



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 137 • NUMBER 098 • 1st SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, October 19, 2001

—
Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 19, 2001

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CUSTOMS ACT

•(1005)

[*English*]

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-23, an act to amend the Customs Act and to make related amendments to other acts.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Deputy Speaker: There are two motions in amendment standing on the notice paper for the report stage of Bill S-23, an act to amend the Customs Act and to make related amendments to other acts.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 1 and 2 will be grouped for debate, but voted on as follows.

A vote on Motion No. 1 will apply to Motion No. 2.

[*English*]

I shall now propose Motions Nos. 1 and 2 to the House.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill S-23 be amended by adding after line 22 on page 91 the following new clause:

“85.1 At the end of the first year after the coming into force of this Act, the Minister shall prepare a report on the application of its provisions and of any regulations made under those provisions, and shall lay the report without delay before the Standing Committee on Finance.”

Motion No. 2

That Bill S-23 be amended by adding after line 22 on page 91 the following new clause:

“85.2 After concluding its proceedings and hearing all the witnesses whose attendance it considers necessary, the Standing Committee on Finance shall report to the House of Commons on its findings, assessments and recommendations with respect to any amendments to be made to this Act.”

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the two amendments I introduced today.

I should point out, first of all, that the Bloc Québécois is in favour of Bill S-23 overall.

It should also be pointed out that examination of this bill was undertaken long before the events of September 11.

I will return to this point later, but perhaps those events cast this bill in a new light and perhaps they also cause us to have a number of concerns in connection with it.

Generally speaking, we are in favour of this bill, because it is worthy of note that the government wishes to facilitate or enhance the flow of trade, particularly between Canada and the U.S., as well as border crossings by individuals.

I am often told just how strict Canada's customs system is compared to other countries, and how this causes delays at its borders. I do believe that the desire to facilitate or enhance border crossings is a laudable decision.

That said, we must not lose sight, specifically because of the lessons learned from the events of September 11, of the need to maintain and ensure the security of Canada.

This focuses attention on the two basic functions of the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency, which are, on the one hand, to facilitate the crossing of persons and goods between Canada and other countries, the United States in particular and, on the other, to ensure the security of persons and goods entering Canada, and perhaps those leaving it as well.

We have a number of reservations about this bill, among them its considerable vagueness as to the precise application of its provisions.

Much latitude is left to the regulatory authority. We have not been very satisfied with what we have been able to see so far, in terms of projected regulations,

On the one hand, we do not have a good idea of what this bill's regulations will actually be and, on the other, what idea we do have leads us to believe that the minister will have very considerable arbitrary powers, which creates certain misgivings about the long term application of the bill.

Government Orders

It is for this reason that we would like the proposed legislation, once adopted, to be reviewed and debated in one year's time, in order to allow us to assess the effect that it, and the related regulations, have had. This will also give us the opportunity to see if, given the very particular context we now find ourselves in, we have succeeded in maintaining the delicate but important balance that I mentioned, between smooth trade flow between Canada and other countries, particularly the United States, and the flow of persons on the one hand, and maintaining and ensuring the security of Canada's borders, on the other.

This is essentially the purpose of my amendments, which would allow us to review the legislation in one year and also to hear from witnesses in committee.

It was pointed out to me earlier that there may be a jurisdiction problem.

• (1010)

I had an informal discussion with the government House leader, who told me that this bill specifies the particular committee we would like to review the legislation. We only mentioned the House standing committee.

The reason for this may be the Bloc's natural tendency to want to leave the job of assessing what is good for the population to duly elected members. We have some reservations regarding the other place, which is made up, as we know, of persons who are appointed, and not always for the right reasons. We acknowledge that there are some individuals in the other place who have exceptional professional and personal qualities. However, the fact remains that regardless of the intrinsic qualities of the individuals who make up the other place, the appointment process casts a shadow on the credibility of the institution in a so-called modern democracy such as Canada.

Obviously our natural inclination would be to have the House of Commons, which, as I said, comprises duly elected representatives, study this sort of thing. But if the technical nature of the amendments presents a major obstacle for the government or the other house and would lead ultimately to the defeat of these amendments, we would rather, and I will perhaps have the opportunity to discuss this informally with the minister, go the route of a single amendment by unanimous consent to have the appropriate joint committee of both houses look after the revision.

However, what is important, if only to lessen concerns and shadows of doubt in the bill, is for us to be able to integrate this clause in the body of the law. There is a lot of talk about it at the moment in what is perhaps not the right terminology in French. The aim essentially would be to use the terms used with respect to C-36, a sunset clause. In other words, the bill would have to be reviewed after a year.

I invite all my colleagues to support these amendment proposals. It goes without saying, as I said a few moments ago, that I would not want my colleagues to oppose these two motions just for technical reasons, even if they are important enough to them to cause their defeat. If our colleagues share our concerns, we could work things out to find a formulation that suited all the parties involved.

However, the objective of these two proposed amendments is valid. It is to ensure that we can review the bill after a year. It will mean that, in the present context and given that the bill was drafted long before the events of September 11, we could maintain this fragile but vital balance between the movement of goods and persons between Canada and abroad and the protection of Canadian borders.

• (1015)

[English]

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on behalf of the coalition and take part in the debate on Bill S-23, an act to amend the Customs Act and to make related amendments to other acts.

Let me begin by reiterating how important trade is to Canada. We are historically a trading nation, going back to the beaver pelt. Without the free movement of goods and services between our borders, our standard of living would certainly be threatened. September 11 has changed how our economy is operating, including the movement of goods and services between our two borders.

There is no doubt the goal of the legislation is reasonable. However September 11 changed all the parameters on how we treat our borders. Provincial leaders are currently calling for perimeter security. Canadian ministers are travelling to Washington weekly to discuss trade and border issues with our counterparts.

Bill S-23 was drafted long before the September 11 event. The bill needs major changes in light of the present day discussions. The coalition believes the bill needs to go back to the drawing board or be scrapped all together. There is no doubt some of the amendments do have merit.

The coalition certainly understands how important trade is with up to a billion dollars a day going back and forth across our borders.

In a time of crisis our governments must work together to ensure that the flow of business services is not interrupted. Both countries benefit from this free flow of goods and services.

At this time I would like to quote from a trade quarterly report written by the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group. On the topic of border crossings it does an excellent job in summarizing the problems. The report begins by saying:

One need look no further than the border to see the problems we are facing with a continental economy. While there are 116 border crossings between the United States and Canada that handle commercial traffic, almost 76% of commercial traffic uses only 9 crossings. Much of the infrastructure is obsolete, even at those crossings that were recently upgraded. Physical infrastructure appears to be only part of the problem, as some suggest that our borders are enforcing a 19th century attitude in a 21st century global economy.

I presume that is why the bill has been tabled. The report goes on to say:

NAFTA and the Shared Border Accord were supposed to facilitate border crossing between Canada and the U.S., although anecdotal evidence from those involved in cross-border activities suggest that crossing the border has actually gotten more difficult over the past five years, rather than easier.

