Paul's Hospital. He waited three days because there was not enough money to open the intensive care unit beds in that hospital. This man died.

My question is for the Minister of Health. Is that his version of the government allowing the provinces to absorb \$7 billion in transfer payment cuts to health care? Does he want the patients to absorb that with their lives?

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member opposite is an individual who likes to keep the House fully informed of all the facts. It would not be for me to suggest that there is any form of negligence being exercised here today.

As the hon. member knows, the reduction of interest rates alone has saved the treasuries of the provinces in excess of \$1.8 billion. Approximately \$8.6 billion is being provided through the auspices of equalization.

*Oral Questions*

The provinces asked something of the Government of Canada. They asked for predictable funding with a cash floor. Not only did we provide them with a cash floor, but we provided them with predictable funding not for three years, as they had requested, but for a five-year period with an escalation clause.

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we have been accused of being a slash and burn party. We want to put \$4 billion into the health care of Canadians.

How can the Minister of Health tell the provinces what stable funding is? Is stable funding the removal of \$7 billion in transfer payments to health and education? That is slash and burn health care in Canada.

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I get the opportunity to stand on the floor in the House of Commons to concur with the preamble of the hon. member's question when he refers to his party as the slash and burn party of the Parliament of Canada.

The hon. member opposite should discover all of the facts and not some of the selected facts that he and the leader of his party are trying to portray to the Canadian people. The reality, as exhibited by the National Forum on Health, is that Canada has the second most expensive health care system in the OECD countries. It is not an issue of funding. It is an issue of management.

\* \* \*

**THE ECONOMY**

**Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Last month, prior to the budget, the minister attended meetings with his financial counterparts from the G-7 nations. Based on budget projections, can the minister advise the House how Canada compares to the other G-7 industrialized nations of the world in economic growth and jobs and in bringing our financial house to order?

**Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the finance minister was very well received by his G-7 counterparts, largely because of the efforts Canada has made in deficit reduction.

Canadian federal borrowing requirements, which are the way most countries measure their deficits, have fallen sharply and will be eliminated in 1998-99. This will be well below any other G-7 country. The total government deficit, both federal and provincial, relative to the GDP has also improved dramatically. It was three percentage points above the G-7. It is now well below the G-7.

• (1455)

Furthermore, both the IMF and the OECD predict that Canada will have the fastest employment growth of the G-7 countries in 1997.

**TRADE**

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

The minister will be aware that the United States has indicated that it would ignore any World Trade Organization ruling having to do with the Helms-Burton act.

Would the Minister for International Trade consider, in the name of Canadian identity, if not security, adopting a similar stance toward WTO rulings which prevent Canada from defending itself with respect to culture and our health care system, vis-à-vis the price of drugs, things which are as important to Canadians as security surely is to Americans.

Would Canada consider that policy?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we believe that international obligations should be respected and we intend to respect them, whether they are with the WTO or with the NAFTA.

We have, in fact, secured provisions that are relevant to the protection of the health care system and relevant to the protection of culture as well.

We intend to continue to follow those rules. We expect the United States to also meet its obligations with respect to the WTO.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**AÉROPORTS DE MONTRÉAL**

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

On February 23, at a rally held to maintain Mirabel airport, Senator Céline Hervieux-Payette spoke on behalf of the government and sought to reassure the public by saying that the Liberal government would finally break the deadlock that it had created. The senator even added that a committee made up of two members of Parliament and three senators, all Liberal, was reviewing the issue and might propose the building of a high-speed train between Mirabel and Montreal's downtown.

Since the Standing Committee on Transport agreed today with the Bloc Québécois' arguments and decided to hold, in the near future, a day of public consultation on the Montreal airports issue, will the Deputy Prime Minister assure us that her government will dismantle the recently set up partisan committee made up of Liberal colleagues of hers, most of whom are not elected members of Parliament?

[English]

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. member that each and every committee of the House is the master of its own destiny.

If the hon. member would like to bring his suggestions to the transport committee, I am sure its chair, the hon. member for Winnipeg South, would be more than happy to entertain them and possibly have a day on the very issues about which the member is speaking.

\* \* \*

#### AIRBUS

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the justice minister on the Airbus matter.

We know now that the letter that was eventually accepted by the Swiss authorities on the Airbus scandal went far beyond the evidence supplied by the RCMP. According to court documents, seven drafts of the letter were prepared by justice officials.

How many drafts of the letter were rejected by the Swiss authorities?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it may be that the hon. member is not familiar with international protocol in such matters, which was established some years ago by the previous government.

The letter that was sent to the Swiss authorities, the only letter that was sent in final form, was acted on by the authorities in keeping with international practice.

\* \* \*

#### HUMAN RESOURCES

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Peterborough has been hard hit by the reorganization of HRD in Ontario. A disability unit has been disbanded and other jobs have been moved. This affects services over a wide region.

I would ask the minister what he can do to assure quality human resources services in our community.

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is important for us as a government to ensure the future of our social safety net. It is important also that we use the technologies which are available today to run the most efficient operations we can.

• (1500)

Canadians will continue to be very well served through the reorganization of the local human resources department. We will have personnel help in over 300 offices across the country that will

#### Privilege

actually be delivering it. We will have 6,000 automated kiosks that were not available before to serve Canadian citizens.

The office in Peterborough is a very important centre for us as a government. It will continue to serve clients and senior citizens of Peterborough for a long time to come.

\* \* \*

#### PRESENCE IN GALLERY

**The Speaker:** I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of the hon. Ross Ginn, Deputy President of the Legislative Council of Tasmania, and Mr. Anthony John Bennenworth, Deputy Speaker of the House of Assembly of Tasmania.

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

[Translation]

**The Speaker:** I received a letter from the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie regarding a question of privilege. I will listen to the hon. member and then I will hear the points of order raised by other members.

\* \* \*

#### PRIVILEGE

##### HEALTH CANADA ADVERTISEMENT

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, today we saw in Quebec's major newspapers an advertisement in which Health Canada refers to "the act", and I mean the government's anti-tobacco "act".

First, this advertisement is false and affects the privileges of this House. Indeed, the ad suggests that the House has passed Bill C-71. The fact is that, while the government did its utmost to gag the opposition regarding this issue, the act has yet to be passed.

The Speaker of the House made an interesting ruling on October 10, 1989, regarding a similar situation concerning a GST ad, when the legislation had not yet been passed. The Speaker ruled, and I am quoting page 4461 of the *Hansard*:

—if your Speaker ever has to consider a situation like this again, the Chair will not be as generous. This is a case which, in my opinion, should never recur. I—remind everyone within the Public Service that we are a parliamentary democracy, not a so-called executive democracy—

In 1989, when the Liberals formed the opposition, they had welcomed the ruling made by the Speaker of the time. Therefore, I am asking the Minister of Health to apologize in this House, on behalf of his department, for the false advertisement which he authorized and paid for with taxpayers' money.

Moreover, I believe I can get the support of the House in asking the Minister of Health to pay back to taxpayers the costs of his false advertising. The minister should use the taxpayers' money to make young people aware of the harmful effects of tobacco.

*Points of Order*

Mr. Speaker, I thank you. If you deem that the issue raised is indeed a question of privilege, I am prepared to table the usual motion. But first I will listen to what you have to say.

[*English*]

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we certainly did not have, or at least I did not have, notice of the particular question of privilege that has just been raised. I certainly have not had a chance to check with my colleague, the Minister of Health, or any other relevant minister on the substance of the allegations made by the hon. member.

• (1505)

I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if we could have your permission to have this question of privilege stood for a day or two while the allegations are checked into. This would make it easier to argue the point and ask you to make the most appropriate ruling.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Duceppe:** Mr. Speaker, the government House leader is a man of experience who surely does not need 24 or 48 hours to recognize something that is quite obvious. I therefore ask for leave to table a copy of that advertisement.

I am prepared to hand it over to him right now, and I suppose the House leader will understand it as soon as he reads it, since he was in this House in 1989. At the time, he advocated a reprimand, to ensure that taxpayers' money cannot be used deceitfully in advance under a false pretenses.

Thus, I table this document and ask that it be passed on to my colleague. With his experience, he will understand at once.

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** For any member of the opposition to table any document we need unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, when there is a question of privilege in this House, I usually reserve judgment for a few hours.

[*English*]

I am sure the hon. member for Laurier—Saint Marie would want to see the document. I did not see the document the Minister of Health handed over. I would like to see the document also.

With the agreement of the House I will wait until the Minister of Health or a spokesperson of the government has a chance to give us

some information. At that time I will review all the documentation and if it is necessary I will get back to the House.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Duceppe:** Mr. Speaker, I respect your decision, unless the government House leader has come to the same conclusion as I did after reading the document I just sent him. If you ask him, maybe he has come to the same conclusion. This is obvious to me.

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** As I understood the hon. government House leader, he had not been apprised. This is my interpretation. He has said he does not want to answer in the name of the Minister of Health.

At this point on this question of privilege I will wait until I have more information.

\* \* \*

**POINTS OF ORDER**

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as you know the House rules are set by precedent. Earlier today during question period you referred to some questions that would appear to come close to encroaching on the orders of the day. I think you also indicated that you would intervene if you believed that the questions encroached on the orders of the day.

Beauchesne's citation 428 (v) says a question must not "anticipate an order of the day or other matters" and (r) says a question shall not "refer to debate or answers to questions of the current session".

Citation 428 of Beauchesne's refers to written questions. I am asking you to advise the House on any guidelines you feel are appropriate that would give direction to the opposition parties that formulate questions, so that we can abide by the rules and know exactly what the rules are when we formulate questions in so far as they may or may not encroach upon the orders of the day.

There does appear to be a different interpretation by the Reform Party compared to the Bloc Quebecois on what is and is not allowable and our assumption of what you would or would not allow as far as questions are concerned.

• (1510)

Therefore, since there is nothing specific in Beauchesne's or in the standing orders that would give us specific direction regarding oral questions, I ask that you come back to the House to give us guidance.

**The Speaker:** The request of the hon. member is a reasonable one in the sense that although the Chair can surely give an opinion

*Government Orders*

on the general direction of questions, I want to give colleagues every latitude in answering questions. When the questions were posed today I listened very attentively that they did not encroach on or refer to the specific bill.

The preambles give me a great deal of difficulty. I have appealed to the House before that if your preambles could be quite concise and then you get into the questions, I am better able to respond. I try as much as possible to listen as you get down to the question or at least to know the direction in which a member is leading. If I feel that a preamble is taking us irrevocably toward a specific section of a specific bill I will intervene.

I would hope on days such as today where Bill C-71 is being debated all day that hon. members would consider perhaps a different line of questioning. I always leave that to members. In my view if a question is of a general nature and not hitting on the bill directly I would tend to allow the question as I have today.

However the point is well taken. I commit myself to reviewing all the questions asked today in question period to satisfy myself and perhaps satisfy the House that the questions were indeed in order. If I find upon reflection that I perhaps was a bit too lenient I will come back to the House and give that direction.

I prefer to give a general direction to members because you know what want to ask and I try to give you as much room as I can. I commit to coming back to the House if it is necessary.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

### TOBACCO ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-71, an act to regulate the manufacture, sale, labelling and promotion of tobacco products, to make consequential amendments to another act and to repeal certain acts, as reported (with amendments) from the committee; and Motions Nos. 2, 4, 5 and 30.

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in the second group of motions, Group No. 2, the Bloc Quebecois had Motion No. 5. This part concerns access to tobacco products. This part maintains the ban on selling tobacco products to persons under 18 years of age. What is new in this second part of the bill is that retailers will now have to ask for an identity card with a photograph.

On many occasions, the Bloc Quebecois has criticized the fact that the Tobacco Sales to Young Persons Act was not enforced. According to certain investigations carried out in the year just ended, 50 per cent of convenience stores did not enforce the legislation and cigarettes were still being sold to young persons under 18 years of age. Worse yet, cigarettes were still being sold

individually. This new provision requiring an identity card with a photograph is very laudable.

• (1515)

It is a measure welcomed by the Bloc Quebecois, because it can truly be effective. We have some questions, however, about how this measure will be enforced. Right now, there are only about 40 public servants throughout the country inspecting convenience store owners, merchants and retailers selling tobacco products. So how can we enforce this measure, although, I repeat, the Bloc Quebecois is in agreement with it? Who is going to report those who have no social conscience and who, for financial gain, will continue to sell cigarettes to those under 18 years of age?

This clause mentions regulations that will follow. It is like signing a blank cheque. We do not know how they will proceed. They are still working out the regulations not mentioned in this bill that, following the master plan tabled by the former health minister, took one year to reach first reading in the House. We have not yet seen the regulations to follow. This is all very laudable and we applaud this measure. We hope that it will be introduced, but we also want this legislation to be enforced.

This part also contains a ban on selling a tobacco product by means of a display that permits a person to handle the tobacco product before paying for it. Goodbye to self-service displays. We also applaud this measure.

The ban on furnishing a tobacco product by means of a dispensing device. It must be understood here that the prohibition concerns access to the products sold by vending machine, not the vending machine itself. This means, more or less, that the machines will have to be kept behind the counter in a restaurant, for example, and the staff will have to go and get the products.

It will also be prohibited to cause a tobacco product to be delivered from one province to another, or to be sent by mail, for a consideration. The obligation for retailers to post signs prohibiting sales to persons under the age of 18 years will be retained, as will the prohibition of sales of packages containing fewer than 20 cigarettes. But that was already in place.

How can it be that there are still corner stores and other businesses where unscrupulous merchants will sell tobacco to young people? According to the statistics and surveys, moreover, these children are often between the ages of 8 and 11. This is how our young people get hooked on nicotine and the taste of cigarettes, and are unable to quit afterward, and the reason why we are so concerned.

The applications or measures they want to put in place are actually quite laudable, as I have said, but there are already measures in place which are not being enforced. There are no inspections, no one making sure the laws are being adhered to. How can we then believe there will be a decrease in smoking by young people? How can we believe that the government has the will to do it? It has the will to put effective measures down on

*Government Orders*

paper, but when the time comes to enforce them, there is nobody around to do it. That is what we are finding fault with.

• (1520)

The bill contains other measures regulating labelling. Essentially, manufacturers are forbidden to sell a tobacco product if it does not bear a message on emissions and on health risks. Since the recent Supreme Court judgment, however, the message may be attributed to a body or individual determined by regulation. Thus, manufacturers will be able to attribute health-related messages to Health Canada, which they could not under the old legislation.

In short, Bill C-71 contains measures which could have a positive impact on tobacco use in Quebec and in Canada. This is worthy of applause, but as I was saying, only if these measures, this legislation, are enforced and not left up in the air, or set out in a bill which does not have the manpower to back it up, the inspectors to enforce it. One wonders how some forty inspectors are going to be able to look after all of Canada and all of the convenience stores across Canada. That is where the ridiculous part of the whole thing lies.

What is of interest to us in Group No. 2 is the Bloc Québécois Motion No. 5, which refers to amending clause 12, so that vending devices, even without security mechanisms, are allowed in places to which young persons are denied access. The clause as amended would read as follows: "No person shall furnish or permit the furnishing of a tobacco product by means of a device that dispenses tobacco products except where the device is in a place to which the public does not reasonably have access or where that device has a security mechanism that is activated before each transaction or that is in a place to which young persons are not permitted by law to have access".

This is just a matter of common sense. The purpose of this clause is to prevent young people from buying their own cigarettes. We quite agree with this measure and with all other measures aimed at restricting access by minors to tobacco products.

If the vending machine is in a place to which young people do not have access, a bar, for instance, obviously they would not be able to use it. You cannot get anything at all from a vending machine unless you are in front of it, whether it is chocolate, gum or cigarettes.

If our laws are enforced, young people under the age of 18 should not be in bars and certainly not have access to cigarette vending machines.

The Bloc Québécois received a memo from an association of operators of automatic cigarette vending machines. Its members are all small businesses that create jobs, and they informed us that in its present form, clause 12 in Bill C-71 would cause them to close, because these businesses would no longer be profitable. They said that the bill was unfair to operators of cigarette vending machines and, as such, discriminatory. "Our members are retailers

as defined in clause 2 of the bill, and as such we ask, no more and no less, to be treated like other tobacco retailers, in other words, on the same level as corner stores, drug stores, grocery stores, and so forth".

I would draw your attention to what this group finds so illogical. Time already!

**The Speaker:** Yes, time flies. Only ten minutes this time.

• (1525)

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lachine—Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think we are debating a societal value here. We are talking about the difference between short and long term.

What should we do in our society about smoking? What action should we take? Whenever a law involves tobacco, be it in the House of Commons or in the provincial legislatures, there is always a huge outcry and a great discussion. I know, because in 1986, when I was the Quebec minister of the environment, we introduced the first legislation to protect non smokers, Bill 84.

At that point in Quebec, people smoked in hospitals, in clinics, in restaurants and in classrooms. Today, things have improved considerably, I must say, but a lot remains to be done. That was the first step. However, when we introduced Bill 84, there was a whole discussion. The entire tobacco industry opposed the very introduction of the bill.

A debate was held in parliamentary committee. The subject was then discussed in the newspapers. It will go on so long as an attempt is made to reduce the effect of smoking, because the tobacco companies know very well that every country that signs on to fight smoking further restricts the market.

The statistics are alarming: 256,000 new smokers in Canada, with 30 per cent of them in Quebec; 14 is the average age of new smokers; 40,000 deaths in Canada, with the highest proportion—11,841—in Quebec; and \$536 million in health care costs in Quebec. If we add on all the economic costs such as absenteeism from work, all the economic costs of smoking, we reach a figure of \$4 billion in negative costs.

I heard our colleagues in opposition say: "Young people do not smoke. If they do, it is not because of a poster or advertising on a car or the like". And if it were? Why then put so much importance on this advertising? Why do the tobacco companies put so much importance on having their brand name appear on a car, a tennis court or at a festival, like the Montreal fireworks festival?

If there is no element of cause and effect, if it is not true that young people are attracted by this subliminal advertising, why then are the tobacco companies so opposed to this bill? Do we believe for one single minute that the tobacco companies would invest if they were not expecting profits at the end of the line? Do the tobacco companies not invest precisely because they know full

*Government Orders*

well that young people are influenced by subliminal advertising? Otherwise, why would they do it?

If there is not an element of cause and effect in sponsorship, why are the tobacco companies fighting so hard against legislation like Bill C-71? If there is no link whatsoever, how do we explain that France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Australia, Norway, Sweden, Iceland, Finland, and in 1998 the United States all passed legislation to either ban or restrict sponsorship?

To those who say that the Montreal Grand Prix is going to disappear I would read an article published in December 1992 in the daily *Le Monde*. It says that the IAF, International Automobile Association, is announcing the withdrawal of the French Grand Prix because of the restrictions imposed on sponsorship. And yet today, four years later, the French Grand Prix is alive and well.

I remember when Air Canada started its smoke free flights. It created an uproar: "Air Canada is going to lose a lot of passengers". Not only did the number of passengers on Air Canada not decrease, it actually increased.

• (1530)

I remember the uproar when Bill 84 was introduced in Quebec, when representatives of the bus company Voyageur came before a parliamentary committee to tell us that they would lose all their clientele if we banned smoking on buses. We gave them a few years' extension to gradually introduce the change.

In the end, the management of Voyageur told me that it was the best decision that could have been taken, that it was a lot cheaper nowadays to maintain buses, that passengers were now used to a non-smoking environment. There is no longer any argument, any discussion on the issue.

The tobacco companies and their allies are engaging in this heated debate because so much is at stake, for them. Of course there is something at stake. Profits, clients, younger clients who get addicted to tobacco.

They say it has nothing to do with health. If it is not a question of health, then what is it? If advertising does not promote smoking, why do tobacco companies insist on using it?

There are so many examples where tobacco companies were replaced by others as main sponsors of international events. There was the Virginia Slims women's tennis tournament. Virginia Slims was replaced by Corel. There was an outcry in the United States, people were asking how a tennis tournament could be sponsored by

a tobacco company. The Australian tennis tournament formerly sponsored by Marlborough cigarettes is now sponsored by Ford.

In 1988, when we tried to convince the managers of the Canadian Open Golf Championship not to accept du Maurier as their sponsor anymore, they told us that without du Maurier the Canadian Open could no longer exist. It is doing fine thank you. This year it will be held in Montreal and will be sponsored by Bell Canada.

**Mr. Dubé:** And by du Maurier.

**Mr. Lincoln:** It is sponsored by Bell Canada; you will have the opportunity to speak later on. What is happening today is that people want to use petty politics to make political hay before the election, they want to make a big issue of this, they say it is not a question of health, that advertisements have no impact on people, that they do not encourage young people to smoke.

However, Minister Rochon himself said there is a direct link and he should know because he is a medical doctor and Quebec's health minister. In November 1996, he proposed even tougher legislation than Bill C-71 which is now before us. In November 1996, he said to the media in Quebec that he wanted that legislation passed. And now we are being told that it is the federal Liberals who are trying to push this.

All these festivals and events that have benefited from these sponsors must be given some room to manoeuvre. That is why the minister has agreed today to extend the period until October 1st, 1998. This will give event organizers two full years to find new sponsors.

My colleague, the president of the Liberal caucus in Quebec, has appealed to the Canadian bankers association. It says that it does not have enough money, that it already gives a lot to charities. The chartered banks have made \$6 billion in profits on the backs of Canadians. It would be nothing for them to give some to the Jazz festival in Montreal, the Montreal Grand Prix or the tennis open. It would be nothing for them. They have made \$6 billion in profits on the backs of all Canadians. I appeal to their corporate spirit, to their corporate conscience, so they will replace these millions that may be lost from tobacco sponsorships.

As the minister has pointed out, nothing prevents a tobacco company from sponsoring an event in the future, but there certainly will be restrictions on advertising. I support the minister's bill entirely. If choices have to be made, human lives are a lot more important than advertising by the tobacco companies.

• (1535)

I support the minister entirely, because I think we do everything we can to reduce the use of tobacco in our society, whether it is in Quebec or elsewhere.

*Government Orders**[English]*

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak today on the motions in Group No. 2 that were put forward by my colleague from Macleod. We are faced with a difficult dilemma.

The dilemma in this bill is how we address decreasing consumption, particularly among youth and dealing with the purchase of cigarettes in shops. Is it fair to criminalize those individuals who unknowingly sell cigarettes to minors or is it fairer to put the responsibility on the individual who goes into the store with the knowledge they are committing an illegal act? My colleague from Macleod and I feel it is more important to put the responsibility and the onus on the child who buys cigarettes and who knows full well he is committing an illegal act.

That is why the motions in Group No. 2 were put forward by my colleague, putting a \$75 dollar summary conviction fine on under-age children who buy cigarettes.

We have heard a lot today on the issue of sponsorship. The ultimate goal of this bill should be to decrease tobacco consumption with all Canadians, particularly youth. We know we can have the greatest effect in decreasing consumption in youth. Tobacco consumption and the addiction to tobacco products occurs when somebody is a child, particularly around the ages of 11 to 14. The consumption of as little as one pack of cigarettes or sometimes even less can ensure that a child is addicted for life.

Over the term of this government, the statistics have been very interesting in a number of areas. One area is the decrease in cost this government effected when it decreased tobacco taxes in February 1994, a move we vehemently opposed. We opposed this because decreasing the tobacco tax was the single most important negative health move that any government in the past 50 years has made.

The negative effect of this move cannot be underestimated. Lowering the cost of cigarettes has introduced 250,000 children to cigarettes each year. They will be addicted for life. Half of them will ultimately die an early death. A great percentage will suffer morbidity from a wide variety of diseases, from chronic obstructive lung disease to angina to a number of other malignancies, which there is not enough time to speak of today.

This is the fate that awaits those children in the future and that is the legacy this government has given to the Canadian people. This is what it has done for their health.

This government was warned by Health Canada. A Health Canada study was conducted by Drs. Morrison, Mao, Wigle and Villeneuve entitled "The Impact of Cigarette Price Rollback on the Future Health of Canadian Adolescents". I will quote from the summary:

Government tobacco control in Canada has had three main components: health promotion campaigns, high tobacco taxes and restrictive policies on public smoking. Even the temporary abandonment of high cigarette taxes will likely lead to a large number of teenagers becoming and/or remaining smokers. The health consequences of the recent tax decrease will continue for decades.

That study, which was given to the minister in 1995, illustrated very clearly, succinctly and scientifically that the impact of a tobacco tax rollback would be utterly devastating to the health and welfare of Canadians, but in particular to the health and welfare of Canadian children. The government has also been inactive in the area of advertising.

● (1540)

The Supreme Court in its wisdom, and I use that very sarcastically because I cannot think of a greater affront to Canadians and a greater lack of responsibility than the Supreme Court has demonstrated through twisting the charter of rights and freedoms, turned down the advertising ban on smoking advertising. What has been the effect of that? Let us take a look.

The data of the last year show in 1996 alone that the lack of a ban on tobacco advertising has been enough to support 250,000 new smokers in this country. The per capita increase has been anywhere from 3 to 4 per cent in this country as a result of not allowing the ban on tobacco advertising itself.

To colleagues from the Bloc Quebecois, I ask them to take a look at this very clearly and it will demonstrate without a shadow of a doubt that the ban on advertising that has been removed has caused an increase in consumption. They should be more concerned than anybody else because the children in Quebec take up smoking earlier and smoke more than children in any other province in this country. Those are the facts.

We have to do something in this House. We have to deal with the epidemic of smoking. The tobacco sponsorship provisions in the bill are okay. We are holding our noses and supporting the bill only because nothing has been done on the tobacco issue in this country for three years. For three years while a quarter of a million kids pick up the habit the government has been diddling around doing nothing.

The health minister would rather deal with banning certain types of soft cheeses than with a health epidemic that claims 40,000 lives every year. What does that say about the commitment of this government to the health of Canadians? If I were them I would be truly embarrassed.

Certainly back in 1994 we had a smuggling epidemic but here is another problem that the government failed to deal with properly. Instead of dealing with the smuggling issue which actually occurs unfortunately on many aboriginal reserves in Quebec, instead of dealing with the smuggling conduits which deal not only with tobacco but also deal with guns, with alcohol, with drugs and with tobacco and people, the government has chosen to put its head in the sand and not address the criminals and the thugs who are



engaging in this and who are associated closely with the gangs in the United States.

Instead of dealing with the thugs, the government has chosen to compromise the health and welfare of all Canadians and in particular the children of this country by rolling back the tobacco taxes. The government has put its tail between its legs and said "we are not going to enforce the law, we are going to compromise the health of Canadians and make it look like we are doing something".

A plan for the health of Canadians and a plan to decrease consumption and a plan to address the smuggling was there and it is as follows. One, bring the tobacco taxes back where they were in January 1994. Two, put forth an export tax which would decrease the smuggling of tobacco. Three, enforce the law to address and arrest those individuals who are committing crimes and who are smuggling all across this country.

The government fails to recognize the law-abiding aboriginal people who live on these reserves who have to put up with thugs in their midst who are engaging in these illicit, illegal practices. No one talks about the culture of fear that many of those people live in. It is an abrogation of the responsibility of this government to not address that problem. It is an abrogation of the responsibility of this government to put its own political fortunes ahead of the health of Canadians.

The government should be ashamed of itself and the Canadian people should understand what is going on here. The plan was there but the government chose to ignore it.

I hope that our colleagues from the Bloc Quebecois will unite with our colleagues in the Reform Party and I hope some members of the Liberal Party to put forth a better solution to address the smuggling issue, decrease consumption of cigarette smoking in this country and enable us to all live in a healthier and happier environment, if not for ourselves then in particular for the health and welfare of our children.

• (1545)

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the report stage motions in Group No. 2 of Bill C-71.

I was a member of the standing committee on health of the House of Commons in 1994 and this was an issue that was before the committee on a number of occasions for a number of reasons. I recall when the committee held public hearings with regard to the issue of plain packaging for tobacco products. We also, as members know, had hearings with regard to the proposed legislation, Bill C-71.

### *Government Orders*

There was a common element in both about which I want to advise the House. I do not think many people realize what happened. The tobacco companies did not, and I stress that, appear before the standing committee on health on either occasion. They demonstrated what we must all accept as one of the most brilliant strategies in terms of an economic strategy for a failing business.

Tobacco companies had to do something to deal with the fact that the health care industry: doctors and nurses, medical officers of health, the communities in which we live, the social agencies that have to deal with the aftermath of problems associated with tobacco consumption and addiction, the Addiction Research Foundation, the Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse, were saying very clearly: "Tobacco hurts Canadians and we have to do something about it".

The tobacco companies had virtually everybody against them. There was absolutely no future for the tobacco industry in Canada. There was no place for them to go. They had to find some way to continue to be in business but they had to insulate themselves from the real people of Canada.

They used their influence to manipulate people. That was their brilliant strategy. They took a position with their resources, with their money. They bought people. Everybody has a price, so they say.

Who appeared before the committee? Cultural groups, recreation groups, sports groups, all came to say: "This is terrible. If you do this, we are going to lose our tobacco sponsorship and we are going to lose these events". That is the brilliance of the strategy. The tobacco companies said to the groups that they were sponsoring: "Let's go—"

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Dubé:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I can understand the hon. member's flash of anger, but I think stating in this House that witnesses were bought by tobacco companies is a bit excessive. I sat on the committee, I saw individuals earnestly make their point, and it seems to me that to say they let themselves be bought is excessive.

**The Speaker:** My colleague, it is very likely that these words are excessive, and I would ask our hon. colleague not to use such words in this debate. The hon. member for Mississauga South.

[*English*]

**Mr. Szabo:** Mr. Speaker, the groups that came before the health committee were a number of cultural groups, recreational groups, sporting associations, and they said: "This is what the impact will be on our organizations and on our events if tobacco advertising is banned".

*Government Orders*

We knew exactly what was happening. These organizations were approached. Their sponsors, the tobacco companies said: "Let's go and fight the tobacco bill in front of the health committee. By the way, if I do not show up, you start without me". That is exactly what happened.

The tobacco companies did not appear during the hearings on the plain packaging issue, even though we found out subsequently the CEO of RJR-MacDonald was actually sitting there. He refused to come and sit at the table to answer questions or to address the issues before the committee. They did buy the consulting services of certain people to speak on their behalf. They came before the committee. One witness was a gentleman from the U.S. with a Ph.D. He came before the committee to talk about the impact of advertising on children. He basically concluded on behalf of the tobacco companies that advertising has no impact on children.

• (1550)

I asked him quite explicitly if he thought that the figure of Joe Camel on Camel cigarettes, because of its cartoon character nature, had any influence on children. He said: "Who is Joe Camel?" This is a consultant, an expert witness, speaking on behalf of the tobacco companies and he admitted before the committee he did not know who Joe Camel was. Then he was asked a rhetorical question: Did he know who Mickey Mouse was? He said: "No, who is Mickey Mouse?" It is clear you can get anybody to say anything if he is working on your behalf.

We saw the same thing before the committee with Bill C-71 and the sponsorship issue. All the groups that we know have a vested interest in seeing events continue appeared. They all found themselves in bed with the tobacco companies, totally addicted to tobacco money. They were relying on blood money and it really was a problem because we had no way of knowing what the real issues were for these people. We asked them if the government made up the additional funding they needed for sponsorship would they support the bill? They said: "No question, it is a good bill".

I would like to remind the House of the kinds of things that tobacco companies have done in the past to support their events. They have advertised in comic books for children. They have held rock concerts where the admission fee was two empty packages of cigarettes. They have had scantily clad women go to high schools to hand out individual cigarettes. These are the kinds of tactics they use. It is all about attracting young people to their products, the 250,000 young people a year who are becoming addicted.

The facts are clear. If you do not start smoking by age 19 it is very unlikely that you will be a smoker in your lifetime. The tobacco companies know it, the health industry knows it. The targets of the tobacco companies are the young people of Canada and of the world.

Other members and the Bloc would say this is awful. We are going to lose all these sponsorships. We are going to lose the races.

We are going to lose Just for Laughs. Where are they going? There is no ban. They can still advertise, they can still promote, they will still have exclusivity. What are the options?

They cannot move the automobile race to the United States. The Americans are going much further than Canada. They are going for a full ban.

It is absolute hypocrisy to argue the benefits of commercialism over the health benefits to Canadians. The consequences of tobacco products cost Canadians \$15 billion a year. I remind members of the Bloc that the right thing to do—and that is why we are here—is to care for the health of Canadians, not for the health of the commercial sector.

In conclusion, I believe that many groups unwittingly have come to members of Parliament: constituents, retailers and all of those who benefit in some small way from the tobacco money, and have unwittingly been put between the health of Canadians and the needs or the demands of the tobacco companies.

The history is clear. The tobacco companies are not prepared to come face to face with the House of Commons. Therefore, we have to do the right thing and protect the health of Canadians because that is why we are here.

[Translation]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. members that we are now at report stage. Yet, the speeches I heard before I rose myself sounded identical to those I had heard one, two or three years ago, in the debate on the principle of the bill. This issue of the principle of the bill has been resolved, and the principle agreed upon, at second reading.

At this stage, we must ensure the bill is viable and contains realistic and adequate provisions. The Bloc voted for this bill.

• (1555)

And having come this far, they would have us throw out the baby with the bath water, in the sense that we are being gagged for making constructive remarks to improve on the bill. We are being told that we will not be allowed to debate the bill later than 5:15 p.m. and third reading will be on Thursday; we are prevented from debating the bill fully the same way we were at second reading.

There is an amendment put forward by Bloc Québécois in the group under consideration. Let me explain briefly, to show you it is a matter of plain common sense.

The bill provides for a security mechanism to ensure those under age cannot use cigarette vending machines in restaurants or other public places. The bill provides that the same type of security

mechanism will have to be used in bars, where minors are not allowed in any case.

This is like wearing both a belt and suspenders. In any case, it lacks logic. It looks like overkill. In small communities where one person mans the bar, this will be an additional obstacle that will adversely affect business. It is not true that a 10, 12, 14 or 15-year old can go into a bar to buy cigarettes. In any case that person does not have the right to go into a bar.

This is the type of amendment we feel is important at this stage, to avoid impossible situations. You will see the kind of details the government should be concerned with, and the type of amendments that should be made, so as to not unduly bother people in their everyday activities.

This is important, because we are trying to see why the government is so intent on ramming this legislation through. It is true that this bill is based on the four pillars of marketing: the ability to influence the price, the product, the promotion and the advertising. This is an approach that can make sense. However, one must see if each of the measures based on these four elements is appropriate. Above all, we must avoid giving way to demagoguery.

The government tells us that sponsors will have until 1998 to adjust, but it does not tell us that they will have no leeway as regards the broadcasting of events outside the country. On the one hand, something is given, but on the other hand, we prevent the sponsorship from having its expected impact. This amounts to prohibiting the event, as the members opposite are well aware.

Then, we are told that the tobacco companies did not appear before the committee. It is not up to me to defend the tobacco companies, but the House should not be misled in this way. Representations were made by the Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers' Council to the committee. So, representations were made.

Finally, some more or less realistic comments are made, which have nothing to do with the stage we are at now. We are trying to improve this bill as much as possible. For instance, the Bloc Québécois is not against the amendments providing for a photo ID card, but we would like to know how this will be implemented in real life.

This bill gives a lot of regulatory authority to the minister. With this kind of legislation, it would have been very useful to find out what the regulations will be and how they will work. But there is no mention of that in the bill.

We also agree with the principle that consumers should not have direct access before paying, as long as it is workable. Representations were made by a coalition of cigarette vending machine owners. These people agree with the measures to further restrict access to tobacco products for young people, but they fear the government might go too far and bring about the demise of their businesses, and I referred earlier to the concerns of bar owners.

I would ask the government to take into consideration the amendments put forward, especially those of the Bloc Québécois

### *Government Orders*

which appear in this group, and to also take whatever time is needed to discuss the issue so that we can end up with an interesting bill and not have to completely overhaul the regulations and the bill just a few years down the road.

• (1600)

[*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.

All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion defeated.

I therefore declare Motion No. 30 defeated.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Dubé:** Mr. Speaker, which motion was just negated? I am sorry, but I have a problem with my earphones.

**The Speaker:** Motion No. 2 in Group No. 2, and the recorded division also applies to Motion No. 30. Agreed?

**Mr. Dubé:** No. 30. Agreed.

**The Speaker:** The question is now on Motion No. 4.

[*English*]

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 the motion stands deferred.

*Government Orders*

[Translation]

**Mr. Dubé:** Mr. Speaker, unless I am mistaken, Motion No. 5 was not read.

**The Speaker:** We cannot vote on Motion No. 5 before the deferred division on Motion No. 4 takes place.

[English]

We will now proceed to Group No. 3.

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (for Minister of Health, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-71, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing lines 18 to 20 on page 7 with the following:

“(c) a promotion by a tobacco grower or a manufacturer that is directed at tobacco growers, manufacturers, persons who distribute tobacco products or retailers but not, either directly or indirectly, at consumers.”

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-71, in Clause 24, be amended by replacing lines 30 and 31 on page 9 with the following:

“readership of not less than eighty-five per cent;”

Motion No. 33

That Bill C-71 be amended by adding, after line 23 on page 22, the following:

“Coming into Force

66. Subsections 24(2) and (3) come into force one year after the day this Act is assented to.”

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-71, in Clause 19, be amended by

(a) replacing line 21 on page 7 with the following:

“19. (1) No person shall promote a tobacco”

(b) adding after line 24 on page 7 the following:

“(2) Subsection (1) does not apply to a person who uses a tobacco product or a tobacco product-related brand element in a promotion that is used in the sponsorship of a person, entity, event, activity or permanent facility or used in the promotion of the sponsorship.”

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-71, in Clause 21, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 3 on page 8 with the following:

“(3) This section does not apply to

(a) a trade-mark that appeared on a tobacco product for sale in Canada on December 2, 1996; or

(b) a tobacco product that is used in a promotion that is used in the sponsorship of a person, entity, event, activity or permanent facility or in the promotion of the sponsorship.”

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-71, in Clause 22, be amended by adding after line 41 on page 8 the following:

“(5) This section does not apply to a person who promotes a tobacco product by means of an advertisement described in subsection (1) where the person does so in a promotion that is used in the sponsorship of a person, entity, event, activity or permanent facility or in the promotion of the sponsorship.”

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-71 be amended by deleting Clause 24.

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-71, in Clause 24, be amended by replacing lines 4 to 42 on page 9 with the following:

24. (1) No one shall promote a sponsorship by means of a tobacco product-related brand element unless

(a) the primary purpose of the sponsorship promotion is to promote an event, activity, person or entity;

(b) the event, activity, person or entity is not primarily associated with young persons;

(c) the promotional material does not depict a tobacco product or its package;

(d) the tobacco product-related brand element does not account for more than 15 percent of the promotional material or is not larger than the name of the event, activity, person or entity;

(e) the promotional material does not appear in any publication that has an adult readership of less than 75 percent or is not broadcast by a radio or television station that, during the broadcast, has an adult audience of less than 75 percent;

(f) the promotional material is not displayed within an area that is less than 200 meters from any elementary or secondary school;

(g) the sponsorship promotion does not use professional models under twenty-five years of age; and

(h) the promotional material is not displayed outdoors for more than three months prior to the commencement of the event or activity or more than one month after the end of the event or activity.