Government Orders

Many propose a completely open border between Canada and the U.S., à la those European Community countries that signed onto the Schengen Agreement. These individuals point out that if Europeans, who were fighting each other as recently as 55 years ago, can open their borders to each other, then surely Americans and Canadians, who have not fired at each other in anger for almost 200 years, could do likewise.

There are others in both countries who believe that our border is already too open and would like to see more restraints put on border travel. In the U.S., Canadians are only temporarily exempted from the provisions of Section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act, which requires all foreigners to be documented in and out of the country. If Section 110 were ever enforced, the consequences for those industries that rely on cross-border commerce, like the auto industry, would be devastating.

Proponents for stricter border control in Canada argue that without the border, Canada would be inundated with American fugitives, firearms and drugs. Those in the United States claim a tight border is required to keep out illegal immigrants, terrorists and drugs. While there is some validity to these claims, in reality over 99% of people crossing the border do not pose any security threat.

● (1020)

An official with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service (USINS) pointed out that with the approximate 30 million crossings at the various Niagara Falls-Buffalo border points, only 10,000 Canadians were deemed ineligible for entry into the U.S. However, 9,500 of these individuals qualified for a waiver to regain the eligibility.

The Canada-United States border does provide an effective tool for law enforcement agencies on both sides of the border. The border provides these agencies with greater latitude to question and search individuals than is permitted elsewhere in either country. The challenge is to utilize these powers only with that small percentage of traffic that poses a threat. We need to balance legitimate security concerns with traffic management. The current process is adding millions, if not billions, of dollars to the cost of cross border business.

The Canadian Trucking Alliance has calculated that for every minute that all trucks are held at the border, an additional \$8 million is added to the direct cost of cross-border shipping. With an average delay of twenty minutes for trucks at the border, that means an additional \$160 million has been added to shipping costs.

Both the American and Canadian governments have tried a number of experimental projects to reduce the time spent at the border. There is general agreement that there should be a minimal amount of paperwork done at the border, but there are concerns about the accuracy of the information currently being forwarded electronically. This is one area where the use of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) is the answer to many of the problems, but it must be shown to be beneficial to all parties involved.

With regards to the movement of people, pilot programs where individuals are pre-screened have had some success. These programs provide border authorities with more information about the individuals than they would otherwise obtain through the usual primary interview at the border. However, the success of these programs has been generally limited to those locations where the pre-screened individual benefits from a dedicated commuter lane that significantly reduces the crossing time.

In closing, we understand that trade is very important to the health of both countries. We believe that there is merit to some of the amendments, but we would like to see the bill go back to the drawing board in light of the events that occurred on September 11.

● (1025)

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill S-23 today. The Canadian Alliance is supporting the bill because it will speed up the flow of goods and people entering Canada.

Bill S-23 is actually the product of indepth consultations with trade and tourism sectors. As far as the amendments which have been introduced this morning, we will support these as well. We do not have any problem with them and it only makes sense to do that.

What I would like to address more than anything else is what is not in the bill that is so important at this time. While assisting with trade issues, the bill does address some equally important issues that

we consider to be positive including new penalty structures, improved equipment, more strict controls over export mail and customs-controlled areas at international airports.

We all know that the world as we knew it before September 11 has changed a great deal. I strongly feel that Canada customs must change as well. Since September 11 our frontline officers have done an excellent job in securing our borders. Security is of the utmost importance. To date, Canada customs has been about collection and not about protection. It is time to reverse those. It is now about protection.

The Canadian Alliance would like to see Canada customs removed from the tax collection agency of revenue Canada and moved into a law enforcement department of the solicitor general. Long before the terrible events of September 11, the auditor general recognized the fact that with more than one hundred million travellers a year entering the country at 147 border points and 13 international airports, the risks to Canada's safety and security were extreme.

Last April the auditor general wrote about customs officers and said that their main role now was to protect Canadians against illegal activities such as smuggling or contraband or the unlawful entry of inadmissible people. He said that their audit raised some concerns about how well these risks were being managed. Since the tragedy on September 11, he had the opportunity to meet with the Canadian Police Association and customs and excise union. He said that both of these organizations, among many others, were in full support of moving customs out of revenue Canada and into the solicitor general department.

The role of customs officers is already very similar to other peace officers. Customs officers in the last year have been issued bulletproof vests, batons, pepper spray and have been given self defence and use of force training to better enforce our laws. Recruitment requirements are now more difficult. Labour Canada has also just contracted a consultant to study the inherent risks of the job and this consultant will undoubtedly look at the question of whether customs officers should be equipped with firearms.

Let me just read a paragraph out of the regulations that customs officers are required to follow in regard to security. Paragraph 16 of the regulations states that Customs officers shall not use force against members of the public where it is known or strongly suspected that the individual is carrying a weapon and considered dangerous if, in the judgment of the officer involved, the use of force would present an undue risk to their personal safety or to the safety of another officer or the public. In these circumstances officers shall note the pertinent details of the case, permit the individual to proceed unobstructed and then the officer shall notify police immediately.

Government Orders

One of the problems with this policy is that in our vast country many of the border crossings are hours away from local police response.

• (1030)

In other words, some dangerous character who arrives at the border can come into Canada because customs officers are not properly equipped or trained to detain and arrest and keep the individual from coming in.

I can understand why the revenue agency would not be equipped in that sense. In one agency we issue both bullet proof vests and calculators. That will not detain the most ardent of criminals. It is time to start issuing the proper equipment so customs officers can do a good job at the border of being able to arrest, detain and hold individuals for the police.

It is possible to do that but we must equip them properly. Under the circumstances customs officers are at risk because they do not have the tools to look after their needs. In particular they do not have the tools to do their work at border crossings where there is only one guard on duty. What chance would they have?

Across the southern border they have increased personnel by 5,400. The last figure I heard was that possibly somewhere around 100 to 130 individuals would be moved into these positions in Canada. It does not make any sense, particularly following September 11.

Why would we want to allow a known criminal, smuggler, big drug pusher or terrorist into Canada for any length of time to roam around and then hope the police would be able to round him up before the individual caused any real problem? That does not make sense. The people at the border crossings are our first line of defence. Let us give them the proper equipment and tools so they can do their job as the front line of defence. We must let them detain and let them arrest. Let us give them the tools to do that.

Another thing I find amazing is that at some border crossings where they only have one individual they are only open for eight hours. They shut the port down for anywhere from 12 to 16 hours. They put up a little orange cone indicating that the border is closed. That would really mean a great deal to somebody who wanted to get into Canada. It would not stop them whatsoever.

If anyone thinks the criminal element or terrorists will only try to come through our major ports they need to give their heads a shake. They know about these ports. They know about the ability to come into Canada. These crossings exist and they know it. That is where they will go.

Let us get serious about tightening them up. Let us get them out from under a collection agency and get them under a protection agency that knows what is required to enforce the law to better protect Canadians. It only makes sense to do that. I do not understand why we are hesitating or reluctant to do that at this time.

In 1998 the government passed Bill C-18 which for the first time in the history of Canada customs extended criminal code powers of detention and arrest to customs officers. Does it not make sense that if officers are to be given the power to enforce the criminal code they

should come under a different agency than tax collectors or Revenue Canada? One would think that would be the case.

We are supporting Bill S-23 because we want the flow of goods and services to continue in an uninterrupted manner and we want to do the best we can to keep them going. However we must not forget that the top priority today as a result of September 11 is the protection and safety of Canadians, so let us do that.

Having said all that I have said, let us make sure we make it a lot easier and safer for our front line officers by equipping and training them properly, getting the right individuals into position and getting them out of collection and into protection.

• (1035)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address Bill S-23. My comments are based on the discussions that our caucus had following the proposals made by the hon. member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, who followed this bill on behalf of our party.

For the benefit of those who may not know it, Bill S-23 will change Canada Customs' controls and rules of operation within the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency.

First I want to mention two points. This is a bill that came from the other place. We are always somewhat uncomfortable with this way of doing things. We do not question the fact that the Parliament of Canada is bicameral, which means that it has two chambers. The same legislative process must be followed in each of the two chambers. We know these rules of operation and we do not question them.

However, the legitimacy of each chamber is not the same, since we feel that any legislation should first be dealt with by the true holders of democratic legitimacy, who are of course the elected representatives sitting in the House of Commons.

Let me do a bit of history. The reason our benches and the floor here in the House of Commons are green is because the Commons represent the grassroots, it is the people's chamber and it reflects the diversity found in the public.

It is no coincidence that, in the other place, the furniture and the floor are red. Why are they red? Because it is the chamber of the monarchy. When the Queen, who is theoretically the head of Canada, comes to our country, she never goes to the House of Commons. She goes to the Senate. There is even a chair reserved for her in the Senate. That is the big difference.

We examined this bill very seriously. The hon. member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles did so, but I also want to mention the rather exceptional work done by Sylvain Boyer, who helped us make the appropriate distinctions. Sylvain Boyer is a kind of behind the scenes thinker who very discreetly sets the tone for all our interventions.

Since we are discussing the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency, we should remember that this agency is special in that it is not, in theory, part of the public service.

Government Orders

In the House, we debated a bill in which there were problems regarding unionization and labour relations. I think we will have the opportunity to come back to these issues.

We are generally in favour of Bill S-23. However marginally, it is a reminder of the events of September 11. It is obvious that Canada, a large continental country, which shares several thousands of kilometres of border with the United States, must have border controls. But these controls must not prevent freedom of circulation between Canada and the United States.

Why is it important to ensure that the flow of goods and people between Canada and the United States is as streamlined as possible? Because economic imperatives demand it, of course. Every day, thousands of people cross the Canada-U.S. border, as do thousands of dollars in goods.

We want there to be the necessary controls when circumstances require, but we also want fluidity between the two countries.

This brings me to another point. In our plan for a sovereign Quebec, it is clear that there will be no customs post between Quebec and English Canada. We will welcome any measure that encourages freedom of circulation.

• (1040)

This was in Mr. Lévesque's 1967 white paper. It was part of the 1980 referendum plan and the 1995 agreement: there will be no customs offices between a sovereign Quebec and the rest of Canada.

The bill before us contains a number of measures. The first has to do with providing for the expedited movement of persons who are precleared and authorized to travel freely between Canada and the U.S.

There will also be streamlined clearance procedures for low risk passengers by pre-arrival risk assessment of passenger information. This is the crux of the bill.

There are people who travel on a regular basis, such as MPs going from one place to another, business people, people in positions of authority which require them to make representations at various times. Obviously, because they travel frequently, are honest citizens and are known to customs officials, these people do not represent a threat to the integrity and security of either country. Provision must be made for very streamlined procedures for these individuals.

This bill addresses such a measure as it relates to requests for information provided by individuals and how it will be handled. We welcome this measure, and have no problem with it.

Another provision of this bill addresses the requirements for provision of information under the existing act. We have no problem with that either.

Obviously, we understand that people do travel and that information must always be available on who is on a plane, who is preparing to go through customs. This is a matter of security, and there may be a need to contact people quickly. We are, of course, in agreement with such a provision.

There is also going to be a harmonization of the provisions relating to the recovery of monies owing under this act, the Income Tax Act and the Excise Tax Act. This is self-evident.

Where the problem lies, and the reason, I believe, for the amendments presented by the hon member for Verchères—Les Patriotes, is the coming into effect of this law and the extremely important role played by the regulatory context.

The categories of individuals to be processed more rapidly are determined by regulation. Implementation of the law is determined by its regulations.

As for the various administrative penalties, the fact that there is provision for 250 different ones to be set out in the regulations concerning the various offences relating to the transit of goods and individuals poses a problem for us.

Moreover, this government's predilection for such vague provisions in a piece of legislation is most unacceptable.

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold: Unclear provisions.

Mr. Réal Ménard: The hon. member for Jonquière calls them unclear. Why not make it a habit in this House to introduce bills that are clear as to their intent, with provisions that can be evaluated, that will not present ambiguity to parliamentarians?

This is unfortunate, because the bill is based on good intentions. Of course, we disagree with the fact that it came from the other place but, overall, the Bloc Québécois supports the harmonization of customs procedures.

Customs must be much more effective at clearing persons and goods. However, a power that is much too broad will be granted through future regulations, and the discretionary power given to the minister is also very broad.

We proposed amendments and I will read one:

85.1 At the end of the first year after the coming into force of this Act, the Minister shall prepare a report on the application of its provisions and of any regulations—

I will conclude by saying that, after the act has been in force for one year, we hope that an evaluation will be made of the measures triggered by this act.

• (1045)

[*English*]

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise here today to speak to not only the amendments but also the bill.

We all know that since the attack on the United States on September 11 the world has changed. Most important, North America has changed. We have to look at many areas not only to tighten up Canada's security but also to address the fact that through some of these measures our trade routes might be impacted.

Government Orders

Canada is a nation of trade. It was built on trade. Our biggest trading partner is the United States which we depend mostly upon. In order to achieve the goals that are needed in Canada and the United States, it is necessary for all government employees to address this concern. It impacts on our daily lives, particularly on the lives of those who are trying to move trade back and forth. We already have some information that companies are looking at moving their operations south of the 49th parallel because of some of these concerns.

Bill S-23 will address some of those concerns. That is why I say here today that I give qualified support to it. I still have many concerns with regard to what has not taken place, what has not been introduced in this bill, and the speed with which this has taken place, which in my opinion has not been fast enough on a number of issues.