(2) The definitions in this section apply in this Part.

“international event or activity” means an event or activity that is

(a) primarily presented in Canada by

(i) an entity whose headquarters or principal place of business is situated outside Canada, or

(ii) a foreign government;

(b) part of a series of events or activities the majority of which are presented outside Canada;

(c) one in which

(i) at least half the artists, competitors or other participants are not residents of Canada; or

(ii) at least half the persons registered for the competition are not residents of Canada; or

(d) recognized by the Canadian Tourism Commission as an international tourist attraction.

“promotional material” means any object, printed matter, publicity, broadcast, poster banner or merchandise that primarily promotes an event, activity, person or entity that is part of the sponsorship and excludes, for the purposes of paragraph (1)(d), where the sponsorship is promoted as part of an international event or activity,

(a) posters and banners displayed at the site of the international event or activity; and

(b) the clothing and equipment of the participants, artists or competitors in the international event or activity.”

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-71, in Clause 33, be amended by deleting lines 14 to 19 on page 12.

**Hon. Roger Simmons (Burin—St. George’s, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 34

That Bill C-71 be amended by adding, after line 23 on page 22, the following:

“Coming into Force

66. Subsections 24(2) and (3) come into force on October 1, 1998 or on such earlier day the Governor in Council may fix by order.”

• (1605)

**The Speaker:** On Motions Nos. 14, 16, 18 and 19, Mr. Robinson is not here to propose these motions and therefore they will be deleted.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Madam Speaker, thus this is Group No. 3, that is, mainly the whole chapter on sponsorship, or clause 24. I remind you that, at second reading, the official opposition voted for the principle of the bill because we agree with 80 per cent of the bill and with all clauses aimed at reducing smoking, especially among young people, but also among all Canadians, although this is obviously more of a voluntary decision for adults.

Concerning sponsorship, though, there are important economic issues at stake for Quebec and for Canada also, since sponsorship accounts for some \$60 million that are distributed by the tobacco companies for sporting and cultural events. Of those \$60 million, some \$30 million go to sporting and cultural events in Quebec. You will understand, therefore, that the Bloc Québécois, which forms the official opposition and has Quebec’s interests at heart, wants to preserve these funds that ensure the survival and even the development of cultural activities, and thus are good for the economy, especially in the tourism industry.

• (1610)

In terms of added value, events such as the Montreal Jazz festival, the Montreal Grand Prix and other international events are important because they attract many visitors to the Montreal area, as do events such as the summer festival in Quebec City, which also attracts many visitors. In fact, all events of this calibre attract a lot of visitors and that is why their economic impact is so great.

But there is also the issue of visibility. Events such as the Montreal Grand Prix, the Du Maurier tennis tournament or the golf

### *Government Orders*

open give sports fans an opportunity to see, on television, what goes on all over the world. It is a window on the world, an opportunity to promote extraordinary sporting and cultural events that give each region and each country the visibility they need.

Let us talk about the Montreal Grand Prix. The Grand Prix in Formula 1 racing comes in third place among sporting events, after the Olympic Games and the World Cup in soccer, in terms of coverage and in terms of viewership. It is the third most important event. There are no such races in the United States or anywhere else in North America. But there is one in Montreal.

We could lose all that because, even if the minister has accepted, through an amendment, to stagger the application of section 24 concerning certain restrictions on the sponsorship of sporting and cultural events, there is still section 31—and I see that the chairman of the health committee, who, like me, has studied this bill clause by clause, knows full well what I am talking about—which will prohibit retransmission as soon as this bill becomes law. So it will be this year, if the bill is adopted in the next few weeks as planned by the government and if the other House gives its consent. This means that the Montreal Grand Prix is threatened, and we see in the newspapers that China, which is badly in need of visibility, is very interested in taking over the Montreal Grand Prix and would be most happy to do so. You can certainly understand why we want to defend ourselves in these circumstances.

There is always the same argument that something similar happened with the French Grand Prix. But in France it is not the same situation because, in the context of the automotive industry, in connection with Formula 1 cars, several companies are represented. The same is true for England, Italy and Germany. There are enough sponsorships from racing car manufacturers that they can do without tobacco sponsorships.

But this is not the case in other countries. It is not the case in Australia. They wanted to ban it, but they were forced to adopt a legislative measure allowing an exception. So, there are a number of countries with the same situation, notably Japan, because it was not possible to attract automobile manufacturers, Formula 1 teams sponsored by tobacco companies, not just by companies we are familiar with but by foreign companies.

Imagine this strange situation: in order for a car sponsored by a tobacco company to be allowed on television, if clause 31 were allowed to stand, the brand on the car would have to be purposely blurred, somewhat like the procedure used when interviewing a criminal or an informer who wishes to remain anonymous. This is commonly seen on television, but in this case, the car is travelling over 200 kilometres an hour. You can imagine the skill required if ever the leading car were sponsored by a tobacco company. There are a number of things like that.

*Government Orders*

The official opposition presented many amendments to clause 24 so as to reduce the impact, so that the situation could continue. Most of the amendments consist of compromises. Most of the amendments we have presented here at report stage were suggested by people who benefit from these sponsorships, not by tobacco products, and not by companies.

• (1615)

I do not wish to come to the defence of tobacco companies. I do not smoke, but sports and cultural events are very important to the cultural and economic life of Quebec. That is what we are fighting for.

The main issue is this: Is there a connection between displaying a tobacco company brand in a place of entertainment or somewhere else and the increase in smoking among young people? I systematically asked this question, as the chairman of the health committee knows. I asked each witness whether he had a scientific study demonstrating a link. Each time, people replied that they did not, that they had a number of studies, but none on that specifically.

A very articulate representative of the Canadian Cancer Society, to whom I had directed the question, even answered me: "No, there is no study".

Finally, these people have the impression that sponsorship is a way of improving the image of tobacco companies, but nobody could show in a scientific way that it helps increase tobacco use. As an advocate of non-smoking, I am pursuing the goal of improving health. I will recall very briefly that I was a recreation professional when I was younger, before I became a member of Parliament. I might not look like it, but I used to take part in 10 kilometre runs. I realized soon enough that it did not agree with smoking. In another speech, I pointed out that Céline Dion surely does not smoke in order to protect her voice.

So, we should do promotion in a positive fashion. We should spend more money on programs to prevent smoking. The government is collecting \$4.5 billion in taxes on the sale of tobacco products. It should take some of that money to try to reach its goals. Instead of announcing a piece of legislation that has yet to be adopted, it should have launched a program to encourage people to stop smoking by showing them the benefits of quitting, how pleasant it is to be in shape, to take deep breaths, to go play outside, as Kino-Québec used to say, to play sports, and by demonstrating, if necessary with the help of athletes or famous singers, how great it is to be in good health and a non-smoker. This would have a very positive impact on our young people.

I know that some other colleagues from the Bloc Québécois will speak later on. My hon. colleague for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead will probably rise and speak with enthusiasm as he puts forward other arguments that will convince you, Madam Speaker, or the chairman of the health committee, to postpone the implementation of this provision of Bill C-71.

[English]

**Hon. Roger Simmons (Burin—St. George's, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part in the debate. As the chair of the health committee that dealt with Bill C-71 I and my colleagues from Lévis, Drummond and others have had a fair amount of exposure to the bill. We have had a good opportunity to say what we want about it. My words today will be few and quite pointed. They will be largely related to the amendment which stands in my name in the group before us.

In general terms I believe very strongly in the provisions of Bill C-71. I believe very strongly in its objectives. The bill goes a long way to seeing that its objectives are met, namely the objective to reduce tobacco consumption particularly by young people.

Our hearings were extensive. I am proud to say on behalf of the committee that we were able to hear all who wanted to be heard over three or four days. The hearings last fall were televised which gave a large body of people, apart from those in the hearing room, an opportunity to participate, to see how the matter was dealt with and to hear the arguments on both sides of the issue. The overall process was served very well. We were able to hear in committee the real concerns that people had with the bill.

• (1620)

At the end of the three or four days of hearings I was rather impressed by the case that had been made by the representatives of sponsored events, those events which have heretofore been sponsored by the tobacco companies. I thought their argument made a fair amount of sense and ought to be examined.

As a result, once the bill had passed clause by clause in committee I as a member of the committee said to my colleagues that we ought to look at some transition period. Instead of bringing in the provision which would limit sponsorship when the bill came into effect, I felt we could allow some lead time for a couple of reasons.

It would give those people involved in sponsored events time to adjust to the new reality. I was cognizant that many events had been planned for this summer and even for next summer. We needed to give those people some lead time to adjust to the new reality.

Equally important was to remove from the tobacco companies a potential weapon, namely the possibility that the tobacco companies would rush out on the excuse of this legislation and cancel forthwith sponsorship funds they had already subscribed to events. I wanted to remove from the tobacco companies that particular excuse. I wanted to take that weapon away from them. The lead time proposed in my amendment has the effect of doing that. If the tobacco companies want in the next year or so to continue

sponsorship, nothing legislatively prevents those companies from doing so.

It would give the organizations running the events time to look around for alternate funding without the threat of having their events collapse because of the immediate loss of the funding upon which they have come to depend over the years.

With these thoughts in mind I made a suggestion to the committee. The committee put forth a resolution to the House a day or so after the bill was reported. It is in that spirit my amendment before the House has been made.

It is not intended to water down or detract from the measures in the bill. My own view on sponsorship was different from what is in the bill. I felt we should have wiped out sponsorship altogether from day one. That was my view. I felt that we ought to have provided alternate funding for a period of three, four or five years. That was my position on that issue.

That view did not prevail. What we have in the bill, I understand for constitutional and other reasons, is a limited sponsorship. That is my second position. I would have preferred to have no sponsorship by the tobacco companies at all. A good argument can be made for that, but that is yesterday's battle so I will not get into it.

The amendment I have proposed will give some assistance to the groups whose concerns we heard in committee. The transition period will give them the extra time they need to find other sponsors. However they also need the certainty of knowing the precise date when the restrictions on sponsorship promotion will come into effect. We do not know exactly when the bill will receive royal assent. It is fair to assume it may well be some time this spring. Events are already en train for this summer. I thought we ought to give them this summer and next to make the adjustments.

With that in mind, and the importance of having a definite date, my motion indicates that we would have the sponsorship provisions in the bill take effect as of October of the following year. This would be a welcome measure for those who are looking for as much time as possible to make the adjustments.

As I have said before, I do not think it in any way detracts from the health principles of the bill. It does not in any way dilute the principles of the measures in the bill.

• (1625)

In closing, let us remind ourselves that this is first and foremost a health bill. Anything it does ought to have as its mandate the improvement of the health of Canadians. The bill goes a long way in that direction.

I hope my amendment is not seen as a diversion but rather as a practical way of accommodating what is a problem created by the bill but not intended. The people who sponsor these events are not

### *Government Orders*

the culprits. If we as legislators can avoid making them victims, we ought to do so. The spirit behind the amendment is to give them that little extra time.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to take part for the second time in the debate and more specifically to speak about sponsorship.

About ten days ago, during my last speech on Bill C-71, I concluded by saying that we were having a false debate. The arguments put forth by the Liberal members, particularly the Minister of Health, prove more clearly every day that we are having a false debate.

I listened very carefully to the hon. member for Burin—St. George's, who is the chairman of the committee on health, and his statements prove once again that I am right. He told the House that he himself moved an amendment allowing the Minister of Health and the Liberal members to rise in this House and declare one after the other that they had not abolished sponsorship of sports and cultural events by tobacco companies.

How can they say that? By deferring the decision by one year. In the original bill, sponsorship of major sports and cultural events by tobacco companies would have been prohibited as of December 1997. The very generous—I would even say munificent—amendment moved by the hon. member for Burin—St. George's defers the decision by one year.

The Liberals are so keen on stifling the economy of Quebec, particularly that of Montreal and of other cities such as Trois-Rivières and Quebec City that have great sporting and cultural events, they so like to hamper what is working well, to stifle the promotion of important events, that they decided to have more fun.

Six months was not enough. They would have had six months to enjoy watching important events simply disappear because of a lack of funds, but six months was not enough for them. Therefore, they decided to have one more year of fun. They gave themselves until December 1998 to have their fun so they could say to the people of Quebec: "You see what a good government we are. We want to stifle your economy, and we will take all the time needed to do so". That is the result of the process, and that is why I am saying that this is a false debate.

Moreover, the health minister, in response to questions in and outside the House yesterday, repeated that his bill had only one objective: to improve the health of Canadians and Quebecers alike, particularly that of young people. It was its sole objective. He said that his bill had nothing to do with sport or culture, and that is why he could afford to ban tobacco advertising at these events.

*Government Orders*

• (1630)

Along the same lines, the Minister of Health says that he understands that there may be problems for the organizers of cultural or sports events, but all they will need to do is to approach the banks instead. Sure, all the organizers of cultural or sports events will need to do is to approach the banks, but they will not be the only ones; dozens of restaurant and hotel owners will also have to approach the banks, but to file bankruptcy. They will be out of business, just as in the example given by my colleague from Trois-Rivières.

I am sure he will quote this example again this afternoon. In the Trois-Rivières area, during the Grand Prix, all motels and hotels display no-vacancy signs as all available rooms within about 50 kilometres are booked. As a result of the decision being made by the Liberal government concerning sponsorships, this will no longer be the case.

The Bloc Québécois will object within the limits allowed by parliamentary procedure to prevent this bill from coming into effect. And if, unfortunately, it did come into effect, we will see to it that people, especially in Quebec—since we will be the hardest hit by this decision—know what is going on, who is responsible for this disastrous Bill C-71. We are going to blow the whistle and we will keep on blowing it.

I am convinced that, when an election is called in a few weeks, or a few months, at most, Quebecers who, in 1993, gave their support to the Bloc Québécois in an overwhelming majority will think of its general record when they are faced with the decision. They will wonder if it has been worth it to have voted for the Bloc in 1993.

When they realize the role the Bloc Québécois assumed in this House, and now with Bill C-71, Quebecers will think: “Thanks to the Bloc, some men and women stood up for the interests of Quebec”. In fact, not one member opposite, among the Liberals, discussed that matter, on the contrary. The Secretary of State for the Federal Office of Regional Development referred to it a few times, but he was told very quickly that if he wanted to keep his job, he had better to keep his mouth shut.

Fortunately, the Bloc Québécois was there to fight for Quebec’s interests. Otherwise, we would never have known this bill’s disastrous consequences for the economy of Montreal, Trois-Rivières, Quebec City and other towns in Quebec.

I will conclude by saying that we are indeed in a false debate. If the Minister of Health cares so much about the health of Quebecers, about the health of Canadians, he should speak up in Cabinet, plead with the Minister of Finance who has repeatedly cut unemployment insurance.

I contend that poverty does a lot more damage than tobacco, not only among children, but also among the general population. Everybody agrees that smoking is bad for your health, but this debate should be at the provincial level, especially in Quebec. We will have this debate. We will decide on the scope of the legislation we pass to protect our children, our women and our men. We do not need the federal government to tell us what to do in this regard.

What we want to avoid most of all is a decision which threatens thousands of jobs in Quebec, and that is something that Quebec men and women will remember during the next election.

• (1635)

[English]

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the motions in Group No. 3.

The previous speaker just spent some time talking about the impact of tobacco advertising on Quebec and that it is a good thing that the Bloc is here. Canadians know it is not a good thing that the Bloc is here and I think Quebecers know it as well.

In the last reported period the cost of smoking in Quebec totalled \$4.1 billion. That puts in context what the alternative is. Members of the Bloc are now saying that this is going to cost jobs at events such as car races, and cultural events are going to disappear and all the economic benefit will be lost.

What does that say about the value of the lives of Canadians to members of the Bloc Québécois? I am not going to dwell on that. I think members of the Bloc have made their position clear. They hold the value of commerce much higher than the value of the citizens of our country.

I want to speak very briefly about the issue of sponsorship. Earlier in the debate I raised the fact that the representatives of tobacco companies did not choose to appear before the Standing Committee on Health to represent their interests. In fact, they sent cultural and sporting groups and organizations whose events they sponsor.

Although the representatives of tobacco companies did not appear before the committee, they were quite active before the hearings of the Standing Committee on Health took place. They made representations by sending letters to citizens, members of Parliament. They had advertisements in newspapers and made television appearances. They did not come before the House of Commons committee, face to face, to be questioned and to provide facts. They were telling it their way, on their terms, and in a way which did not provide all the facts.

I want to refer to one of the ads from a newspaper. They claim that the restrictions under Bill C-71 make the sponsorship of any event commercially untenable.



*Government Orders*

The tobacco companies continue to use the words "ban advertising and promotion". The fact is that tobacco companies will not be banned from advertising and promoting events. Some would argue that advertising should be banned, as I am told it will be in the United States, a total ban. In Canada there will be restrictions, not a ban. It means that the tobacco companies will still be able to advertise fully in magazines, direct mail solicitation for support and sponsorship of their events. They will still be able to occupy 10 per cent of a poster size even where they can be seen by children.

However, there will be some restrictions. No longer will an entire venue be totally coloured and plastered with the name of a cigarette brand. The exclusive sponsor of an event will still be able to be identified. They will continue to have that right.

It makes me wonder exactly where these events are going to go. The tobacco companies want to advertise. Obviously they are advertising because they feel there is some benefit to it. In letters we have received, some have said they do not know anyone who has gone to a tennis match, came out and said: "I want to start smoking because I was at that tennis match".

It is not that easy. The promotion of any product involves a multiplicity of approaches. It involves colours, sounds and different venues, different medias.

We have some examples. In 1992 the French government banned tobacco sponsorship and promotion. Throughout the debate, just as we are having here, the opposition to the government said that events, such as the Grand Prix, would be gone as a result of the ban. The Grand Prix circuit would withdraw. In fact, the organizers went so far as to announce that the French Grand Prix would be pulled from the 1993 circuit if the legislation went through.

• (1640)

What are the facts? The legislation did go through, the 1993 French Grand Prix did go ahead as scheduled as did the 1994, 1995 and 1996 Grand Prix. That is just one example. There are many other examples of where threats, directly or indirectly, by the tobacco companies are simply a bunch of smoke. They have absolutely no relevance to what really will happen. In fact, some have characterized it as a cliché of Chicken Little, "the sky is falling". Everything is going to fall apart.

Most members of Parliament have received letters from the Alliance for Sponsorship Freedom. It represents itself as an alliance of concerned organizations and sponsors of arts, sports, fashion and entertainment events in Canada. Let us look at these poor organizations who, on behalf of the tobacco companies, are saying: "The sky is falling and our events are going to be cancelled if you do this".

Here is just an indication of what are the real facts with respect to how much somebody gets through tobacco sponsorship. People are talking about Just for Laughs, which is a Quebec based cultural

event, and about how terrible it is going to be for Canadians because Just for Laughs will be gone. The fact is that Just for Laughs only receives 10 per cent of its budget from tobacco money. Are the Bloc Quebecois going to convince Canadians that Just for Laughs is going to disappear because it loses 10 per cent of its sponsorship funding? Nonsense.

Members of the Neptune Theatre in Halifax also speak on behalf of this alliance. How much does the Neptune Theatre receive? This is for the people who said it was awful about tobacco sponsorship being restricted. The Neptune Theatre only receives one-half of 1 per cent of its revenue from tobacco money. Is the Neptune Theatre going to go out of business because it loses one-half of 1 per cent of its revenue? Nonsense.

Representations of Players Grand Prix de Canada also speak on behalf of the the Alliance for Sponsorship Freedom. The Grand Prix de Canada receives only one-fifth of its revenues from tobacco money. Again I must ask the question: Is the Grand Prix de Canada going to disappear simply because of the loss of one-fifth of its revenues from tobacco money?

Finally, a 1995 Canadian Conference of the Arts study of 78 arts groups across Canada found that 60 per cent of the surveyed groups received less than 1 per cent of their revenues from tobacco money. In fact, 86 per cent received less than 5 per cent of the revenues from tobacco.

It is very clear from the examples I have given that the tobacco companies have come across a brilliant, superior strategy to deal with a fatal situation in their business. They are going out of business and we know that. We cannot find a place to smoke legally any more in municipal and public buildings in Canada. The Canadian people are making it very clear that the importance is not the commercial benefit of businesses like the tobacco companies. It is the health and welfare of Canadians. It is what the government has brought forward in Bill C-71. It is what the Minister of Health, day after day, has been fighting for in this place. Notwithstanding the Bloc Quebecois and others saying how terrible it is, it is the right thing to do.

As legislators, we are elected to do the right thing and the health of Canadians must come before the profits of the tobacco companies.

I just want to repeat the impact of tobacco on Canada: some \$3.5 billion in direct health care costs and about \$15 billion in comprehensive costs, whether it be social program costs, productivity costs, et cetera, and 40,000 lives lost every year.

We know from research statistics that if a person does not start smoking by the age of 19, it is very likely that person will not become a smoker. It is also clear to the tobacco companies that that is the case. It is clear from their strategies that their target audience is young people. This Minister of Health has been defending Bill C-71 on behalf of the youth of Canada. I am proud to support it and

*Government Orders*

I know this House will support the excellent legislation and the health of Canadians as represented in Bill C-71.

• (1645)

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to speak in this debate, and I will be making use of several documents which I feel to be of great importance.

I have here a letter signed by the Prime Minister himself, Jean Chrétien, dating from 1995, which says the following:

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to extend a welcome to all of you attending this concert presented by Du Maurier Arts.

This event, part of a prestigious six-concert series in six Canadian cities, is evidence of a long and faithful tradition of promoting and encouraging our Canadian artists. Since its inception, Du Maurier Arts Ltd. has been a major supporter of the arts, and has provided many outstanding talents with the opportunity to develop their careers and to bring honour to our country.

I congratulate this organization for its outstanding contribution to the expansion of the arts, and I hope that each and every one of you will have a most entertaining evening.

So there you have six cultural events in six major cities that will no longer be able to take place, thanks to Bill C-71.

This morning we also received a letter from the Montreal Symphony Orchestra, telling us that they had been involved in the Du Maurier matinees for 25 years, and now these matinee performances are in danger of going up in smoke—no pun intended—because the government has decided to pass a bill, some of the clauses of which are anything but sensible.

For the benefit of those of our hon. colleagues who are with us today, I would repeat that the Bloc Québécois supports at least 85 or 90 per cent of this bill, but that we have been given responses this afternoon which have come very close to verging on the opposite of truthfulness.

Clause 31 states, and I quote:

31.(1) No person shall, on behalf of another person, with or without consideration, publish, broadcast or otherwise disseminate any promotion that is prohibited by this Part.

[—]

(3) No person in Canada shall, by means of a publication that is published outside Canada or a broadcast that originates outside Canada or any communication other than a publication or broadcast that originates outside Canada,—

This is clear as mud, and the Supreme Court is going to have fun trying to interpret all this.

—promote any product the promotion of which is regulated under this Part, or disseminate promotional material that contains a tobacco product-related brand element in a way that is contrary to this Part.

At noon, they explained to us on television what all this meant. It means that the Australian Grand Prix on Sunday might not be televised, although the hon. member opposite insisted that anything goes and that nothing is prohibited in this bill; although the minister said during question period this afternoon that he had nothing against promotions and sponsorship and that it was still allowed; and although they told us the present situation might continue until October 1998.

They would have us believe that it will go on until 1998, just enough time to have an election in between. People are not easily fooled. They realize that the Bloc Québécois, while it disagrees with this bill, supports a healthy life style. No one would be against that. We are all for health, but we do not think this is the way to keep people healthy.

When you do not give people the jobs they need, when you cut their unemployment insurance and when all they have left is welfare, you should at least have the decency to let them have a smoke with their feet up on the wood stove. Taking away their right to smoke would be the last straw.

• (1650)

The government is about to regulate people's private lives, telling them what they can do, who they can talk to and what they can watch. This is absurd.

There is also the Coalition québécoise pour le contrôle du tabac which issues press releases that are entirely misleading and refers to us as a party that caves in to pressure groups. As if they were not a pressure group! What is this coalition? A pressure group, pure and simple. It is just applying pressure in the opposite direction. That is the only difference.

We represent the interests of Quebec. We promised Quebecers that we would go the limit to defend the interests of Quebec and that is what we are doing now. We want to tell this government, which is insensitive and is even deaf to the demands of its own supporters, we say to this government that it makes no sense at all to paint yourself into a corner the way it has done. How they can back out? By saying that they will add an extra year or a fourth or a fifth? That does not change anything. It just postpones dealing with the problem.

We want this government to deal with the problem right away and to make the right decisions. I spent 35 years of my life teaching young children, and I can tell you that preventing young people from watching the Grand Prix and their idol Jacques Villeneuve is not going to deal with the problem of smoking in Quebec.

*Government Orders*

Just let them try to make us believe that one. Earlier, I was listening to a young driver, who was totally shattered this afternoon to hear the minister lay the guilt on him for the death of 40,000 people, because he races cars, and tobacco companies sponsor car races.

He was totally shattered at the attempt to link these two things. Are we now going to be prevented from smoking in our own cars, because it could be dangerous and could cause accidents? Smoking has already been prohibited in aircraft, because the people in front were sending their smoke to the back or the other way around, according to how the air circulated.

We are on the point of being regulated everywhere, and that does not make a lot of sense. What does the coalition have to say?

The Bloc is acting as if the question of tobacco sponsorship concerned only economic interests and had nothing to do with tobacco and its effects on health, that is, the 12,000 deaths annually in Quebec. Do we have to again repeat what we have said so many times? This bill is first and foremost a matter of public health.

In 80 per cent of the cases, we agree that it pertains to public health.

I met Dr. Vanasse in my riding, who is in charge of public health in the region. Even though he came to my riding office to lobby for my support of the bill, he said that it avoided the heart of the issue by not controlling the product. So, the government is not dealing with the essential, but with the secondary and is preventing people from having access to cultural and sporting events.

Do you know what is important for a people? It is to develop culturally, and sports are an integral part of the cultural life of a people. I would like to thank the Liberal Party officially. I would like it to be noted in *Hansard* that I am thanking the Liberal Party, because what happened in Montreal at noon is totally amazing.

The city shut down between 11.30 a.m. and 11.45 a.m., taxi drivers and everything. Because of a bill that has a number of stupid clauses, you enabled us to make a few political points. The next time we will win even more ridings in Quebec, and it will be one more reason to leave this country, which wants to prevent us from fulfilling ourselves.

• (1655)

**Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ):** It is with great pleasure that I rise again to speak to Bill C-71, which deals with tobacco in general, as well as its consumption, promotion, labelling, sale, and manufacture.

To start with, I would like to salute two of my colleagues who have done a tremendous amount of work on this issue, namely my colleague from Drummond and my colleague from Lévis, who often had to face difficult circumstances due to the underhanded way the government has dealt with this issue of utmost importance

for thousands and thousands of Quebecers and Canadians. It tried to work behind closed doors, at the end of a session and at night, issuing position papers and press releases. It made sure the official opposition had to work under the most difficult conditions. It refused to work in committee, only to yield to pressure from the opposition. Therefore, I want to pay tribute to both my colleagues because without them, this debate would probably not have taken place.

I would also like to pay tribute to people who today rose to the occasion in Montreal of course, but also in Trois-Rivières, in my riding, in my home town. Restaurant owners, shopkeepers, taxi drivers, hotel managers and employees marched in the streets to show their unmitigated displeasure and disagreement with this particular provision of the bill and not with the spirit of the bill itself. These are significant nuances that the government in its carelessness seems unable to grasp.

As the leader of the Bloc Québécois and leader of the opposition said during question period, we agree with 80 per cent of this bill. We, however, totally disagree with one of its major aspects, which is the focus of the present debate, and that is the advertising, the sponsorships. That is why I rose today. We can see how the government is acting in bad faith. The more the government speaks on this issue, the more we can see its bad faith; it wants to convince the public and this House that eliminating sponsorships, billboards and tobacco company logos will have a positive impact on people's health. This would require a great leap of logic that is outrageous.

The government is refusing to budge, even though it is a matter of economic development as thousands of jobs, including some 100 in Trois-Rivières, 3,000 in Montreal and 5,000 in Canada, are at stake. There are also some international repercussions. People in 141 countries can watch the Trois-Rivières Grand Prix on television. I discovered that this morning. This is no small feat! The Grand Prix is not a spontaneous event. If it can be held at all this year, it will be for the 28th year, thanks to the work and energy of the many volunteers involved.

My colleague, the member for Lévis, mentioned earlier that the Montreal Grand Prix was the third sporting event in importance after the Olympics and the World Cup in soccer. We are talking about huge events here. These are significant events which create an interest, they put Montreal on the map, they attract tourists and they make them want to come back.

The government is not being transparent, it is acting with shortsightedness and incompetence and in bad faith; it is trying to ram this bill through the House by muzzling the opposition as much as possible. We know that, at first reading, only one representative of the Bloc Québécois, my colleague from Lévis, was able to speak. At second reading, the government also acted very quickly. It announced that closure would be imposed today

*Government Orders*

and that third reading would take place Thursday, so as to restrict debate as much as possible.

• (1700)

I would like to draw your attention to this government's attitude, which may be interpreted in various ways. Earlier the chairman of the health committee moved Motion No. 34 with great pride, saying—as the Prime Minister repeated later—that the bill would not come into effect until October 1, 1998. They were very proud of that announcement.

But, if this product is lethal, as I heard on the radio at home this morning, how can they brag about delaying the implementation of this bill as much as possible? Either this is an extremely harmful product or we are able to deal with it. However, if it is extremely harmful, as the bill is suggesting, let us try to act as soon as possible, and certainly not brag about it. Let us not amend this bill only to implement it on October 1.

Therefore, we see that the government is inconsistent and does not care about the public interest, about the best interests of the people. Either it is urgent or it is not. If it is urgent, let us act. If the bill is not so urgent, if it is not so serious, it should never be enforced. The government's current position is remarkably inconsistent, and this is something I wanted to underline.

In this respect, we must also point to the very deplorable behaviour of someone from La Mauricie who, given his influence, his power, his origins, is quite aware of what is going on and of the terrible, catastrophic impact this bill will have on the Quebec economy. You will have recognized the Prime Minister and member for Saint-Maurice, whose behaviour and carelessness I condemn. He does not listen and springs to the defence of this bill.

Reference was made earlier to the great public rallies in Montreal and Trois-Rivières, where people have taken to the streets today. Opposition to the bill is mounting. I would be very pleased to read a release I just received at 3.23 p.m., stating the position of the Montreal Exchange on this issue, not that of the Bloc Québécois.

Very briefly, it reads: "The Montreal Exchange supports the various Montreal communities that are protesting the adoption of Bill C-71. According to its President and Chief Executive Officer, Gérald A. Lacoste, the loss of international events, due to the passing of the law as presented, would be disastrous for Montreal. The Montreal Exchange has frequently used these large-scale events, such as the Canadian Grand Prix and the Du Maurier Open, to promote the dynamism of Montreal and its marketplace among the international financial community".

This is a fine illustration of the consensus developing in a wide segment of the population, which is a stakeholder for one part and

an observer for the other, and which realizes that this government simply lost its bearings and, in this case, can appropriately and colloquially be said to have lost it.

[English]

**Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Middlesex, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to Bill C-71 respecting the tobacco act.

If enacted one of the amendments would oblige the Minister of Health to lay before the House of Commons any proposed regulations under sections 7, 14, 17, 33 or 42 of the act. At that time an appropriate committee would be struck to conduct inquiries or public hearings with respect to the proposed regulation and report its findings to the House.

At the end of the 30 sitting days following the day on which the proposed regulation was laid before the House, the governor in council could make a regulation under any of the aforementioned sections only if the House of Commons has not concurred in any report from a committee respecting the proposed regulation, in which case the regulation may be made in the form laid, or the House of Commons has concurred in a report from a committee approving the proposed regulation or an amended version of it, in which case the governor in council may only make the regulation in the form concurred in.

• (1705)

As members will know, regulations are subordinate laws made pursuant to the authority of statutory provisions called enabling powers. The authority to make regulations is usually delegated to the governor in council, cabinet, but it may also be delegated to one or more individuals or to an independent agency. Ideally these powers are used to make the detailed rules that support the statutory provisions.

While there are a few particular cases in which parliamentary review of regulations before they are made is provided for, this process is a relatively rare exception to the general rule. In general the normal legislative process gives Parliament the role of setting out the principles of law in detailed provisions appropriate for inclusion in the statute and determining the scope and nature of the enabling power which authorizes an elaboration of these provisions by even more detailed supporting rules.

The making of this subordinate law is then left to government ideally in consultation with the primary stakeholders and with some input from the general public. What then are the exceptions to the general regulation making process?

The best example is section 116(2) of the Criminal Code which has required since 1992 that all regulations made pursuant to enabling power under part III of the code, the gun control laws, be

*Government Orders*

laid before Parliament for a review by committee prior to their enactment. A requirement that all regulations made pursuant to this enabling power undergo such a review is a precondition to exercise of the power to make the subordinate laws. Thus we see in section 118 of the Firearms Act a procedure for parliamentary review of proposed regulations before they are made.

Opportunity should be given to the House of Commons to scrutinize and amend, if deemed necessary, any regulations proposed by the minister under the said section.

While I acknowledge the general necessity and appropriateness of executive regulation making in the great majority of cases, I would argue that there are very good reasons regulation making powers in Bill C-71 must be subject to full democratic accountability which is only possible through Parliament.

We must first examine the context in which Bill C-71 was drafted. Essentially the bill represents a response by the Minister of Health to the last year's decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in *RJR-MacDonald versus the Attorney General of Canada*.

Members will recall that in the September 21, 1995 decision a majority of the court ruled the government had failed to demonstrate that the restraints in the Tobacco Products Control Act regarding advertising, promotion and labelling were reasonable, justified restrictions on the freedom of expression and consequently struck down most of the provisions of the act.

In its ruling the Supreme Court has also been helpful through its suggestions of a number of options which the federal government might use in future legislation. In particular, the court mentioned such options as a partial ban on advertising which would allow information and brand preference advertising, a ban on lifestyle advertising, measures to prohibit advertising aimed at children and adolescence, and health labelling requirements with the source of the labelling.

All these options have been incorporated in Bill C-71. Bill C-71 represents a conscientious attempt to respond to the guidance offered by the Supreme Court of Canada. At the same time we must remember that tobacco continues to be a legal product. The producers and retailers of this legal product continue to enjoy the rights and freedoms afforded to them by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Should we not then take advantage of every opportunity available to us as parliamentarians to ensure that any regulations proposed under the bill are scrutinized in detail and in public by a committee which would presumably invite all stakeholders to state their case pro or con on any proposed regulations? I certainly think so.

A public process would go a long way toward legitimizing any proposed regulations precisely because it would allow stakeholders the opportunity to propose in public improvements to the regulations. This public scrutiny of proposed regulations could very well lessen the possibility of court challenges against legislation.

Let us not forget the Tobacco Products Control Act was challenged in court almost as soon as it was proclaimed into law in 1988, taking another seven years before the case finally ended up in the Supreme Court of Canada. Do we really want a repeat of this process, especially when we consider that a number of tobacco companies have already been making threatening noises about further court action against the proposed legislation?

It seems to me we have a golden opportunity to correct flaws which existed not only in the substance of the previous legislation—and here I am referring to both the Tobacco Products Control Act and the Tobacco Sales to Young Persons Act—but in the process as well.

● (1710)

No member of the House would welcome more court challenges to Canada's tobacco legislation. We want it to work. By inviting all stakeholders to participate in the regulation making process, I am convinced we will have created a forum whereby regulations will be made through negotiation rather than intimidation.

I will now say a few words about the actual scope of the enabling power of Bill C-71. In so doing I will argue that taken together they expand regulation making powers far beyond what may be believed as their legitimate scope and must therefore be subject to full democratic accountability, which is possible in Parliament.

The five sections I have mentioned provide for the enabling power to make regulations in the first five parts of the bill which deal with tobacco product standards: access to tobacco products, labelling, promotion and enforcement. Each section begins with the phrase "the governor in council may make regulations", followed by a number of relatively detailed subsections that enumerate the specific areas in which regulations can be made. So far so good.

Each of these subsections is detailed enough to satisfy the principle that regulations should only be made in areas that have been sufficiently defined. However—and here is where alarm bells go off in the minds of all members of the House—each of these sections concludes with the subsection "the governor in council may make regulations generally for carrying out the purposes of this part".

*Government Orders*

In and of itself this catch-all phrase represents sufficient reason to demand that all regulations proposed under the bill be brought under the scrutiny of the parliamentary committee. When we consider that the purpose of the first five parts of Bill C-71 is to introduce a number of restrictions in areas of product content, access, labelling, promotion and enforcement, surely all types of regulations to be made in these invasive periods should be spelled out clearly in enabling power. Unfortunately they are not and the reason is simply that each of these sections contains a subsection which gives the governor in council a virtual *carte blanche* to propose any regulation at all.

How does one define the phrase “generally for carrying out the purpose of this part”? No one can because the options are practically endless. If few people today seriously dispute the legitimacy of executive law making, concerns linger over the extent of these law making powers in the manner of their exercise. The perception is that the regulation making process is not fully compatible with the values of democratic and open government. Whereas statutes are enacted by elected representatives in a public forum, regulations will be characterized as the handiwork of appointed officials who remain unaccountable to Parliament or to the public.

I point out this final observation to my colleagues. Since regulations have the force of law, the process by which they are made must be one that maximizes opportunities for the citizens to participate in their making. Since the legislation which preceded Bill C-71 has been struck down by the Supreme Court of Canada as a transgression against the freedom of expression, the least we can do as legislators is to ensure that reasonable constraints be put in place to check any potential abuse within the regulation making process of the bill.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I thank you for giving me the floor, even though I will not have enough time to finish my 10-minute speech. Still, I want to mention certain principles and parameters on which I will elaborate on Thursday, when we resume this debate.

I remind this House and all our viewers that the Bloc Québécois is not opposed to health and is not trying to fight a bill which, on the surface, seeks to protect people's health. As we said, we all want to do the right thing. We voted in favour of this bill at first and second reading, but we can no longer support it at report stage, because the government is trying to force solutions on us that do not address the real problems.

What is the problem? The problem is that some people smoke too much and become susceptible to problems such as heart attacks, lung cancer, asthma, etc. This is the problem. The government wants to reduce tobacco use and, to that end, it has decided to eliminate sponsorships. This is like telling someone who eats too much that we will cut his fingers off. Instead of teaching the person

not to consume the product that is harmful to his health, we cut that person's fingers off. We are opposed to the solution that the government wants to apply. We have to look at the link between the remedy being proposed and the objective pursued.