There are concerns expressed by the public, not only here in Canada but also in the United States. One of the big concerns we hear is that here in Canada many people think that through co-operation with the United States we will lose some of our sovereignty, that we will lose what we take to be wholly Canadian. That is not true. That part of it is a myth.

Americans have concerns that Canada will not implement a lot of what it has been talking about with regard to our borders. That has grown over the years. Even as the ministers have stated in the House, we have been very lax. We have allowed a lot of our laws and policies to be abused. That can be addressed. All of those concerns can be addressed.

What we have to understand first is that it is only a border and we are dealing with a continent. In order to achieve that, we should be harmonizing as close as possible with the allies we trade with. That becomes the most important thing. We have to be able to move our goods back and forth. We have to look at ways of speeding up the movement of the legitimate people that come to Canada.

I will quote something by Gordon Giffin who was the U.S. ambassador to Canada until last April. He talks about harmonizing, but there is another issue he discusses. "We have talked about a perimeter of defence to try and offset some of the concerns that are happening at the border and I am strongly in favour of that".

He goes on to mention: "Perimeter policy does not imply unilateral action. Actually, it offers an opportunity for Canada to define the agenda for this dialogue". Here is the interesting part: "Since the 1950s we have jointly defended North American airspace through NORAD, American and Canadian military personnel working together with seamless binational command authorities. Both procedures were not unilaterally imposed by the U.S. and Canada is not less sovereign for its role in that initiative. Surely if we can have a military perimeter policy, we can find better ways to collaborate on the civilian side as well. Canada and the United States share much more than geography as our shared goals that provide the foundation for this task".

• (1050)

The good news is that there are people here in Canada and the United States that are working toward achieving those goals. If Europe can figure out how to simply enact legislation that allows

goods to flow freely, surely we can do no less here in Canada and the United States. It becomes mandatory.

In order to achieve that, we have to look at our customs agency. Most people in Canada have the mistaken impression that the customs agents are our first line of defence. In some aspects it is true on the inspection part. A real strange thing is that our customs agency is basically underneath the revenue department and not the justice system. The citizens of our country are depending upon those customs agents out there to stop the flow across our borders of certain goods or people yet they have no power to detain them nor the equipment to stop them.

I find that very strange as do the people in the United States and other countries. If we are going to base customs strictly on revenue and taxation, then at least give our customs officers calculators and let them know that is their mandate.

If we are going to do what is necessary in order to secure our borders, then let us properly equip our customs officers. Let us train them to be officers and not tax collectors. Let us put our first line of defence back where it should be, at our borders.

Today if a customs officer has a problem with people coming into Canada, if somebody coming across the border threatens a customs officer, if a customs officer feels that he is being threatened, if he or she feels that the people coming in are armed or dangerous, they are supposed to let them cross our border unimpeded and phone the RCMP. Coming from a province where some of our customs officers may be an hour to an hour and a half away from the closest RCMP detachment, I find that very strange. In a province like British Columbia, within an hour to an hour and a half people can disappear awfully fast. They can also swap any goods being brought across the border illegally without being noticed. That is a major concern. We hear this across the board regarding our custom agents and also the American agents.

Another area of concern is the sharing of information. This must be mandatory. As we receive information about safety concerns regarding the flow of people across our borders, we should be obligated to share those concerns not just with one or two, but with all law enforcement agencies in Canada and the United States. Until we are able to harmonize that information and finally come to the realization that we are no longer innocent people in the world and can no longer live underneath the old rules that we were used to, that we must tighten our security, we will always have these concerns.

To do that we have to implement some of the amendments that are put forward in this bill and hope that the government will listen and act upon them. That becomes of primary importance. If we are to have free travel and trade routes and keep that trade flowing to eliminate hours of backlog at the border, we must address not only the concerns of the American people but also the concerns of Canadians who have come forward so strongly since September 11.

•(1055)

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to speak to the bill today, not because of what is in it but for the opportunity to address issues that should be raised concerning the travel of people and commercial goods across the border between ourselves and the United States.

Before I address the specifics of the bill I will express our party's displeasure with the fact that this very important issue has been addressed once again at the Senate level. The issue, which before September was crucial for my riding in terms of ongoing economic viability, has become extremely important since September 11 yet is being addressed by a body that is unelected and unaccountable. This is a policy that the government has unfortunately followed all too often.

I will emphasize a point that a number of other members have made, that the bill and the issues it addresses were all addressed prior to September 11. We have said ad nauseam that our lives as individuals and as a society as a whole in North America have changed dramatically since September 11. As a result the bill is inadequate to deal with the issues around moving goods and people across the border between ourselves and the United States.

To digress for one moment, the Bloc has raised a couple of amendments. I express our support for those amendments. Since both the amendments deal with an early review of the legislation we would like to see the bill withdrawn and sent back to the planning stages because it is inadequate for the needs we faced before September 11 and even more so since the tragedy and the outflow from those events.

I will begin to address the balance that the bill attempted to reach, and that it clearly has not achieved, between the issues of security, the free flow of goods and people across the border, and, because it has raised its head, the issue of civil liberties for both travellers and employees on the Canadian side of the border.

The Deputy Speaker: I wish I did not have to interrupt the hon. member but I must proceed to statements by members at this time. After question period he will have approximately seven minutes remaining in his intervention.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

BERNARD MASCARENHAS

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine from York North, Bernard Mascarenhas, worked as the managing director at Marsh Canada. On Tuesday, September 11, 2001, Bernard was working at the company's offices at the World Trade Center in New York City. He did not survive the catastrophic destruction of the terrorist attack.

Over 20 years ago Mr. Mascarenhas adopted Canada as his new country. He was a hardworking man who did very well in his profession. He was also a very humble man who gave much of himself to help those less fortunate. He loved his family and was devoted to his wife Raynette, son Sven and daughter Jaclyn.

S. O. 31

In honouring the thousands of people who perished on September 11, we must remember that they were individuals like Bernard Mascarenhas who worked hard, gave to their community, loved and were loved.

* * *

MARINE CONSERVATION AREAS

Mr. Andy Burton (Skeena, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a matter of great importance to my constituents. I have been working to amend Bill C-10, the badly flawed government bill on marine conservation areas.

Over 25 organizations, municipalities, chambers of commerce and fishing groups have made their concerns known to me and through me to the committee. Unfortunately less than half will have the opportunity to present their concerns to the committee. The government has done a poor job of consulting with British Columbians.

The Union of B.C. Municipalities passed a unanimous resolution calling on the government to consult widely prior to passing the bill. The bill has the potential to seriously hamper offshore oil and gas exploration on the west coast, a resource an ailing British Columbia economy badly needs to build its future.

I ask the government, on behalf of my constituents, to please listen to our concerns and delete clause 13. I ask it not to stand in the way of B.C.'s offshore oil and gas development.

* * *

•(1100)

ORGAN DONATIONS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada lags behind other countries in organ donations despite the efforts of various groups and individuals.