I feel the government is trying to administer medication whose side effects have once again not been properly evaluated. It is a good thing to look for measures to restrict and reduce tobacco use, but there are various ways of achieving this. The best one is education.

Unfortunately, I must stop now. I will have good examples to provide on Thursday. I believe I will have at least nine minutes left. Thank you for allowing me to begin my speech.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** It being 5.15 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier this day, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith all questions necessary to dispose of report stage of the bill now before the House.

The 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 (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare the motion agreed to on division.

(Motion No. 6 agreed to.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The next question is on Motion No. 7. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more that five members having risen:*

*Government Orders*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The results of the recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 9, 12 and 13.

The next question is on Motion No. 25. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 33. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

(Motion No. 33 negatived.)

• (1720)

[*English*]

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 Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on Motion No. 34 stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

We will now proceed to the motions in Group No. 4

Since Mr. Robinson is not in the House, we cannot deal with Motions Nos. 10 and 11.

We will go to Motion No. 20.

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-71 be amended by deleting Clause 25.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The question is on Motion No. 20.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Since Mr. Robinson is not present, we cannot deal with Motions Nos. 22 and 23.

We will now go to Motions Nos. 23 and 24.

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-71, in Clause 28, be amended by replacing, in the English version, line 31 on page 10 with the following:

“ry, or used with a service, if the non-tobacco”

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-71, in Clause 29, be amended by replacing line 8 on page 11 with the following:

“(c) furnish an accessory that bears a tobacco product-related brand element without monetary”

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The question is on Motion No. 23. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*Government Orders*

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

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 Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

• (1725)

**Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Middlesex, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 27

That Bill C-71 be amended by adding after line 9 on page 17 the following new Clause:

“42.1 (1) The Governor in Council may not make a regulation under section 7, 14, 17, 33 or 42 unless the Minister has first laid the proposed regulation before the House of Commons.

(2) A proposed regulation that is laid before the House of Commons is deemed to be automatically referred to the appropriate committee of the House, as determined by the rules of the House, and the committee may conduct inquiries or public hearings with respect to the proposed regulation and report its findings to the House.

(3) The Governor in Council may make a regulation under section 7, 14, 17, 33 or 42 only if

(a) the House of Commons has not concurred in any report from a committee respecting the proposed regulation within the thirty sitting days following the day on which the proposed regulation was laid before the House, in which case the regulation may only be made in the form laid; or

(b) the House of Commons has concurred in a report from a committee approving the proposed regulation or an amended version of it, in which case the Governor in Council may only make the regulation in the form concurred in.

(4) For the purpose of this section, “sitting day” means a day on which the House of Commons sits.”

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 28

That Bill C-71 be amended by adding after line 9 on page 17 the following:

“42.1 (1) The Minister shall table in the House of Commons every regulation made under this Act within three sitting days after the day on which it is made.

(2) The regulation comes into force on the 10th sitting day after the day on which it is tabled, or on any later day specified in the regulation, unless a motion to repeal it, signed by not fewer than thirty members of the House of Commons, is filed with the Speaker of the House of Commons before the 10th sitting day.

(3) If a motion to repeal the regulation is filed with the Speaker of the House of Commons in accordance with subsection (2), it shall be taken up and considered by the House of Commons within five sitting days after the day on which it is filed.

(4) The motion shall be taken up after the ordinary hour of daily adjournment, for a period of not more than four hours, and at the end of the debate the Speaker of the House of Commons shall, without delay or further debate or amendment, put every question necessary for the disposition of the motion.

(5) If the motion is adopted, the regulation is repealed, and if the motion is defeated, the regulation comes into force on the day after the day on which the motion is defeated or on any later day specified in the regulation.

(6) The regulation is repealed if Parliament is prorogued or dissolved before the motion is disposed of or, if no motion has been filed, before the end of the period mentioned in subsection (2).

(7) For the purpose of this section, “sitting day” means a day on which the House of Commons is sitting.”

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The vote 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 Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

I therefore declare the motion carried.



*Government Orders*

(Motion No. 27 agreed to.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Motion No. 27 having been agreed to, there will be no vote on Motion No. 28.

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-71 be amended by adding after line 21, on page 21, the following:

“59.1 Notwithstanding anything in section 7, 14, 17, 33 or 42, no regulation may be made under any of those sections except with the approval of every province.”

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 31

That Bill C-71 be amended by deleting Clause 53.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C-71 now before the House. The first question is on Motion No. 1.

Call in the members.

• (1750)

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

(*Division No. 232*)

## YEAS

## Members

Adams	Althouse
Anawak	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Bakopanos
Bélair	Bélanger
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bodnar	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Canuel
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Comuzzi	Copps
Crawford	Crête
Culbert	Cullen
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Dingwall
Dion	Discepolo
Dromisky	Dubé
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Duncan
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	Epp
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier
Gilmour	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Grey (Beaver River)
Grose	Grubel
Guay	Guimond
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harvard
Hayes	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob
Johnston	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knutson	Landry
Langlois	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loubier
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney	Manley
Marchand	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
McCormick	McGuire
McWhinney	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Mifflin	Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Paré	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peric
Peters	Peterson

*Government Orders*

Pettigrew	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proud	Ramsay
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Riis	Ringma
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rocheleau
Rock	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Scott (Skeena)	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Silye	Simmons
Solomon	Speaker
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Taylor
Telegdi	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams
Wood	Young
Zed—201	

**NAYS**

Members

—0

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

• (1800)

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Could the member for Beauce indicate how he is voting? The clerk was unable to take it down.

**Mr. Bernier (Beauce):** For the fourth time, the member for the Republic of Beauce will be voting with the government.

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

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 232.*]

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 1 agreed to.

**Mr. Alcock:** Madam Speaker, a point of order. I would like to have my vote recorded.

**An hon. member:** Madam Speaker, they missed him the first time he stood up.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, I believe that you will find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to report stage Motions Nos. 8, 23 and 24.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Is it agreed to apply the results?

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Agreed, Madam Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, I think the way we are voting is fine. The member for Burin—St. George's has left the Chamber so we cannot apply his vote to the Liberal count.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Agreed and taken into consideration.

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

(*Division No. 234*)

**YEAS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Althouse	Anawak
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bachand
Bakopanos	Bélair
Bélangier	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Beauce)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Bodnar
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Canuel	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Culbert
Cullen	Cummins
Dalphon-Guiral	Daviault
de Savoye	Debien
Dingwall	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Duncan	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Forsyth	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier	Gilmour
Godfrey	Godin
Goodale	Graham
Grey (Beaver River)	Grose
Grubel	Guay
Guimond	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard	Hayes
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Ifody
Irwin	Jackson
Jacob	Johnston
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin

*Government Orders*

Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Lincoln
Loubier	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)	McCormick
McGuire	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Paré
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Silye
Solomon	Speaker
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Taylor
Telegdi	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Ur
Valéri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams
Wood	Young
Zed—201	

**NAYS**

Members

—0

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

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

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 234.*]

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

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 234.*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare the motions carried. Therefore, Motions No. 26 and 29 are carried.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, just to reassure the House, the vote was on Motions Nos. 8, 23 and 24 at report stage.

● (1805)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** To clarify the situation, Motions Nos. 26 and 29 are consequential to Motion No. 8.

**Mr. Kilger:** May I ask the Chair for clarification? Were the motions you mentioned moved by the New Democratic Party or not?

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Motions Nos. 26 and 29 are in the name of the hon. Minister of Health and, in accordance with the Speaker's ruling, the result of the vote on Motion No. 8 applies to them. Consequently, when Motion No. 8 was agreed to, we agreed to Motions Nos. 26 and 29. Those are the three motions moved by the Minister of Health.

[*English*]

We now move to Motion No. 3.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, if the House agrees, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting yea.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** The members of the official opposition will vote nay, Madam Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote yes.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, the New Democratic Party caucus members present this evening will vote yes on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernier (Beauce):** Madam Speaker, to be consistent, I will vote yea.

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 233*)

**YEAS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Althouse	Anawak
Assadourian	Augustine

*Government Orders*

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bakopanos
Bélaire	Bélangier
Bellemare	Benoit
Bernier (Beauce)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bodnar	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chatters
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Culbert	Cullen
Cummins	Dingwall
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grey (Beaver River)	Grose
Grubel	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard	Hayes
Hill (MacLeod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Johnston	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knutson	Lastewka
Lee	Lincoln
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney	Manley
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)	McCormick
McGuire	McWhinney
Meredith	Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Pettigrew
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Ramsay
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Riis	Ringma
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Scott (Skeena)	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Silye	Solomon
Speaker	Speller
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams
Wood	Young
Zed—159	

## NAYS

## Members

Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brien
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier	Godin
Guay	Guimond
Jacob	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Label
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Marchand
Ménard	Mercier
Nunez	Paré
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—42

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 3 carried.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, I believe that you will find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motions Nos. 4 and 17.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Does the House agree on the application of the vote?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 233.]*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Therefore, Motions Nos. 4 and 17 are carried.

The next vote will deal with Motion No. 7. The vote on Motion No. 7 will also apply to Motions Nos. 9, 12 and 13. If Motion No. 7 is agreed to, it will not be necessary to vote on Motion No. 15. If Motion No. 7 is negated, we will then have to vote on Motion No. 15.

● (1810)

The next question is on Motion No. 7.

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

*(Division No. 235)*

## YEAS

## Members

Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brien
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac)

*Government Orders*

Crête  
Davialt  
Debien  
Duceppe  
Fillion  
Gauthier  
Guay  
Hart  
Landry  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Leroux (Shefford)  
Marchand  
Mercier  
Nunez  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pomerleau  
Sauvageau

Dalphonf-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Dubé  
Dumas  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Godin  
Guimond  
Jacob  
Langlois  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Loubier  
Ménard  
Meredith  
Paré  
Plamondon  
Rocheleau  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—44

Rideout  
Ringma  
Robillard  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)  
Serré  
Sheridan  
Solomon  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
Stinson  
Szabo  
Telegdi  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Volpe  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Williams  
Young

Riis  
Robichaud  
Robinson  
Schmidt  
Scott (Skeena)  
Shepherd  
Silye  
Speaker  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Strahl  
Taylor  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Verran  
Walker  
Wells  
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)  
Wood  
Zed—158

**NAYS**

Members

Adams  
Althouse  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Bélair  
Bellemare  
Bernier (Beauce)  
Bevilacqua  
Bodnar  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Calder  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Cohen  
Collins  
Copp  
Culbert  
Cummins  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Duncan  
Easter  
Epp  
Finestone  
Fontana  
Fry  
Gagliano  
Gilmour  
Goodale  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Grubel  
Harvard  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hopkins  
Ianno  
Irwin  
Johnston  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lee  
MacDonald  
Maloney  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)  
McGuire  
Mifflin  
Mitchell  
Murray  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Penson  
Peters  
Pettigrew  
Pillitteri  
Ramsay  
Regan

Alcock  
Anawak  
Augustine  
Bakopanos  
Bélangier  
Benoit  
Bertrand  
Blaikie  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Brushett  
Caccia  
Campbell  
Cauchon  
Chatters  
Collenette  
Comuzzi  
Crawford  
Cullen  
Dingwall  
Discepola  
Duhamel  
Dupuy  
Eggleton  
Fewchuk  
Finlay  
Forseth  
Gaffney  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Grose  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hayes  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hubbard  
Iftody  
Jackson  
Keyes  
Kirkby  
Lastewka  
Lincoln  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)  
Manley  
Massé  
McCormick  
McWhinney  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Murphy  
Nault  
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Payne  
Peric  
Peterson  
Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Proud  
Reed  
Richardson

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Davialt
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 7 lost. I would therefore declare Motions Nos. 9, 12 and 13 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 15.

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

*(Division No. 236)*

**YEAS**

Members

Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brien
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphonf-Guiral
Davialt	de Savoye
Debien	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier	Godin
Guay	Guimond
Jacob	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Marchand
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—43	

## Government Orders

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Althouse	Anawak
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bakopanos
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Benoit
Bernier (Beauce)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bodnar	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chatters
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Culbert	Cullen
Cummins	Dingwall
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grey (Beaver River)	Grose
Grubel	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Harvard
Hayes	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hopkins
Hubbard	Iaino
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Johnston
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Lastewka	Lee
Lincoln	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
McCormick	McGuire
McWhinney	Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Pettigrew
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Ramsay
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Riis	Ringma
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Scott (Skeena)	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Silye	Solomon
Speaker	Speller
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams
Wood	Young
Zed—159	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

● (1825)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 15 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 25.

(The House divided on Motion No. 25, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 237)

## YEAS

## Members

Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brien
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphon-Duval
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier	Godin
Guay	Guimond
Hart	Jacob
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Marchand	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Nunez	Paré
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—44

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Althouse	Anawak
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bakopanos
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Benoit
Bernier (Beauce)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bodnar	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chatters
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Culbert	Cullen
Cummins	Dingwall
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton

*Government Orders*

Epp  
Finestone  
Fontana  
Fry  
Gagliano  
Gilmour  
Goodale  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Grubel  
Harvard  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hopkins  
Ianno  
Irwin  
Johnston  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lee  
MacDonald  
Maloney  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)  
McGuire  
Mifflin  
Mitchell  
Murray  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Penson  
Peters  
Pettigrew  
Pillitteri  
Ramsay  
Regan  
Rideout  
Ringma  
Robillard  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)  
Serré  
Sheridan  
Solomon  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
Stinson  
Szabo  
Telegdi  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Volpe  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Williams  
Zed—157

Fewchuk  
Finlay  
Forseth  
Gaffney  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Grose  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hayes  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hubbard  
Iftody  
Jackson  
Keyes  
Kirkby  
Lastewka  
Lincoln  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)  
Manley  
Massé  
McCormick  
McWhinney  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Murphy  
Nault  
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Payne  
Peric  
Peterson  
Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Proud  
Reed  
Richardson  
Riis  
Robichaud  
Robinson  
Schmidt  
Scott (Skeena)  
Shepherd  
Silye  
Speaker  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Strahl  
Taylor  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Verran  
Walker  
Wells  
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)  
Wood

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Barnes  
Clancy  
Deshaies  
Lalonde  
Lefebvre  
St. Denis  
Venne

Bonin  
Davialt  
Hickey  
Langlois  
Phinney  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

● (1835 )

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 25 lost.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, I believe you will find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to report stage Motions Nos. 20 and 32.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Agreed, Madam Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, the previous vote can apply unless members of our caucus would like to stand to indicate otherwise.

**Mr. Hart:** Madam Speaker, I oppose the motion.

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, I would like to go on record as opposing Motions Nos. 20 and 32.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, the New Democratic Party members in the House vote no on these motions.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernier (Beauce):** Madam Speaker, I will vote the same way as the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer.

[*English*]

(The House divided on the Motion No. 20, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 239*)

**YEAS**

Members

Bachand  
Bellehumeur  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Canuel  
Crête  
Davialt  
Debien  
Duceppe  
Fillion  
Gauthier  
Guay  
Jacob  
Langlois  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Loubier  
Ménard  
Nunez  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pomerleau  
Sauvageau

Bélisle  
Bergeron  
Brien  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Dubé  
Dumas  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Godin  
Guimond  
Landry  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Leroux (Shefford)  
Marchand  
Mercier  
Paré  
Plamondon  
Rocheleau  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—42

**NAYS**

Members

Adams  
Althouse  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Bélair  
Bellemare  
Bernier (Beauce)  
Bevilacqua  
Bodnar  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Calder  
Catterall

Alcock  
Anawak  
Augustine  
Bakopanos  
Bélanger  
Benoit  
Bertrand  
Blaikie  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Brushett  
Caccia  
Campbell  
Cauchon

## Government Orders

Chamberlain	Chatters
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Culbert	Cullen
Cummins	Dingwall
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grey (Beaver River)	Grose
Grubel	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Harvard
Hayes	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Johnston
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Lastewka	Lee
Lincoln	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
McCormick	McGuire
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Silye
Solomon	Speaker
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Taylor
Telegdi	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Williams	Wood
Zed—159	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshais	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 20. I therefore declare Motion No. 32 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 34.

[Translation]

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, you will find that there is unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members having voted yes.

• (1840)

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Madam Speaker, the members of the official opposition will vote no.

[English]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, the Reform Party members present will vote yes unless instructed otherwise by their constituents.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, NDP members present in the House today vote yes.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernier (Beauce):** I vote yes, Madam Speaker.

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Madam Speaker, I must point out to the Chair that the hon. member for Richmond—Wolfe was called away for this vote.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 34, which was agreed to on division:)

(Division No. 238)

## YEAS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Althouse	Anawak
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bakopanos
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Benoit
Bernier (Beauce)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bodnar	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chatters
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Culbert	Cullen
Cummins	Dingwall
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham



*Government Orders*

PAIRED MEMBERS

Grey (Beaver River)	Grose
Grubel	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Harvard
Hayes	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Johnston
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Lastewka	Lee
Lincoln	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
McCormick	McGuire
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Silye
Solomon	Speaker
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Taylor
Telegdi	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Williams	Wood
Zed—159	

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 34 agreed to.

The next question is on Motion No. 31.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 31.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, you will find that there is unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members having voted no.

**Mr. Dalphond-Guiral:** Madam Speaker, the members of the official opposition will vote yes. The hon. member for Richmond—Wolfe is back; he will vote with his party.

[*English*]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, Reform Party members present will be voting yes unless instructed otherwise by their constituents.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, could you clarify precisely what motion this is, please?

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** This is Motion No. 31.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, New Democrat members in the House vote no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernier (Beauce):** Madam Speaker, as my allegiance is to Beauce, I vote with the government.

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 240*)

YEAS

NAYS

Members

Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brien
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier	Godin
Guay	Guimond
Jacob	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Marchand	Ménard
Mercier	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—41	

Bélisle	Bergeron
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond-Guiral	de Savoye
Dubé	Dumas
Gagnon (Québec)	Godin
Guimond	Landry
Laurin	Lebel
Loubier	Ménard
Nunez	Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau	Sauvageau

Members

Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Canuel	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye

*Government Orders*

Debien  
Duceppe  
Duncan  
Fillion  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Gilmour  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Guay  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hayes  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Johnston  
Langlois  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Loubier  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
Ménard  
Meredith  
Nunez  
Penson  
Plamondon  
Ramsay  
Rocheleau  
Schmidt  
Silye  
Stinson  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Williams—73

Dubé  
Dumas  
Epp  
Forseth  
Gauthier  
Godin  
Grubel  
Guimond  
Hart  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Jacob  
Landry  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Leroux (Shefford)  
Marchand  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)  
Mercier  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Paré  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pomerleau  
Ringma  
Sauvageau  
Scott (Skeena)  
Speaker  
Strahl  
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)

Rideout  
Robichaud  
Robinson  
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)  
Shepherd  
Solomon  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Taylor  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Verran  
Walker  
Wells  
Wood

Riis  
Robillard  
Rock  
Serré  
Sheridan  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
Szabo  
Telegdi  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Volpe  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Zed—128

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Barnes  
Clancy  
Deshaies  
Lalonde  
Lefebvre  
St. Denis  
Venne

Bonin  
Daviault  
Hickey  
Langlois  
Phinney  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

## NAYS

## Members

Adams  
Althouse  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Bélair  
Bellemare  
Bertrand  
Blaikie  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Calder  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Collette  
Comuzzi  
Crawford  
Cullen  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Dupuy  
Eggleton  
Finestone  
Fontana  
Gaffney  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Goodale  
Grose  
Hopkins  
Ianno  
Irwin  
Keyes  
Kirkby  
Lastewka  
Lincoln  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)  
Manley  
McCormick  
McWhinney  
Mitchell  
Murray  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Peric  
Peterson  
Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Proud  
Regan

Alcock  
Anawak  
Augustine  
Bakopanos  
Bélangier  
Bernier (Beauce)  
Bevilacqua  
Bodnar  
Brushett  
Caccia  
Campbell  
Cauchon  
Cohen  
Collins  
Copps  
Culbert  
Dingwall  
Discepola  
Duhamel  
Easter  
Fewchuk  
Finlay  
Fry  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Harvard  
Hubbard  
Iftody  
Jackson  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lee  
MacDonald  
Maloney  
Massé  
McGuire  
Mifflin  
Murphy  
Nault  
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Payne  
Peterson  
Pettigrew  
Pillitteri  
Reed  
Richardson

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 31 negated.

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (for the Minister of Health)** moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea with the exception of the member for Hillsborough who is absent for this vote and the member for Haldimand—Norfolk who will be voting in the negative.

• (1845)

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, could you please inform the House on which motion we are voting. You did not finish your sentence and I did not get the number from the whip because he never said the number. I would appreciate it if you would tell us.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** We are voting on report stage concurrence.

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Madam Speaker, the members of the official opposition will vote nay.

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, the Reform Party members present will vote yes unless instructed otherwise by their constituents.

**Mr. Hart:** Madam Speaker, I vote against the bill.

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, my constituents have advised me to vote against this bill.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, members of the NDP present vote yes.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Bernier (Beauce, Ind.):** Madam Speaker, I will vote like the member for Outremont.

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

(Division No. 241)

**YEAS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Althouse	Anawak
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bakopanos
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Benoit
Bernier (Beauce)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bodnar	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chatters
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Culbert	Cullen
Cummins	Dingwall
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
Épp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grey (Beaver River)	Grose
Grubel	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Harvard
Hayes	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Johnston
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Lastewka	Lee
Lincoln	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
McCormick	McGuire
McWhinney	Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhian	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Pettigrew
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Silye
Solomon	Speaker

Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Strahl  
Taylor  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Verran  
Walker  
Wells  
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)  
Wood

Stewart (Brant)  
Stinson  
Szabo  
Telegdi  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Volpe  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Williams  
Zed—156

**NAYS**

Members

Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brien
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier	Godin
Guay	Guimond
Jacob	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Marchand
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Speller	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—44

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** When shall this bill be read the third time? At the next sitting of the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

**CANADA LABOUR CODE**

The House resumed from March 3, 1997, consideration of Bill C-66, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at report stage of Bill C-66.

*Government Orders*

The question is on Motion No. 2.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, you will find there is unanimous consent to say that members who voted on the previous motion, with the addition of the hon. member for Hillsborough, be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** There are problems mustering the troops, Madam Speaker. The Bloc Québécois votes yea.

[*English*]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote no. It should be noted that the member for Calgary Centre is no longer here.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, the New Democratic Party members in the House this evening vote yes on this motion.

• (1850)

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Madam Speaker, I would like to point out that the hon. members for Roberval and Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, as well as the hon. member for Beauce, will be absent for the votes to follow.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 242)*

## YEAS

## Members

Aithouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Blaikie
Brien	Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Dalphond-Guiral	Daviault
de Savoye	Debien
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)	Godin
Guay	Jacob
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Marchand	Ménard
Mercier	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Solomon	Taylor
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—47	

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Anawak	Assadourian
Augustine	Bakopanos
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Benoit
Bertrand	Bevilacqua

Bodnar	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chatters
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Culbert	Cullen
Cummins	Dingwall
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grey (Beaver River)	Grose
Grubel	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Harvard
Hayes	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Johnston
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Lastewka	Lee
Lincoln	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
McCormick	McGuire
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Ringma
Robichaud	Robillard
Rock	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Speaker
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams
Wood	Zed—150

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

*Government Orders*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 2 negatived.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe you will consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following. Before I list them, I would ask you to withdraw the following members from the government side: Mr. Dingwall, Mr. Bélair and Mr. Volpe.

We would apply the previous vote with those exceptions to report stage Motions Nos. 3, 9, 50, 13, 36, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 34, 27, 38, 40, 46, 48 and 52.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Does the House give its consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Bélair:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Nature called. I am back. I would like to be registered for this vote.

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

*(Division No. 243)*

**YEAS**

Members

Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Blaikie
Brien	Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Dalphon-DuGiral	Daviault
de Savoye	Debien
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)	Godin
Guay	Jacob
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Marchand	Ménard
Mercier	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Solomon	Taylor
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—47	

**NAYS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anawak	Assadourian
Augustine	Bakopanos
Bélangier	Bellemare
Benoit	Bertrand

Bevilacqua	Bodnar
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chatters	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Comuzzi	Copps
Crawford	Culbert
Cullen	Cummins
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grey (Beaver River)	Grose
Grubel	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Harvard
Hayes	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Johnston
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Lastewka	Lee
Lincoln	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
McCormick	McGuire
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Ringma
Robichaud	Robillard
Rock	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Speaker
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Williams	Wood
Zed—147	

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

*Government Orders*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 3 negatived. By unanimous consent, I also declare Motions Nos. 9, 50, 13, 36, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 34, 27, 38, 40, 46, 48 and 52 negatived.

Consequently, Motions Nos. 16, 17, 23, 39, 44 and 53 are also negatived.

• (1855)

The next question is on Motion No. 5.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, I think you will find unanimous consent that those members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior being added to the list and the hon. members for St. Boniface and Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke being removed from the list. Liberal members will vote no.

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Madam Speaker, the members of the official opposition will vote yes.

[*English*]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, Reform members present will vote yes unless instructed otherwise by their constituents.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, New Democrat members present vote no on this motion.

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

(*Division No. 244*)

## YEAS

## Members

Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Canuel	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Epp
Fillion	Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)	Gilmour
Godin	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Guay
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Hayas	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Jacob
Johnston	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)

Loubier	Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Nunez	Paré
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams—70

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Althouse	Anawak
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bakopanos
Belair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bodnar	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Culbert	Cullen
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Grose
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Lastewka	Lee
Lincoln	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McWhinney	Mifflin
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Pettigrew
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Solomon	Speller
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	Wood
Zed—123	

*Government Orders*

PAIRED MEMBERS

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 5 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 6.

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

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Madam Speaker, the members of the official opposition will vote no.

[*English*]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote yes.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party caucus will vote no on this motion.

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

(*Division No. 245*)

YEAS

Members

Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Hayes	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Penson	Ramsay
Ringma	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams—30

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Althouse	Anawak
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bachand
Bakopanos	Béclair
Bélangier	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Bodnar
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)

Brushett	Bryden
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Canuel
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Culbert
Cullen	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Dion
Discepolo	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Godfrey	Godin
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guay
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jacob	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knudson	Landry
Langlois	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loubier
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney	Manley
Marchand	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McWhinney	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Paré	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Riis	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Solomon
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Taylor
Telegdi	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	Wood
Zed—163	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

*Government Orders*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 6 lost.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, I believe you will find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motions Nos. 45, 49, 11, 24, 28, 29, 26, 31, 42, 47 and 37.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral:** We agree.

[*English*]

**Mr. Johnston:** Madam Speaker, did the government whip say Motion No. 47 or 37?

• (1905)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Both motions.

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, I do not think it is the fault of the government whip but a mistake was made. The application of the vote to Motion No. 37 is correct. The application to Motion No. 47 is not correct for the Reform Party. All the others are right.

**Mr. Kilger:** I agree, Madam Speaker. The vote applies to Motion No. 37 but not to Motion No. 47.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 245.*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Motions Nos. 45, 49, 11, 24, 28, 29, 26, 31, 42 and 37 are lost. Consequently Motions Nos. 41, 51, 25 and 43 are also lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 7.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, if you were to seek it, you would find unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion, except for the hon. members for Hamilton West and London East, be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral:** Members of the official opposition will vote yea.

[*English*]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote no.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, New Democratic Party members present will vote no on this motion.

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

(*Division No. 246*)

## YEAS

## Members

Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brien
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoie
Debien	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Godin	Guay
Jacob	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Marchand
Ménard	Mercier
Nunez	Paré
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—40

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Althouse	Anawak
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bakopanos
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Benoit
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Bodnar
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chatters	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Comuzzi	Copps
Crawford	Culbert
Cullen	Cummins
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duncan
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	Épp
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Forseth
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grey (Beaver River)	Grose
Grubel	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Harvard
Hayes	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hubbard
Ianno	Itody
Irwin	Jackson
Johnston	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Lastewka	Lee
Lincoln	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
McCormick	McGuire
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell	Murphy



*Government Orders*

Murray  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Penson  
Peters  
Pettigrew  
Pillitteri  
Ramsay  
Regan  
Rideout  
Ringma  
Robillard  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)  
Serré  
Sheridan  
Speaker  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Strahl  
Taylor  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Verran  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Williams  
Zed—151

Nault  
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Payne  
Peric  
Peterson  
Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Proud  
Reed  
Richardson  
Riis  
Robichaud  
Robinson  
Schmidt  
Scott (Skeena)  
Shepherd  
Solomon  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
Stinson  
Szabo  
Telegdi  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Walker  
Wells  
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)  
Wood

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Barnes  
Clancy  
Deshaies  
Lalonde  
Lefebvre  
St. Denis  
Venne

Bonin  
Davialt  
Hickey  
Langlois  
Phinney  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 7 lost.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, I believe you will find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 47.

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral:** Agreed.

*[English]*

**Mr. Strahl:** Agreed.

**Mr. Solomon:** Agreed.

*[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 246.]*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 47 lost.

• (1910)

The next question is on Motion No. 54.

**Mr. Kilger;** Madam Speaker, I propose you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting yea.

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral:** Madam Speaker, members of the official opposition will vote yea.

*[English]*

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote yes except for the member for Skeena who has left the Chamber.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, New Democrat members present will be voting yes on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 54, which was agreed to on the following division: )

*(Division No. 247)*

**YEAS**

Members

Adams  
Althouse  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Bakopanos  
Bélanger  
Bellehumeur  
Benoit  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Bevilacqua  
Bodnar  
Brien  
Brushett  
Caccia  
Campbell  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Collenette  
Comuzzi  
Crawford  
Culbert  
Cummins  
Davialt  
Debien  
Discepolo  
Dubé  
Dumas  
Dupuy  
Eggleton  
Fewchuk  
Finestone  
Forseth  
Gaffney  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Gilmour  
Godin  
Graham  
Grose  
Guay  
Hart  
Hayes  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Ianno  
Irwin  
Jacob  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Langlois  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Lincoln  
MacDonald  
Maloney  
Marchand  
Massé  
McCormick  
McWhinney  
Mercier  
Mifflin

Alcock  
Anawak  
Augustine  
Bachand  
Bélair  
Bélisle  
Bellemare  
Bergeron  
Bertrand  
Blaikie  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Calder  
Canuel  
Cauchon  
Chatters  
Cohen  
Collins  
Coppes  
Crête  
Cullen  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Duceppe  
Duncan  
Easter  
Epp  
Fillion  
Finlay  
Fry  
Gagliano  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Godfrey  
Goodale  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Grubel  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Harvard  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hubbard  
Iftody  
Jackson  
Johnston  
Kirkby  
Landry  
Lastewka  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Lee  
Leroux (Shefford)  
Loubier  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)  
Manley  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)  
McGuire  
Ménard  
Meredith  
Mills (Red Deer)

*Government Orders*

Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Paré	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proud	Ramsay
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Riis	Ringma
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rocheleau
Rock	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Solomon
Speaker	Speller
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams
Wood	Zed—190

## NAYS

Members

—0

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaiies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 54 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 33.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, I believe you will find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 33.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Agreed.

[*English*]

**Mr. Strahl:** Agreed.

**Mr. Solomon:** Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 247.*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I therefore declare Motion No. 33 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 12.

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

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Members of the official opposition will vote yea, Madam Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote no.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, NDP members present will vote no on this motion.

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

(*Division No. 248*)

## YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anawak	Assadourian
Augustine	Bachand
Bakopanos	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bodnar	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Canuel	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Comuzzi	Copps
Crawford	Crête
Culbert	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Daviault
de Savoye	Debien
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Finlay	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Godfrey	Godin
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guay
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jacob	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Lincoln
Loubier	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Mitchell

*Government Orders*

Murphy  
Nault  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Parrish  
Payne  
Peters  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Plamondon  
Proud  
Regan  
Rideout  
Robillard  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)  
Shepherd  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
Szabo  
Torsney  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Walker  
Wells  
Wood

Murray  
Nunez  
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)  
Pagtakhan  
Paré  
Patri  
Peric  
Peterson  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pillitteri  
Pomerleau  
Reed  
Richardson  
Robichaud  
Rocheleau  
Sauvageau  
Serré  
Sheridan  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Telegdi  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Valeri  
Verran  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Zed—154

previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Members of the official opposition will vote yea, Madam Speaker.

[English]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote yes.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, New Democrats present this evening will vote yes on this motion.

**Mr. Dhaliwal:** Madam Speaker, I will be voting with the government on this motion.

• (1915 )

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

**NAYS**

Members

Althouse  
Benoit  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Cummins  
Epp  
Gilmour  
Grubel  
Hart  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Johnston  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Ramsay  
Ringma  
Schmidt  
Speaker  
Strahl  
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Blaikie  
Chatters  
Duncan  
Forseth  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hayes  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
Meredith  
Penson  
Riis  
Robinson  
Solomon  
Stinson  
Taylor  
Williams—36

(Division No. 249)

**YEAS**

Members

Althouse  
Bachand  
Bellehumeur  
Bergeron  
Blaikie  
Brien  
Chatters  
Crête  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Dubé  
Dumas  
Epp  
Forseth  
Gilmour  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Guay  
Hart  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Jacob  
Landry  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Leroux (Shefford)  
Marchand  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)  
Mercier  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Paré  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pomerleau  
Riis  
Robinson  
Sauvageau  
Solomon  
Stinson  
Taylor  
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Bélisle  
Benoit  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Canuel  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Cummins  
Davault  
Debien  
Duceppe  
Duncan  
Fillion  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Godin  
Grubel  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hayes  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Johnston  
Langlois  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Loubier  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
Ménard  
Meredith  
Nunez  
Penson  
Plamondon  
Ramsay  
Ringma  
Rocheleau  
Schmidt  
Speaker  
Strahl  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Williams—76

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Barnes  
Clancy  
Deshaies  
Lalonde  
Lefebvre  
St. Denis  
Venne

Bonin  
Davault  
Hickey  
Langlois  
Phinney  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 12 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 14.

[Translation]

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, if you were to seek it, you would find unanimous consent that all members who voted on the

**NAYS**

Members

Adams  
Anawak  
Augustine  
Bélair

Alcock  
Assadourian  
Bakopanos  
Bélanger

*Government Orders*

Bellemare	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bodnar
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Comuzzi	Copps
Crawford	Culbert
Cullen	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepolo
Dromisky	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Lastewka	Lee
Lincoln	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McWhinney	Mifflin
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Pettigrew
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Robichaud
Robillard	Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	Wood
Zed—115	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 14 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 19.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, if the House agrees, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion, and please add the member for Eglinton—Lawrence, be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting yea.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Members of the official opposition will vote nay, Madam Speaker.

[English]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, NDP members present vote yes.

(The House divided on Motion No. 19, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 250)

## YEAS

Members	
Adams	Alcock
Althouse	Anawak
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bakopanos
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Benoit
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Bodnar
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chatters	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Comuzzi	Copps
Crawford	Culbert
Cullen	Cummins
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dromisky
Duncan	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Forseth	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Grey (Beaver River)
Grose	Grubel
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Harvard	Hayes
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Johnston
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knutson	Lastewka
Lee	Lincoln
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney	Manley
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)	McCormick
McGuire	McWhinney
Meredith	Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Pettigrew

*Government Orders*

Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Proud  
Reed  
Richardson  
Riis  
Robichaud  
Robinson  
Schmidt  
Serré  
Sheridan  
Speaker  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Strahl  
Taylor  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Verran  
Walker  
Wells  
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)  
Wood

Pillitteri  
Ramsay  
Regan  
Rideout  
Ringma  
Robillard  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)  
Shepherd  
Solomon  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
Stinson  
Szabo  
Telegdi  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Volpe  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Williams  
Zed—152

**Mr. Dalphond-Guiral:** Members of the official opposition will vote nay, Madam Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote yes.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, NDP members present will vote no on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 35, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 251*)

**YEAS**

Members

Adams  
Anawak  
Augustine  
Bélair  
Bellemare  
Bertrand  
Bodnar  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Calder  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Cohen  
Collins  
Coppes  
Culbert  
Cummins  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Dupuy  
Eggleton  
Fewchuk  
Finlay  
Fry  
Gagliano  
Gilmour  
Goodale  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Grubel  
Hart  
Hayes  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Ianno  
Irwin  
Johnston  
Kirkby  
Lastewka  
Lincoln  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)  
Manley  
Massé  
McCormick  
McWhinney  
Mifflin  
Mitchell  
Murray  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Penson  
Peters  
Pettigrew  
Pillitteri  
Ramsay  
Regan  
Rideout  
Robichaud  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)  
Shepherd  
Speaker  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Strahl

Alcock  
Assadourian  
Bakopanos  
Bélanger  
Benoit  
Bevilacqua  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Brushett  
Caccia  
Campbell  
Cauchon  
Chatters  
Collenette  
Comuzzi  
Crawford  
Cullen  
Dhaliwal  
Discepola  
Duncan  
Easter  
Epp  
Finestone  
Forseth  
Gaffney  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Grose  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Harvard  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hubbard  
Itody  
Jackson  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lee  
MacDonald  
Maloney  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)  
McGuire  
Meredith  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Murphy  
Nault  
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Payne  
Peric  
Peterson  
Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Proud  
Reed  
Richardson  
Ringma  
Robillard  
Schmidt  
Serré  
Sheridan  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
Stinson  
Szabo

**NAYS**

Members

Bachand  
Bellehumeur  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Canuel  
Crête  
Daviault  
Debien  
Duceppe  
Fillion  
Godin  
Jacob  
Langlois  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Loubier  
Ménard  
Nunez  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pomerleau  
Sauvageau

Bélisle  
Bergeron  
Brien  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Dubé  
Dumas  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Guay  
Landry  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Leroux (Shefford)  
Marchand  
Mercier  
Paré  
Plamondon  
Rocheleau  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—40

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Barnes  
Clancy  
Deshaies  
Lalonde  
Lefebvre  
St. Denis  
Venne

Bonin  
Daviault  
Hickey  
Langlois  
Phinney  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 19 agreed to.

The next question is on Motion No. 35.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, if you were to seek it, you would find unanimous consent that all members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

*Government Orders*

Telegdi	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vancilief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Williams	Wood
Zed—145	

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

(Division No. 252)

**NAYS**

Members

Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Blaikie
Brien	Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Dalphondu-Guiral	Daviault
de Savoye	Debien
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)	Godin
Guay	Jacob
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Marchand	Ménard
Mercier	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Solomon	Taylor
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—47	

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshaies	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 35 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 32.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, if the House agrees, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting yea.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Dalphondu-Guiral:** Members of the official opposition will vote yes, Madam Speaker.

[English]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote no.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party will vote yes on this motion.