The problem appears to lie with the relatives of people who are unexpectedly taken. Often the driver's licence or other documents declaring the deceased's wishes to donate organs are found too late or those wishes are simply not acted upon.

Organ transplant technology has advanced very rapidly in recent years. It is tragic that sick people cannot take advantage of this for lack of available organs. A national organ registry would help. Those who wished to donate organs would all be listed in the same place, making verification of their wishes easier. This would ensure that their wishes were carried out.

Let us all work to improve organ donations in Canada.

* * *

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, October is Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Month. The purple ribbon members of parliament have received represents the campaign to make Canadians aware of the importance of early intervention and prevention of child abuse and neglect.

S. O. 31

Ever since the purple ribbon campaign was started by the Durham Children's Aid Society in 1992, a growing number of organizations dedicated to protecting children and children's rights have joined in. Last year 39 agencies participated.

The Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies reports that by working together these agencies are accomplishing their objective to educate the public and take the message to wider audiences.

During the month of October I encourage all my colleagues in the House to support this campaign and to focus on the work of children's aid societies so that one day, child abuse will become a thing of the past.

* * *

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask hon. members of the House to join me today in recognizing Amnesty International Week.

Amnesty International is among the most highly respected human rights organizations in the world and was awarded the Nobel peace prize in 1977.

Amnesty's work enables people to make a difference. All around the world there are innocent people, poets, human rights activists, journalists and others, who are imprisoned, tortured, executed or who simply disappear. Amnesty International speaks out for the rights of these innocent people, telling officials that these individuals are not anonymous. Often it has led to their release.

Amnesty International's work is particularly relevant in the new world that has emerged since September 11. Amnesty's work on behalf of refugees and its commitment to human rights provides hope and courage in today's world.

I ask Canadians to join me today in lighting a candle to prove that, as the old Chinese proverb says, "It is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness".

* * *

CANADA WINTER GAMES

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to travel to New Brunswick this fall. The residents of the cities of Bathurst and Campbellton were warm and inviting.

While there I learned that these cities will jointly host the 2003 Canada Winter Games. The Minister of Labour awarded the games to the Bathurst-Campbellton bid committee in 1999.

These games will see participants from Canada's ten provinces and three territories. The games will provide an opportunity for dedicated athletes to participate and compete against their peers. Races will be won, awards will be presented and friendships will be formed.

I was also made aware during that visit that the minister made a campaign promise to provide \$2.5 million for these games. Has the minister fulfilled her promise to the people of New Brunswick and the Canadian athletes of the 2003 Canada Winter Games?

[*Translation*]**ORDER OF CANADA**

Mr. Serge Maril (Beauharnois—Salaberry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the Governor General of Canada presided over a ceremony for new members of the Order of Canada.

During this prestigious ceremony, 48 Canadians were honoured for their contribution to our nation. The Order of Canada is the highest honour for lifetime achievement.

I would like to pay tribute to these persons who, through their commitment, deserve the recognition of all Canadians.

I would particularly like to congratulate the Quebecers who received the honour. Their accomplishments have helped our society to develop and move in the right direction.

* * *

●(1105)

CANADIAN MUSEUM OF CIVILIZATION

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Canadian Museum of Civilization launched an exhibit entitled "The Lands within Me", in reference to the many places that have shaped the works of the 26 artists of Arab origin, of whom more than half have chosen to live in Quebec.

The works presented, both in their choice of medium and in the texts that accompany them, clearly illustrate that artistic expression cannot be dissociated from the human experience. All we need to do now is take the time to recognize how it affects us.

I would recommend this exhibition to everyone. There are pieces that are both stunning and significant, such as Karim Rhoem's magnificent photograph, entitled "A Family Resemblance". Rhoem is a Quebecer of Moroccan origin who introduces us to the Giroux family, a family of 11 living in Sainte-Rose de Laval.

The exhibition's curator, Aïda Kaouk is right in stating that "The Lands within Me" invites us to broaden the view we have of others, who may be different in their origins, but who are similar in their human experiences.

* * *

[*English*]**DIAMOND INDUSTRY**

Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced Bill C-402, an act to prohibit the importation of conflict diamonds into Canada.

We know the marketing lines that "diamonds are a girl's best friend" or that "diamonds are forever", but to many people on the African continent, diamonds mean something completely different.

The illegal diamond trade has been used to finance the activities of rebel groups in places like Sierra Leone, Angola and the Democratic Republic of Congo. To many Africans, diamonds do not mean eternal love, they mean death, destruction and suffering.

This illegal trade must be stopped. It not only threatens human rights, political stability, economic development and peace and security in a number of areas, it also threatens the legitimate diamond trade in countries like Botswana, South Africa and indeed Canada.

We have been a leader in the Kimberley process which involves an international system for the certification of rough diamonds. We must work to ensure the Kimberley process is successful if we are to finally eliminate the trade in conflict diamonds.

* * *

[Translation]

AIR CANADA

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it seems the reduced fares announced by Air Canada may not be fair.

The discounts are significant, but Quebec City is not on the list of originating cities. In fact, the fare between Toronto and Quebec is \$100 more than the fare between Toronto and Winnipeg. This is absurd.

For far too long, the people of Quebec City have paid exorbitant fares to fly. Air Canada is the only airline serving Quebec City. It would be unfair for it to increase its fares and benefit accordingly from its monopoly.

I want to assure this House and the people of Quebec City that I will monitor Air Canada's fares closely on all flights between Quebec City and other Canadian cities.

It is vital to ensure the rights of Quebec travellers are protected, and we will fight to see they are.

* * *

[English]

PEACEKEEPING

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to acknowledge in parliament two residents of Prince Edward Island who have been honoured as recipients of Canada's prestigious peacekeeping award.

They are Mr. Blair Darrach of New Haven, who served with the special forces units in the 1960s and 1970s, including two missions to Cyprus, and Mr. Thomas Albrecht of Albany, who served with the Canadian forces from 1963 to 1979, participating in missions to Cyprus, Egypt and the Golan Heights.

Blair, Tom and their families exemplify the best of our service men and women. They have shown a willingness to serve in some of the world's most troubled places and enhanced our nation's efforts to make this a more peaceful world.

I congratulate and thank them for a job well done and for the inspiration they provided to others.

S. O. 31

MACKENZIE-PAPINEAU BATTALION

Mrs. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the unveiling of the national Mackenzie-Papineau monument honouring the bravery and sacrifices of the Canadians who fought against fascism in the Spanish Civil War from 1936 to 1939.

Recognition of the Mac-Paps is long overdue. Former New Democrat MP Nelson Riis worked tirelessly to win Mac-Pap veterans and their survivors the war pensions they deserve.

The Canadians who volunteered for the Mac-Pap Battalion were true heroes, motivated by their convictions to risk everything in the name of freedom and democracy. They went despite attempts by the Canadian government of the day to stop them. Their valour in the field did our nation proud.

The Mac-Paps are an integral part of Canada's long history of involvement in the worldwide struggle against tyranny. That struggle continues today.