**YEAS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Althouse	Anawak
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bachand
Bakopanos	Bélar
Bélangier	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Bodnar
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Canuel
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Culbert
Cullen	Dalphondu-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Finlay	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Godfrey	Godin
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guay
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jacob	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Lincoln
Loubier	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Paré
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proud	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rocheleau
Rock	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Serré
Shepherd	Sheridan
Solomon	Speller
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur	Valeri

*Government Orders*

(Division No. 253)

Vanclief  
Volpe  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Zed—163

Verran  
Walker  
Wells  
Wood

**NAYS**

Members

Benoit  
Chatters  
Duncan  
Forseth  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hayes  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
Meredith  
Penson  
Ringma  
Speaker  
Strahl  
Williams —29

Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Cummins  
Epp  
Gilmour  
Grubel  
Hart  
Hill (Macleod)  
Johnston  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Ramsay  
Schmidt  
Stinson  
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Barnes  
Clancy  
Deshaies  
Lalonde  
Lefebvre  
St. Denis  
Venne

Bonin  
Daviault  
Hickey  
Langlois  
Phinney  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

● (1920)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare Motion No. 32 carried.

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.)** moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, if the House agrees, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting *yea*.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Members of the official opposition will vote no, Madam Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote no unless instructed otherwise by their constituents.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party present will vote *yea* on this motion.

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

Adams  
Althouse  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Bélair  
Bellemare  
Bevilacqua  
Bodnar  
Brushett  
Caccia  
Campbell  
Cauchon  
Cohen  
Collins  
Copps  
Culbert  
Dhaliwal  
Discepolo  
Dupuy  
Eggleton  
Finestone  
Fry  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Irwin  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lee  
MacDonald  
Maloney  
Massé  
McGuire  
Mifflin  
Murphy  
Nault  
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Payne  
Peters  
Pettigrew  
Pillitteri  
Reed  
Richardson  
Riis  
Robillard  
Rock  
Serré  
Sheridan  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
Szabo  
Telegdi  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Volpe  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Zed—123

**YEAS**

Members

Alcock  
Anawak  
Augustine  
Bakopanos  
Bélanger  
Bertrand  
Blaikie  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Calder  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Collette  
Comuzzi  
Crawford  
Cullen  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Easter  
Fewchuk  
Finlay  
Gaffney  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Goodale  
Grose  
Hubbard  
Ifody  
Jackson  
Kirkby  
Lastewka  
Lincoln  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)  
Manley  
McCormick  
McWhinney  
Mitchell  
Murray  
O'Brien (Labrador)  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Peric  
Peterson  
Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Proud  
Regan  
Rideout  
Robichaud  
Robinson  
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)  
Shepherd  
Solomon  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Taylor  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Verran  
Walker  
Wells  
Wood

**NAYS**

Members

Bachand  
Bellehumeur  
Bergeron  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Canuel  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Bélisle  
Benoit  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Brien  
Chatters  
Crête

*Private Members' Business*

Cummins	Dalmond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Epp
Fillion	Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)	Gilmour
Godin	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Guay
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Hayes	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Jacob
Johnston	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Nunez	Paré
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Williams—69	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Barnes	Bonin
Clancy	Daviault
Deshais	Hickey
Lalonde	Langlois
Lefebvre	Phinney
St. Denis	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Venne	

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare the motion carried.

**Mr. Kilger:** Madam Speaker, the motion we will be considering during private members' hour stands in the name of the member for The Battlefords—Meadow Lake. All parties have been consulted and have agreed that we will proceed with private members' hour, although we are passed the hour of seven o'clock.

The agreement encompasses the member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup who would be given the courtesy, and that was agreed to by the member for The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, that he speak first during private members' hour. That is the agreement we came to. I hope it will stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Do we have unanimous consent for that agreement?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** It being 7.25 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

## PENSIONS

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should renew its commitment to British pensioners living in Canada and vigorously pursue an agreement with the government of the United Kingdom to provide them with pensions fully indexed to the cost of living.

[Translation]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to the hon. member's motion concerning the government's commitment to British pensioners living in Canada.

I agree there is something entirely unacceptable in the present situation. As a result, pensioners are receiving and will receive in the future, if the situation does not change, the same amount they have received since the very beginning. Of course there was no indexation at the time, and now we have a situation that has become absurd, where pensioners who earned the right to a pension are in fact deprived of that right since the amount is not really significant. It is too bad the motion is not votable, but perhaps it could be examined in committee and we will see what can be achieved by going this route.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to a similar situation that existed with respect to American pensions. Last year, a very unfortunate decision was made by the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States when the tax treaty between these two countries was renewed. Formerly, people receiving American pensions received the full amount and declared half of the amount on their income tax return. In other words, someone who received \$10,000 in pension payments in one year would declare \$5,000, and as result of various tax deductions, low income people were not too severely penalized.

However, under the new tax treaty signed by the Government of Canada, and the Minister of Finance himself admitted it was unfair, pensioners are now taxed at source by the American government and have no way of recovering the amounts they are due. This is totally unacceptable. It leads to situations that make no sense at all.

For instance, someone in my riding is now faced with the following problem: formerly she received \$400 per month, which by the end of the year added up to only \$4,800. This person is 62 and it is the only income that person has. As result of the deduction at source, this person gets \$290 per month instead of \$400. It means \$110 deducted per month. When your income only amounts to a few thousand dollars, this \$110 per month is often needed to pay for rent and food. This is totally unacceptable. The minister



admitted it was unfair, but unfortunately, there has been no concrete action by the government in recent months to deal with the situation.

• (1930)

As you know, negotiations are under way with the U.S. government aimed at modifying the tax agreement. I have made representations to the minister and the senior officials responsible for trying to move this matter along, and according to their best case scenario, the tax agreement will perhaps be changed in 1998, if everything goes well, and if there is rapid progress.

During that time, those who are being penalized will continue to be penalized, and the government has proposed no stop-gap measures whatsoever to remedy the situation, none whatsoever. The latest budget contained not a single one. Yet the Minister of Finance's budget would have offered a fine opportunity to make some corrections, to improve these pensioners' situation. But nothing doing.

I find this absolutely deplorable, since there are 70,000 people across Canada who are affected by this situation. Of these, 10,000 are in Quebec, 1,643 in the lower St. Lawrence region alone. These are all people who went to the U.S. to earn their living, often in New England just across the border in Maine, but also all along the border. Now they are coming back to Canada and finding themselves in an absolutely horrible situation.

To repeat the example I gave just a while ago: when a person is entitled to about \$10,000 from that pension, the Americans hold back \$2,500, which means he or she is left with \$7,500. Then when the person files income tax, he has to declare the whole \$10,000 as income, even though the \$2,500 has been lost sight of forever, with no way of ever getting it back.

Here is what is being suggested as an interim measure: in calculations for the guaranteed income supplement, for example, the actual amount received by the person could be used, and this would give him a better chance of being eligible for a sizeable portion of the income supplement.

It is hard to understand why the minister has not heeded these requests and why there have been no proposals made. It is not because no one has spoken of them to him, for there have already been important meetings in various parts of Canada, and it is known that 70,000 people are affected by this.

In my riding alone, at least 200 people have written to the minister in recent months. Hundreds of people have signed petitions to get this matter corrected, and we are still unable to rouse the sympathies of the minister to get him to correct the situation for low income earners.

### *Private Members' Business*

There are some strange situations. For example, in the case of someone with a substantial pension of say \$40,000 a year, \$10,000 would go to the American government. In the past, this person was taxed on 50 per cent of the amount he or she received, that is \$20,000.

Under the new convention, people earning a lot pay less income tax, and people earning little now receive less. This situation must be corrected. It is not a partisan situation, it is a situation that calls for concrete action by the government. In the same way as the member called for fair treatment of British retirees in Canada, I think our own people, Canadian citizens, who worked hard in the United States for a period of time, must enjoy the same treatment.

A number of people in my riding have often worked for logging companies as lumberjacks, cooks and in other capacities, where they have worked very hard. Today they choose to retire in their corner of the land of their birth, and the current situation is untenable.

I think we have reached the stage where more vigorous public action has to be taken to get the government to decide on this matter. At the end of March, I intend to hold a meeting of pensioners from Témiscouata and the whole Lower St. Lawrence region. I also invite all those who could be affected by this situation so that it is made clear that what they are going through is unacceptable for people whose income is only a few thousand dollars annually.

For example, there are women between the ages of 55 and 65 who are still not entitled to a pension and who wait a few years until their income is a little bit more respectable. Their American pension is all they get. They were used to receiving a cheque and making it last, but since January 1996 it has been a nightmare. They are forced to borrow money, to turn to their families, to find other ways of making ends meet. We are not talking about high income earners. These are people for whom this is truly the minimum amount they can manage on.

• (1935)

These are amounts that they have earned and that they have no possibility of recovering from the American government. It is completely impossible right now for a Canadian citizen to apply to the American government for this \$2,000 or \$3,000 to which he was entitled in the past.

Because the tax rules are different in the two countries, when a person declared his income in Canada, because of the salary protection measures we introduced that are not available in the American system, he was not as heavily penalized. He could cash the cheque. While he was receiving it, he could spend it as required and only paid taxes the following year. This is very different from the present situation where the amount is deducted at source and can never be recovered.

*Private Members' Business*

So if we have compassion for British pensioners living in Canada, I think we should show the same compassion for Canadian citizens living in Canada who earned a pension in the United States. I hope the government will take action in the short term because, if not, there will definitely be a lot of questions asked during the next election campaign, because people who are being deprived of the income necessary to their survival will certainly not be content with promises of future action.

A public servant told me they were doing everything possible to negotiate a change to the tax convention and that it will take place in 1998. He can say that to me, but for the person living with this every day, it is unacceptable, and it is vital that a temporary measure be worked out as soon as possible. I hope that the government will work something out in the coming months, so that equity for citizens of Quebec and of Canada in receipt of American pensions can be restored.

For these reasons, I am well aware of the importance of the member's motion concerning British pensioners and I hope that we can study it, that the member can take it to committee so that a concrete solution can be found, and that similarly, with respect to American pensions, a temporary, concrete solution can be found in the short term to correct the inequity that has been acknowledged by the minister.

[English]

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Madam Speaker, today I am very proud to sponsor and debate private members' motion M-53 which supports the cause of British pensioners living in Canada. As I will outline in my remarks today, these people have been unfairly treated and deserve our support in every way we can provide it.

This is certainly not a new issue. It has been around for a long time and I am pleased to say that, informally, the Government of Canada has been supportive of British pensioners living in Canada. It is time that the government became a little more formal in its requests of the British government and that is the reason for my motion today.

When I say that we have been supportive informally, let me quote from a recent letter that I received signed by Canada's former Minister of Human Resources Development, the present Minister of National Defence.

The minister said: "The Government of Canada has been very active for many years in trying to persuade the United Kingdom to conclude a social security agreement that would provide for the indexing of British pensions.

"Prime Minister Chrétien has raised the issue of frozen British pensions on several occasions with Prime Minister John Major.

"These included his visits to London in June, 1994, for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of D-Day and his visit marking the 50th anniversary of V-E Day.

"These occasions were especially appropriate, given that so many of the British pensioners in Canada are either themselves veterans of the second world war, or the widows of veterans.

"Canada's High Commissioner to the United Kingdom has also been very active on the issue of frozen British pensions.

"The high commissioner and his staff have had numerous meetings with United Kingdom cabinet ministers and with both government and opposition members of Parliament.

"It is clear from these meetings that the U.K. is not about to consider unfreezing its pensions in Canada. However, I can assure you that the Government of Canada will continue to do everything we can to try to persuade the British government to change its position".

That was a letter that I recently received from the former Minister of Human Resources Development. Obviously, the government is committed to the substance contained in the motion in front of us today.

• (1940 )

I have also been told that the current minister, the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel, was in London in mid-January, just a short five weeks ago. At that time he raised the frozen pension issue again with his counterpart.

The government is on side with this motion. I hope it will say so again today in this debate. Support in the House of Commons, in public debate, is worth so much more than comments made in private meetings. The word of the minister is one thing, but the voice of Parliament is another. By supporting the motion today, members of the House can help to add the voice of Parliament to the voice of the minister in support of these very deserving people.

For the members of the House who do not yet know why this is important, let me take a minute to outline the issue.

Pensions for elderly British expatriates resident in Canada are frozen at the level paid on the first date of payment or at the date when the individual took up residence in Canada. The same situation exists for almost 425,000 elderly expatriate residents in 137 other countries throughout the world. Yet, at the same time, some 325,000 British expatriate pensioners residing in some 37 other countries enjoy the same annual upgrading enjoyed by the equivalent pensioner beneficiaries living in the United Kingdom.

All of these pensioners, regardless of where they live, accrued their credits toward a state pension on the same basis. During their working life in the United Kingdom, they all paid into the fund in

*Private Members' Business*

the same way and reasonably assumed that they would all benefit on an equal basis when it came time to draw their pensions.

Successive British governments have failed to correct this completely unfair and discriminatory situation. The British old age security pension is indexed, in part, to the British retail price index and is subject to being upgraded in April of each year. Since 1965 the value of the pension for pensioners residing in Britain and the 37 other non-frozen countries has increased over 15 times its 1965 value.

The Canadian Alliance of British Pensioners gives this example of how unfair the pension plan is. A 65-year-old man living in Britain who became eligible for a full British pension in 1974 is now receiving a pension of £61.15 per week. If that same individual, on retirement, had elected to move to Canada to be close to his children or other members of his family or for any other reason, he would still be eligible for a pension, but only for the same level of pension paid to him when he left the country, possibly around £10 per week. The amount of the pension would never have changed over the period from 1974 to today. That is clearly discriminatory.

The matter has hit the floor of the House of Commons in Britain and numerous MPs there want to see changes brought about. In July 1994, for example, Winston S. Churchill, MP, said with regard to a particular case being debated:

That lady and others like her are being cheated—there is no other word for it—by the government of £53.60 per week of the pension to which she contributed.

If we were talking about a private personal pension or a life insurance policy, and the directors of the company tried to restrict the territorial area of payment, I am sure that my hon. friend, the minister, would have a shrewd idea of where those directors would be languishing now.

They would be in jail, and rightly so.

In my constituency there is a Dr. Derek and his wife Kathy Brown who now live near Big River, Saskatchewan. On their retirement they came to Canada to get away from the crowds of Britain and were told when they left that their pension would be payable worldwide. Derek Brown was a doctor in Britain for most of his working life and his pension was a full one when he claimed it 10 years ago. Now, because he lives in Canada and because his pension is not indexed, his £42.50 per week is nearly £20 a week less than he would get if he were to move back to Britain.

● (1945 )

Dr. Brown says:

The thing that annoys us is that they say they cannot afford to do it for us.

But they index the pensions paid in the United States, but not for us in Canada.

It is this discrimination that we are so fed up with.

Dr. Brown has also written to me to say that he thinks the motion before us today should be somewhat amended to replace the word indexed with the word prorated since the pensions in Britain are not exactly indexed to the cost of living. This would be quite acceptable and I would propose this change be made should the motion be sent to committee.

During the past few weeks since the motion was drawn for debate I have received many letters from British pensioners in support of the motion. I will quote one letter in particular written by Miss Elaine Dawn of Vancouver, British Columbia. She writes:

I am writing to request that you please support the current plight of British pensioners who live in Canada who, due to no fault of their own have, had their pensions frozen at the rate at which they first entered this country.

I am sure you will agree that this is very unfair considering just south of the border in the United States, British pensioners can enjoy the same indexing of pensions as if they had continued to live in England.

It certainly seems very unfair to me that certain countries support British pensioners while others, like Australia and Canada, have frozen the pensions of British subjects at the same level at which they entered their country.

I am sure you will agree that this has meant a great deal of hardship to many people.

Miss Dawn's letter says what many others said to me in similar letters received during the past four or five weeks.

While I was preparing for this debate today, Mr. Doug Ross, president of the Canadian Alliance of British Pensioners, wrote to me to let me know that in Britain the House of Commons select committee for social security had tabled its report on pension benefits for expatriates living in countries like Canada.

He told me that hearings had been held in London during December 1996, following which the committee issued a report that admitted the design of the current policies of pensions to expatriates was a mess. It also acknowledged that Britain was alone among OECD countries in failing to pay up ratings, as they call them, equally to all the beneficiaries of state contributory pension plans regardless of where they live.

However the committee disappointed many. It fell short of accepting the requests of the pensioner groups which asked them to recommend to the government that it should end the discriminatory practice of using country of residence as a factor in the determination of pension benefits. Instead the committee simply turned the problem over to the government by taking the unusual stand for a committee in Britain of recommending a free vote in the British Parliament to allow members of the British House to express their opinions.

Britain is about due for an election. There is no opportunity or time for this vote to be called. If an election is held and a new house is created with new members of Parliament, the report of the committee will no longer be valid. The next government will not be

*Private Members' Business*

required, as the motion puts it, to present any motion to the house for members to vote on. Therefore this pass on of responsibility is a great disappointment to those who appeared before the committee.

Mr. Ross and the Canadian Alliance of British Pensioners in particular have informed me of how disappointed they are the issue is not yet resolved. They have told me they appreciate the efforts of the Canadian government in support of their campaign to end pension discrimination, but at the same time they feel strongly Canada and other Commonwealth countries must take a much more aggressive stance in their bilateral dealings to step up the pressure on Westminster to end the disgraceful practice of freezing the pensions of some expatriates.

Mr. Ross writes that there are 718,000 British expatriates resident in Canada. Some 137,000 of them have some level of current frozen U.K. state pensions earned during the period they lived, worked and served in the United Kingdom. An end to pension freezing by Britain would ease the plight of thousands of cash strapped pensioners living in Canada and would directly inject \$150 million in the first year into the Canadian economy.

• (1950)

It is time our Parliament supported the cause of the British expatriate pensioners. This motion which costs the government nothing serves to enhance the position already taken by the government in bilateral international discussions. It adds the voice of Parliament to the voice of the government to the voice of the minister speaking in Britain.

I expect to receive unanimous support of the members speaking in this debate. Therefore I serve notice that it is my intention to rise at the end of the debate to request unanimous consent to move the appropriate motion which would allow us to send the matter to committee for further action. I look forward to the support and comments of other members of the Chamber.

**Mr. Ian Murray (Lanark—Carleton, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I thank the member for The Battlefords—Meadow Lake for his motion.

The British pensions paid to some 130,000 persons in Canada are frozen. In other words, they are not increased from year to year to compensate for rises in the cost of living. The same situation exists in many other countries around the world including Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

This is not the case everywhere in the world. Under the European Union's regulations on social security, for example, the United Kingdom indexes annually the pensions it pays to persons who

have retired in the Costa del Sol, the French Riviera or elsewhere in the EU.

Under social security agreements the United Kingdom has concluded with many other countries around the world British pensions are also indexed in these countries. They include, to name a few, Bosnia, Croatia, Cyprus, Israel, Turkey and the United States.

For 20 years the Government of Canada has been trying to persuade the United Kingdom to conclude a social security agreement that would lead to the annual indexing of the British pensions paid in Canada. The United Kingdom has repeatedly refused because of the costs it would incur.

The issue of frozen British pensions has been raised at every level. The Prime Minister has personally discussed it twice with Prime Minister John Major. The Minister of Foreign Affairs discussed the unfreezing issue at his first bilateral meeting with the British Foreign Secretary.

Most recently, in January of this year, the Minister of Human Resources Development went to London and personally discussed the issue with his British counterpart, the Secretary of State for Social Security. I regret to say the British reply is always the same: the United Kingdom cannot afford to index its pensions in Canada.

The Government of Canada believes the fundamental issue at the heart of the unfreezing issue is fairness. The persons who are receiving frozen pensions contributed to the British national insurance scheme during their working years in the United Kingdom. They made these contributions in the expectation they would eventually receive a pension in retirement irrespective of where they might choose to live.