As Canadians and parliamentarians, it is our duty to support the members of the Canadian armed forces who serve our country today, the loved ones they leave behind, as well as to honour and provide for the veterans who served in the conflicts of yesterday.

The Mac-Paps have a rightful place in that storied heritage. May this new monument stand forever as a fitting reminder of their valour.

* * *

•(1110)

[Translation]

TAX HAVENS

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the superintendent of financial institutions has asked Canadian banks to co-operate in the FBI's efforts to trace and freeze funds belonging to terrorist groups.

We have often asked the Minister of Finance to report on this and tell us whether such co-operation should extend to foreign branches of Canadian banks. This question is basic, since the funds often comprise dirty money, which is laundered in perfectly honest institutions, but in countries considered tax havens, which are very permissive and which, according to the OECD, do not look too closely at its source.

The major Canadian banks have a lot of branches in the Caribbean, a total of 50 for fewer than 2 million people, in a region that is the very best place for tax havens.

The Minister of Finance must answer these questions and unequivocally fight the practices of the tax havens, an excellent breeding ground for terrorists' financial power.

Oral Questions

[English]

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the face of recent news of anthrax scares and terrorist threats around the world, I would like to take a moment to emphasize the importance of a calm and rational response.

It is understandable that at a time such as this individuals might give in to fear and panic. It is crucial that we all remain alert but it is equally important that we not succumb to the temptation to see the world only through the lens of our fear, amplified by repeat media broadcasts. This is exactly what the terrorists would want.

Common sense is our greatest ally as we struggle with the new realities of the world around us. The government has sought a reasoned and measured response to the threat which balances security needs with the individual rights of our citizens. We have taken strong measures to ensure the safety of all Canadians.

Once again I urge Canadians to remain strong, rational and level-headed as we all work together to confront this new world reality.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, on Monday I will be visiting the proposed site of the American based Sumas 2 energy plant along with the coalition leader, the member for Fraser Valley.

Emissions from the planned Washington border location are expected to compound existing air quality problems for the Fraser Valley. The site is located in a sensitive air pocket that traps emissions, making it difficult for area residents to breathe.

The Fraser Valley has one of the most stressed air spaces in Canada, due mostly to the cumulative effect of the pressure that air pollutants have and the effect they have on human health.

Health officials, environmentalists and many other individuals are saying that the site of power generating plants is absolutely paramount. The municipality, the provincial Liberals and the MP for Fraser Valley have all expressed concerns about the planned site. The only ones who have not so far are the environment minister for British Columbia and the environment minister for Canada.

When will the federal Minister of the Environment join with other individuals in British Columbia and stand up for the people in the Fraser Valley?

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL SECURITY

Ms. Yolande Thibeault (Saint-Lambert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after the events of September 11, I noticed an escalation in the fears of Canadians. Security is certainly one of our main concerns.

I am pleased to see that our government is committed to making sure that we can live according to our values and beliefs. The measures it has put in place are reassuring.

I would mention a number of examples: border post security has been increased; a new citizenship card has been announced; a cabinet committee on security has been formed; and a new bill to protect us against terrorism is now before this House.

I believe that our government is responding satisfactorily to the concerns of Canadians. It is responsible and it is vigilant.

* * *

• (1115)

[English]

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the transport minister has said that he does not favour air marshals on planes because airports can be made totally secure.

That would be fine except last Sunday in Toronto an airport worker was observed going around the security measures, obviously a friend of someone who was doing that screening. If pilots, passengers and janitors must go through then so too should airport workers. That is not very comforting. This was reported to Transport Canada and no action has been taken yet.

Air marshals would make passengers more comfortable. They would not carry weapons that would puncture the fuselage of a plane but a specific weapon that would take out a terrorist. I believe the use of air marshals would be sensible and I believe most Canadians share that feeling.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Stockwell Day (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, despite the sometimes overheated rhetoric and reply of the minister of immigration, no one in the House is talking about wanting to build penal colonies for refugees who show up here without identification papers.

We are simply asking the minister to put in place a system that would detain persons who arrive here without papers until it can be proven they are not a security risk. It is simple. What problem does the minister have with that?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what exists today. When people arrive at a port of entry and make a claim, they are fingerprinted, photographed and an extensive interview takes place. If there is any concern that they may pose a security risk to Canada, whether they have documents or not, but especially if they are undocumented, then they are detained.

Mr. Stockwell Day (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, for how long?

Oral Questions

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for the leader of the official opposition to know that we detain an individual for as long as necessary. In fact, if we believe that individuals pose a danger to Canada there is a security certificate procedure now in place which, by the way, the new Immigration and Refugee Protection Act actually streamlines and makes it easier for us to be able to remove those individuals.

Mr. Stockwell Day (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, she did not answer the question. They are not detained for any great length of time.

[*Translation*]

The question is a simple one. Identification papers are required to board an airplane bound for Canada. Yet, every day, people arrive here without them.

Could the minister assure us that people who arrive here without papers will be automatically detained until it can be shown that they are not a security threat?

[*English*]

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the official opposition would have us believe that all undocumented refugees who come to Canada are terrorists or criminals and should be detained under mandatory provisions. It is false that they are all terrorists or criminals.

Further, as Minister of Citizenship and Immigration I am not going to detain a woman who comes to our border with her children simply because she does not have documents. If she poses a threat, that is a different question, but for someone who does not pose a threat, no, sir, not in Canada.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that was a smear and nothing but a smear.

Let me switch over to the justice minister. Yesterday in Vancouver a man who was wanted in the U.S. for being a purchasing agent for Hezbollah was released on bail. The justice minister has the power and the authority to extradite this individual so that he can face those accusations in the States. Will she do it?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House that my lawyers were in court opposing the bail application and we argued against the provision of bail. I have to respect the decision of the court in that case. It did grant bail to the individual in question.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, obviously the answer is no.

Listen to the stuff this guy provided: mine detection and blasting equipment, aircraft analysis software, stun guns, photographic equipment, global positioning equipment. This is not the sort of fellow that I think we should have on bail in Canada.

This minister has the power to extradite. I ask again, is she going to do it?

• (1120)

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member

should be aware this matter is before the court. In fact, I may well be called upon to make a final decision as to whether or not this person is extradited. It would be inappropriate for me to comment at this point when this matter is before the court.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ANTI-TERRORISM LEGISLATION

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the events of September 11, it was agreed that, in order to avoid proving terrorists right, a balance had to be maintained between the values of democracy, freedom and security.

If the government is serious when it says that we must be prudent and wise in dealing with the September terrorist attacks, does it realize that the signals it is sending to the public are very disturbing?

[*English*]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in fact as we have said on a number of occasions, we believe that we have struck the right balance in our legislation to deal with the evils of terrorism. We recognize that this is an important task. It is one that we take up very seriously.

It is also one that I look forward to working with our Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights in relation to, because in fact as I have said in the House on a number of occasions, I look forward to their advice and their recommendations to ensure we get that balance.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, whether it is the Access to Information Act, the Protection of Privacy Act, the Patent Act, the criminal code, the electronic surveillance legislation or any other act, we simply fear that rights and freedoms which, until now, we thought were sheltered from arbitrary decisions by the government, will now be vulnerable.

What message does the government want to send to the public, which is concerned about the use the government could make of the exceptional powers it is in the process of grabbing?

[*English*]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. member that what Canadians want is to be protected effectively and fairly from the scourge of terrorism. That is what we believe our anti-terrorism legislation provides.

However, I have already indicated that while we believe we have struck the appropriate balance, some of these issues that are implicated in the legislation are things on which reasonable people of good faith can disagree. That is why we have a parliamentary committee process. That is why we will hear from the committee. I look forward to its advice and recommendations.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in special legislation such as this one, definitions are of critical importance. The starting point for a fair use of these powers is undoubtedly the definition of terrorist activity.

Oral Questions

All week long, the minister has been telling us that the terrorist activity that is targeted is the one that generates terror, but this is not at all reflected in the bill.

Will the minister confirm that the concept of terror is nowhere to be found in the bill's definition of terrorist activity?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in fact let me point out to the hon. member that what we are defining is terrorist activity. We are not defining violent activity. We are defining terrorist activity. Therefore I would ask the hon. member to keep in mind that is what we are concentrating on. That is what we are focused on in this legislation: those who would use terror to achieve their goals.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the term terror is not mentioned in the definition. Through her answer, the minister herself has shown that there is room for interpretation, even before the bill is passed.

How does the minister think that a police officer who has to implement the act a year from now will do so in the heat of the moment? If the minister, who drafted the bill, is interpreting its provisions, does she not think that the police officer will do the same and that things could get out of hand?

This is precisely what Canadians and Quebecers fear. They fear that the act may not be applied properly. My question is very simple: the word terror is not mentioned in the legislation.

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I find interesting is listening to the hon. member who is always very quick to criticize that which we on this side are trying to do, but not when called upon for constructive recommendations to help us.

I indicated yesterday at committee that we believe the definition of terrorist activity is sufficiently precise and clear. However, I made it plain to the committee that if it can help us in terms of language that will achieve what I hope are shared objectives I will be very interested in hearing that advice. So far all the hon. member does is—

• (1125)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the United States has confirmed that American troops are now on the ground in southern Afghanistan and certainly Canadians have reason to believe that our own soldiers who are part of the joint task force two might also be deployed there in the near future.

In every military operation there is a set of clear goals and objectives to be attained. My question for the defence minister is quite simple. What are the victory conditions?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as has been said many times, obviously the suppression of terrorism is our goal. Obviously we want Canadians, Americans and all people in the free world to be able to live without fear of the kinds of attacks that were experienced on September 11. To be able to flush out these organizations, to break them up, to cut off their funding, to cut off their recruitment, to cut off their communications with each other, these are all part of the objectives. That has been made clear right from the beginning.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, attacking the root causes of terrorism is an action. It is not a victory condition. Canadians really want to know when this war will be over. It is a legitimate question and I hope the minister would agree.

What is there to be achieved? Is it arresting bin Laden, overthrowing the Taliban, destroying Afghanistan's infrastructure? What is it? What are the conditions before all Canadian troops can come back home?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, rather than repeat what I just said, which really in effect answers the hon. member's question, let me also say that this is a multi-dimensional campaign. It involves more than just military action. In fact in the long run it will be won by means other than military power. There is no doubt that root causes, what causes people to join these kinds of organizations, all have to be examined.

Again I must say that in terms of the current action in Afghanistan it is not against Afghanistan or the Afghanistan people, but to be able to flush out the terrorists and their supporters.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, since Bayer has a patent for the drug Cipro and it has adequate stock on hand, why would the government break the law by getting a generic manufacturer to produce it?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the premise of the question, but I do want to report that Health Canada officials have been and continue to be in discussions with Bayer to work out any difficulties or issues.

I think that the hon. member and his party, all members of the House, Bayer and others in Canada should be willing to work together to serve what I trust we all agree is the main priority, protecting the health of Canadians.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, there is also the tiny problem of breaking the law that perhaps the minister should be careful with. The minister did not seek authorization from the patent commissioner or Bayer prior to awarding the contract to Apotex to produce a generic version of the drug.

Since the government has not declared a state of emergency, since it has not sought permission from the patent commissioner under section 19 of the Patent Act, and since it has not asked Bayer for permission, it is breaking the law, plain and simple.

Oral Questions

Is the real reason the minister chose Apotex to produce the drug that Apotex gave tens of thousand of dollars to the Liberal Party of Canada? Is that it?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has misstated the Patent Act. There is no requirement to declare a case of national emergency. The act can apply to extreme urgency or where the use for which the authorization is sought is a public or non-commercial use.

The hon. member is totally off base in his allegations. I do not know why he and his party fail to be concerned with the main priority, protecting the health of Canadians. Why is that not important to them?

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, over and over since September 11 Canadians have seen shocking evidence of an inept Liberal administration. In June 2000 the health minister was asked by provincial and local governments to take national leadership to prepare for possible bioterrorism, yet it took until yesterday for even the beginnings of a plan to emerge.

Why did the minister completely neglect even basics like stockpiling necessary medicines?

• (1130)

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the health department set up a special office to deal with possible bioterror activities. What the minister announced yesterday, and it was a good announcement and I am surprised she is not praising it, is just the most recent of a series of steps to protect Canadians.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that certainly is not what the emergency response people are saying. They are saying there has been no leadership at all.

Now the minister has moved from inaction to knee-jerk reaction. Yesterday he, a former justice minister, swept aside the laws protecting research and development patent to order illegally produced anthrax medicine.

Is the minister telling us that he thinks there is an emergency situation that justifies breaking the law of the land?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we do not concede that any laws are being broken. I repeat that discussions continue with Bayer to work out any issues.

I trust that the Alliance Party and the other parties in the House agree with us that the priority is the health of Canadians. Why is the Alliance Party now appearing to put the health of Canadians behind some company's commercial interests?

* * *

[Translation]

ANTI-TERRORISM LEGISLATION

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the anti-terrorism bill is making it possible for the government to get around not only the Access to Information Act, but the Privacy Act as well, as the commissioner, George Radwanski, pointed out yesterday.

How can the Minister of Justice justify the government's grabbing the power to do as it sees fit with the personal information it has collected on Quebecers and Canadians?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times in the House before, the power to which the hon. member refers is an exceptional power in which I, in my role as Attorney General of Canada, the chief law officer of the country, can issue a certificate to ensure that in exceptional circumstances highly confidential information is not released.

I should remind the member that the power that is seen in the anti-terrorism legislation is very similar to powers found in legislation of our allies with whom we share information and receive information.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the privacy commissioner is excluded from Bill C-36. This means that no one, no organization, not the commissioner, not parliament, not the justice system will be able to control the actions of the government.