Now, however, depending on which country they decide to spend their retirement years in their British pension may or may not be frozen. The unfairness is compounded by the fact that most of today's British pensioners in Canada served the United Kingdom during World War II or are the widows of British veterans. This point was emphatically made by the Prime Minister when he met with Prime Minister Major on the occasion of the commemoration of the 50th anniversaries of D-Day and V-E Day.

There is also a humanitarian consideration. Many of the British pensioners in Canada came to our country so that they could spend their retirement years with their children and grandchildren who immigrated here. Their frozen British pensions make them more financially dependent on their families. For many this can mean a loss of dignity.

There are undoubtedly also some pensioners in Britain who would like to join their families in Canada but have not done so because their British pensions will be frozen.

*Private Members' Business*

On February 5 the social security committee of the British House of Commons released a report on the issue of frozen British pensions. The report unfortunately did not call directly on the U.K. government to change its position on unfreezing. However it pointed out the illogic of the current British policy of indexing its pensions in some countries and not in others. In the words of the report:

Surely no one would have deliberately designed a policy of paying pensions to people living abroad intending to end up in the position we are in today—It is impossible to discern any pattern behind the selection of countries with whom bilateral agreements have been made providing for unfreezing.

● (1955)

The committee's report goes on to recommend a free vote in the British House of Commons:

—to allow members to express their opinion on the principle of whether the government should pay upgradings to some or all of those pensioners living in countries where upgradings are not paid at present.

The Government of Canada views this as a positive suggestion. We hope it will be adopted by the United Kingdom.

I urge all members of the House to support the motion put forward by the hon. member for The Battlefords—Meadow Lake. The government is already strongly committed to vigorously pursuing an agreement with the United Kingdom that provides for the indexing of British pensions.

Unanimous adoption of the motion will clearly demonstrate the commitment of all parties in the House and of all Canadians to the resolution of this long outstanding problem.

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if you seek unanimous consent of the House to delete Motion No. 259 in the name of the member for Calgary Southwest from the Order Paper and replace the name of the hon. member for Calgary West with the name of the member for Calgary Southwest as the sponsor of Private Members' Bill C-341 on the Order Paper.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, since other members are interested in speaking to the motion I will keep my comments brief.

When I was asked to speak to the motion my first reaction was what business was it of ours. This is a pension problem for some Canadian citizens but it is the responsibility of the British government to be make these payments. If the shoe were on the other foot, how would I feel if the government in Westminster were making

decisions or passing resolutions that had to do with how Canada treated its expatriate citizens as far as pensions were concerned?

When I looked into it I wondered why on earth a pensioner who lives in Canada would be treated any different from the way the same person living in the United States would be treated. It just did not make any sense to me.

I quite cheerfully take up the cudgel on behalf expatriated Britons living in Canada who are scattered fairly evenly across the country. There are perhaps proportionately a few more living in the maritimes than in the rest of the country.

For the interest of members of Parliament present and those at home fixed to the television watching this debate, it is of particular interest that Britain does not index the pensions paid to expatriated Britons living in Commonwealth or former Commonwealth countries. Canada, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa and Zimbabwe are the countries where Britain does not index pensions. Yet it does in Germany, France and other countries in the Economic Union.

In 1996 the stated British government reason for the discrimination was that the other countries had entered into agreements with the British government. Alternatively indexation is a requirement of the European Economic Community. Britain has entered into an agreement to index the pensions in the European Economic Community but not with Canadians.

● (2000)

It is interesting to note that if a pensioner lived in, as one example, Bosnia, they would be collecting a fully indexed pension. However, because they live in a former Commonwealth country or Canada they do not.

On behalf of the Reform Party and on behalf of those British ex-patriot citizens resident in Canada and who have come to us and other members of Parliament to ask that we take up their case, I am happy to do so.

I know the member opposite, who will soon be on her feet, will be taking up the cudgel on behalf of the British ex-patriots living in Canada as well.

There are 208,000 British pensioners living in Canada right now. Fifty-two thousand live in British Columbia. If the pensions to ex-patriot British pensioners living in Canada were fully indexed and were paid it would mean an additional \$200 million annually to the budget at Westminster. There are many ex-patriot Canadians resident in Britain. Those ex-patriot Canadians resident in Britain benefit from the fact that we pay their indexed pensions. Does it not seem reasonable that Britain should also index the pensions to ex-patriots from Britain living in Canada? It seems to me that it would make good sense to do that.

I will terminate my comments on this subject by once again reiterating the fact that on behalf of the Reform Party we support

*Private Members' Business*

this motion. I understand that the member for Battlefords—Meadowlake has served notice that he will be asking for this motion to be made votable. We would certainly support that.

Seeing the member opposite ready to rise to her feet, I will terminate my comments.

**Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Guelph—Wellington, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague who is a gentleman always.

It is with pleasure that I rise to speak in support of this motion which calls upon the Government of Canada to seek an agreement with the British government that would require the British government to begin paying costs of living increases to British pensioners living in Canada.

I thank the hon. member for the Battlefords—Meadowlake for raising this issue. I am also grateful to my constituents who have written to me to raise my awareness to their concerns.

The United Kingdom is the country of origin of the largest number of immigrants to Canada since the second world war. Many have made significant contributions to the prosperity of Canada. As members know, Guelph is called the royal city. We are proud of our heritage which is tied to Great Britain.

It is therefore troubling that in spite of the efforts of the Government of Canada over the last 20 years there is still no social security agreement in place between our two countries to protect the pension rights of British pensioners in Canada. We are discussing pension rights of a significant number of people, estimated at around 130,000. These people are being hurt because the British government refuses to provide them with the same protection against inflation that is enjoyed by British pensioners living in the United Kingdom, the European Union and a number of other countries with which the United Kingdom has social security agreements.

I believe that the policy of the current British government is illogical. All the people we are talking about have contributed to the British pension plan and believed when they did that they would be paid a pension to which they were entitled and that everyone would be treated fairly and in the same way. This is not the case.

• (2005)

The current policy of the British government therefore treats some of its citizens more equally than others. The situation exists where many British pensioners living in Canada, including those living in Guelph—Wellington, who wrote to me only recently received considerably less than those in Great Britain who made exactly the same contributions but who reside in the United Kingdom or in countries with which the United Kingdom has social security agreements.

Is this unfair? Of course it is. This has resulted in a significant loss of income for some pensioners living in Canada. Many of these people moved to this country to be closer to their children and their grandchildren and the reduction in their pension income has been very difficult.

I am told that in some cases these pensioners who worked all of their lives and contributed to the British pension plan are now dependent on their families. This has resulted in a loss of dignity.

For people who spent their lives hoping and contributing for a decent pension plan, this must be quite a blow. Interestingly, the inconsistency of this policy has been recognized by members of Parliament in Britain.

A recent British parliamentary committee studying this issue noted that there seems to be no pattern to this system, which provides indexing for some but not for others.

In addition, the report went on to observe that no one would have deliberately set out to design such a system. However, this is the situation faced by thousands of people living in Canada. Something obviously has to be done if this double standard is to be eliminated. It is time for the British government to act.

I was saddened to learn that the current British government seemed no more willing to correct this situation now than it has been for the past 20 years. The reason appears to be that the cost of fixing this injustice is estimated to be about \$16.8 million in the first year and this figure is growing over time to about \$150 million per year.

As a supporter of fiscal restraint and deficit reduction, I appreciate the difficulties that this means for the British government. However, we must insist that the British treat its pensioners living in Canada in exactly the same way as those living in the United Kingdom and other country by providing them with the same indexation of benefits enjoyed by pensioners living elsewhere.

The Canadian government has tried to make its position clear. For instance, the Prime Minister spoke to British Prime Minister Major about this when they met during the 50th anniversary of D-Day and the 50th anniversary of V-E Day.

As well, the Minister of Foreign Affairs raised this issue with his British counterpart at their first bilateral meeting. More recently, the Minister of Human Resources Development discussed this with the British secretary of state and with various spokespersons of the opposition during his visit to London in January.

He emphasized then how strongly the Government of Canada feels about this issue. These are concrete examples that show the determination of this government to see this matter through to a

*Private Members' Business*

successful conclusion. I remain hopeful that the British government will change its attitude on this issue.

Last October, I shared with this House my motion calling for a seniors bill of rights. At that time I spoke about the people in my community who deserve our respect and support. They are, of course, seniors who gave so much and ask for so little.

I spoke then, as I do now, about their one main request, to be treated with the dignity they deserve. I spoke about the many organizations, associations and senior complexes, like the Elliott under the leadership of David Hicks, who support our seniors.

The injustice that is experienced by the thousands of British pensioners living in Canada is another example that we must always be vigilant and watchful to protect those most vulnerable and to help those who help them.

This motion has my support and I urge all members to support it as well. By supporting this motion, members of Parliament will demonstrate the resolve of all Canadians to see this matter to a successful conclusion, thus ensuring that justice is done for these 130,000 people living in Canada.

The royal city says yes to this motion and so do I.

**Mr. Taylor:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, it does appear that all members wishing to speak on this motion tonight have risen and spoken. As the mover of the motion, I want to thank them very

much for the dedication and concern they showed for British pensioners during their remarks tonight. I thank them very much for that.

I noticed that all members who spoke today from all the parties represented in the House were supportive of the motion, including the two government members.

Therefore I think it would be appropriate to ask if there was unanimous consent of the House to make this a votable motion and send it to committee so that there could be full House support for the government's position.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** There is not unanimous consent.

There being no further members rising for debate and the motion not being designated a votable item, the time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

It being 8.11 p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 8.11 p.m.)





# CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Government response to petitions</b>	
Mr. Zed .....	8561
<b>Interparliamentary delegations</b>	
Mr. Paradis .....	8561
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Foreign Affairs and International Trade</b>	
Mr. Graham .....	8561
<b>Transport</b>	
Motion for concurrence in sixth report .....	8561
Mr. Crête .....	8561
Mr. Lebel .....	8563
Mrs. Dalfond-Guiral .....	8564
<b>Business of the House</b>	
Mr. Kilger .....	8565
Motion .....	8565
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 98; Nays, 73 .....	8565

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Tobacco Act</b>	
<b>Bill C-71—Time Allocation Motion</b>	
Mr. Peters .....	8566
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 120; Nays, 78 .....	8566
(Motion agreed to.) .....	8567
<b>Consideration resumed of report stage</b>	
Bill C-71. Consideration resumed of report stage .....	8567
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	8567
Mr. Patry .....	8568
Mr. Ménard .....	8569
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) .....	8571
Mr. Loubier .....	8572
Mr. Sauvageau .....	8573
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) .....	8575
Mr. Crête .....	8576
Mr. Godin .....	8577
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred .....	8579
Division on Motion No. 3 deferred .....	8579
Division on Motion No. 8 deferred .....	8579
Motion No. 2 .....	8579
Mr. Hill (MacLeod) .....	8579
Motion No. 4 .....	8579
Mr. Peters .....	8579
Motion No. 5 .....	8579
Mr. Dubé .....	8579
Motion No. 30 .....	8579
Mr. Hill (MacLeod) .....	8579
Mr. Volpe .....	8580
Mr. Dubé .....	8581

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>Curling</b>	
Mr. Collins .....	8582
<b>Small Business</b>	
Mrs. Ablonczy .....	8582

<b>Tobacco Legislation</b>	
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	8583
<b>World Trade Organization</b>	
Mr. Riis .....	8583
<b>Sky's the Limit Snow Challenge</b>	
Mr. Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury) .....	8583
<b>Armenian Community</b>	
Mr. Assadourian .....	8583
<b>Canada Infrastructure Works Program</b>	
Mr. Jackson .....	8584
<b>Tobacco Legislation</b>	
Mr. Brien .....	8584
<b>Patent Drugs</b>	
Mr. Hill (MacLeod) .....	8584
<b>A Toonie for Canada</b>	
Ms. Torsney .....	8584
<b>Gerry Donoghue</b>	
Mr. O'Reilly .....	8585
<b>Status of Women</b>	
Mr. Discepola .....	8585
<b>Tobacco Act</b>	
Mr. Rocheleau .....	8585
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Ramsay .....	8585
<b>Tobacco Act</b>	
Mr. Patry .....	8585
<b>Women's Institute</b>	
Mrs. Ur .....	8586

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

<b>Tobacco Act</b>	
Mr. Gauthier .....	8586
Mr. Dingwall .....	8586
Mr. Gauthier .....	8586
Mr. Dingwall .....	8586
Mr. Gauthier .....	8587
Mr. Dingwall .....	8587
Mr. Duceppe .....	8587
Mr. Dingwall .....	8587
Mr. Duceppe .....	8587
Mr. Dingwall .....	8588
<b>Pensions</b>	
Miss Grey .....	8588
Mr. Peters .....	8588
Miss Grey .....	8588
Mr. Peters .....	8588
Miss Grey .....	8588
Mr. Peters .....	8589
<b>Tobacco Act</b>	
Mrs. Picard .....	8589
Mr. Dingwall .....	8589

Mrs. Picard .....	8589
Mr. Dingwall .....	8589
<b>Pensions</b>	
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	8589
Mr. Peters .....	8590
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	8590
Mr. Peters .....	8590
<b>Tobacco Act</b>	
Mr. Dubé .....	8590
Ms. Copps .....	8590
Mr. Dubé .....	8590
Ms. Copps .....	8590
<b>Health Care</b>	
Mr. Hill (Macleod) .....	8590
Mr. Dingwall .....	8590
Mr. Hill (Macleod) .....	8590
Mr. Dingwall .....	8591
<b>Tobacco Act</b>	
Mr. Pomerleau .....	8591
Mr. Gagliano .....	8591
Mr. Pomerleau .....	8591
Mr. Dingwall .....	8591
<b>Health Care</b>	
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) .....	8591
Mr. Dingwall .....	8591
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) .....	8592
Mr. Dingwall .....	8592
<b>The Economy</b>	
Mr. Culbert .....	8592
Mr. Peters .....	8592
<b>Trade</b>	
Mr. Blaikie .....	8592
Mr. Eggleton .....	8592
<b>Aéroports de Montréal</b>	
Mr. Dumas .....	8592
Mr. Keyes .....	8593
<b>Airbus</b>	
Mr. Ramsay .....	8593
Mr. Rock .....	8593
<b>Human Resources</b>	
Mr. Adams .....	8593
Mr. Pettigrew .....	8593
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker .....	8593
<b>PRIVILEGE</b>	
<b>Health Canada Advertisement</b>	
Mr. Duceppe .....	8593
Mr. Gray .....	8594
The Speaker .....	8594
<b>Points of Order</b>	
<b>Oral Question Period</b>	
Mr. Williams .....	8594
The Speaker .....	8594

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Tobacco Act</b>	
Bill C-71. Consideration resumed of report stage .....	8595
Mrs. Picard .....	8595
Mr. Lincoln .....	8596
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) .....	8598
Mr. Szabo .....	8599
Mr. Crête .....	8600
Motion No. 2 negatived .....	8601
Mr. Eggleton .....	8602
Motions Nos. 6, 17, 33 .....	8602
Mr. Dubé .....	8602
Motions Nos. 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, 25 .....	8602
Mr. Simmons .....	8603
Motion No. 34 .....	8603
Mr. Dubé .....	8603
Mr. Simmons .....	8604
Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead) .....	8605
Mr. Szabo .....	8606
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	8608
Mr. Rocheleau .....	8609
Mrs. Ur .....	8610
Mr. Laurin .....	8612
(Motion No. 6 agreed to.) .....	8612
Division on Motion No. 7 deferred. ....	8613
Division on Motion No. 25 deferred. ....	8613
(Motion No. 33 negatived.) .....	8613
Motion No. 20 .....	8613
Mr. Dubé .....	8613
Division on Motion No. 20 deferred .....	8613
Motions Nos. 23 and 24 .....	8613
Mr. Dingwall .....	8613
Division on Motion No. 23 deferred .....	8614
Division on Motion No. 24 deferred .....	8614
Mrs. Ur .....	8614
Motion No. 27 .....	8614
Mr. Dubé .....	8614
Motion No. 28 .....	8614
(Motion No. 27 agreed to.) .....	8615
Mr. Dubé .....	8615
Motion No. 32 .....	8615
Division on Motion No. 32 deferred. ....	8615
Mr. Dubé .....	8615
Motion No. 31 .....	8615
Motion No. 1 agreed to on division: Yeas, 201; Nays, 0 .....	8615
Motions Nos. 8, 23, 24, 26 and 29 agreed to on division: Yeas, 201; Nays, 0. ....	8616
Motion No. 3 agreed to on division: Yeas, 159; Nays, 42 .....	8617
Motions No. 4 and 17 agreed to on division: Yeas, 159; Nays, 42 .....	8618
Motion No. 7 negatived on division: Yeas, 44; Nays 158 .....	8618
Motion No. 15 negatived on division: Yeas, 43; Nays, 159 .....	8619
Motion No. 25 negatived on division: Yeas, 44; Nays, 157 .....	8620
Motions Nos. 20 and 32 negatived on division: Yes, 42; Nays, 159 .....	8621
Motion No. 34 agreed to on division: Yeas, 159; Nays, 41 .....	8622
Motion No. 31 negatived on division: Yeas, 73; Nays, 128 .....	8623
Motion for concurrence .....	8624

Mr. Eggleton .....	8624
Motion No. agreed to on division: Yeas, 156; Nays, 44 ...	8625
(Motion agreed to.) .....	8625
<b>Canada Labour Code</b>	
Bill C-66. Consideration resumed of report stage .....	8625
Motion No. 2 negatived on division: Yeas, 47;	
Nays, 150 .....	8626
Motion No. 3 negatived on division: Yeas, 47;	
Nays, 147 .....	8627
Motions Nos. 3, 9, 50, 13, 36, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 34, 27,	
38, 40, 46, 48, 52, 16, 17, 23, 39, 44, 53 negatived. ....	8628
Motion No. 5 negatived on division: Yeas, 70;	
Nays, 123 .....	8628
Motion No. 6 negatived on division: Yeas, 30;	
Nays, 163 .....	8629
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral .....	8630
Motions Nos. 45, 49, 11, 24, 28, 29, 26, 31, 42 and 37	
negatived on division: Yeas, 28; Nays, 165 .....	8630
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral .....	8630
Motion No. 7 negatived on division: Yeas, 40;	
Nays, 151 .....	8630
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral .....	8631
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral .....	8631

Motion No. 54 agreed to on division: Yeas, 190;	
Nays, 0 .....	8631
Motion No. 12 agreed to on division: Yeas, 154;	
Nays, 36 .....	8632
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 76; Nays, 115 .....	8633
Motion No. 19 agreed to on division: Yeas, 152;	
Nays, 40 .....	8634
Motion No. 35 agreed to on division: Yeas, 145;	
Nays 47 .....	8635
Motion No. 32 agreed to on division: Yeas, 163;	
Nays, 29 .....	8636
Motion for concurrence .....	8637
Mr. Gagliano .....	8637
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 123; Nays, 69 .....	8637

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

##### Pensions

Mr. Taylor .....	8638
Mr. Crête .....	8638
Mr. Taylor .....	8640
Mr. Murray .....	8642
Mr. Williams .....	8643
Mr. McClelland .....	8643
Mrs. Chamberlain .....	8644

**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**8801320  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*

Canada Communication Group — Publishing

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

*En cas de non-livraison,*

*retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:*

Groupe Communication Canada — Édition

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons**

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes**

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:**

**Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :**

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

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Additional copies may be obtained from the Canada Communication Group — Publishing, Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, at \$1.75 per copy or \$286 per year.**

**Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.**

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant au Groupe Communication Canada — Édition, Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, à 1.75 \$ l'exemplaire ou 286 \$ par année.**