Does the minister consider this acceptable in a free and democratic society?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I should point out to the hon. member that the ultimate control over any action taken by me in my capacity as Attorney General of Canada is the Parliament of Canada.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in the Burns and Rafay case the Minister of Justice argued, and I quote:

It is necessary to refuse to ask for assurances in order to prevent an influx to Canada of persons who commit crimes sanctioned by the death penalty in other states. [Failure to do so] would make Canada an attractive haven for persons committing murders in retentionist states.

Is this still the minister's view even though the Supreme Court of Canada rejects this argument in this case?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should be aware what the supreme court said in Burns and Rafay. Among other things, it said that the attorney general retains his or her discretion to seek assurances or not in exceptional circumstances.

The court acknowledges there may very well be exceptional circumstances to be determined initially by the attorney general as to whether or not assurances need to be sought. I would intend to exercise that discretion on a case by case basis.

Oral Questions

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister claims that she has the discretion to extradite criminals facing the death penalty but the Burns and Rafay decision said clearly that a court would have to determine whether an extradition request would pass the Oakes test.

Who has the discretion, the minister or the courts?

• (1135)

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, members should be aware that I have the discretion to determine and I will exercise that discretion on a case by case basis as to whether I think there are exceptional circumstances that justify not seeking assurances.

Can that decision made by me, a public official, be reviewed by the court at the request of the accused person? Yes, of course. It would be a shocking proposition to suggest that it could not be reviewed.

* * *

[Translation]

HEALTH

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, claiming supply problems, the Minister of Health violated the federal Patent Act by ordering drugs to fight Anthrax from Apotex, a manufacturer of generic drugs, while Bayer, the company with the patent, has enough for the government's needs.

How does the Minister of Health justify his government's failing to comply with its own laws, thus jeopardizing the pharmaceutical industry in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada? That is unacceptable.

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are complying with the Patent Act. I hope the Bloc will agree with us that the priority is to protect the health of all Canadians, including Quebecers.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the priority is to comply with government legislation.

The Bayer officials are positive they can supply the government. In addition, the drug ordered from Apotex has yet to be approved by Health Canada. So there was no justification for the minister's decision.

Will the government acknowledge that it acted too quickly, and illegally, and will it reverse its decision?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the premise behind the hon. member's question is incorrect.

No drug, patented or generic, is sold in Canada without government approval.

I therefore again ask why the Bloc is not interested in the health of Canadians. It should be our priority, for Quebecers and all other Canadians.

[English]

IMMIGRATION

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration claimed that whenever immigration officials are concerned that an individual poses a security threat or will not show up for a hearing they can and do detain. I suspect the minister has forgotten the case of Nabil Al-Marabh. This man was finally captured in the U.S. by the FBI and is wanted in connection with the attacks on North America.

If, as the minister claims, her officers have the tools they need, why do they not use them to protect Canadians and our neighbours?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the impression the member opposite is trying to create. I am particularly concerned when members opposition call for the mandatory detention of all undocumented refugees, suggesting that they are all terrorists and criminals.

When members opposite do not listen to the words of the top cop in Canada, Mr. Zaccardelli, the commissioner of the RCMP, they do a disservice to Canadians. Yesterday the commissioner said that he totally disagrees with the notion that we are a safe haven. He said that we should eliminate that word from our vocabulary in this country. That was his testimony yesterday at the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Nabil Al-Marabh was freed by the minister's Immigration and Refugee Board even though he had a violent criminal background, was apprehended with false documents trying to sneak into the U.S. from Canada and had been rejected as a refugee claimant. This is a man who may be connected with the horrific events of September 11.

How can the minister claim that she is doing her job and protecting Canadians when individuals like Nabil Al-Marabh can slip through her department's fingers?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again the member opposite is taking an individual case that is before the courts. As my colleagues have said, it is irresponsible to do or say anything that may have an impact on a successful prosecution.

Let me again repeat what the top cop, Commissioner Zaccardelli, had to say. He stated that we are no different than any other western country. He said that we face the same issues, the same problems, the same challenges, and that being an open society is still trying to protect citizens as much as we can.

* * *

• (1140)

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. Shawn Murphy (Hillsborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue.

All Canadians are aware of the initiatives being taken to improve and enhance security at our U.S.-Canadian borders. On a related and equally important issue, what action is the minister and his department taking with a view to engaging the United States to ensure at the same time the efficient free flow of travellers and goods through the border?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all know that Canada customs started to reform the system some time ago. We all know as well that my vision with regard to the land border is a vision of co-operation. As well, we signed an agreement back in 1995 with the United States talking about harmonization, co-operation and joint engagement.

I would like to report to the House that last week the commissioner of the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency met with his counterpart. Also this week my colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister, met with some elected people in the United States. Next Monday night I will be delivering a speech in Flint, Michigan in order to talk about our vision.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we have been attempting to get an answer from the Minister of Human Resources Development that will help a good deal of Canadians who are currently unemployed because of what happened on September 11. We continue to get platitudes from her.

Could the minister tell us when she will decide whether the hours that are needed to qualify for EI are going to be reduced or not? When will she make that decision?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the better thing to do is to assure the House and all Canadians that should they need the services of the employment insurance program it is there now and it can serve them in these times that are very difficult.

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, if I hear that one more time I will be nauseous. If she will not answer that question and give us more platitudes, could she tell us if she is doing anything about reducing the number of weeks it takes for her officials to process applications?

Seven hundred people have been laid off at the casino in Windsor and they are having to wait five, six and seven weeks for their applications to be heard. Could she tell us what she is doing about that?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there has been a backlog in the processing of employment insurance claims but there is a process in place in the department and the backlog is being reduced.

Where we have mass layoff circumstances we have particular provisions with dedicated employees who are there to work with particular employees, to go on premises to make sure that the applications are processed quickly and efficiently.

Oral Questions

HEALTH

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, my question is about this very suspicious practice of buying from Apotex when Bayer had all the product available to meet the health needs of Canada.

Contrary to what the Deputy Prime Minister has just told the House of Commons, before going to Apotex the government made no application under section 19(1) and did not notify Bayer as required in the law. There is no question, the government broke the law.

My question is for the Minister of Justice. Does the Minister of Justice intend to prosecute the Minister of Health for breaking the law of Canada or does she consider—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Deputy Prime Minister.

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I did not say that the government had made application under section 19(1). I simply pointed out that the use of it did not require a national emergency to be declared. I would ask the leader of the fifth party if he would get a better person to prepare his questions. That one was totally ridiculous.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I will rise on a point of privilege after question period.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the scientific soothsayer or, if you prefer, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, contradicted his colleague, the government House leader in the other place, and said that the generic version of Cipro was safe, when the drug has not even been tested.

The Minister of Health is ordering millions of dollars worth of a drug which has not even been approved by his department.

In the absence of conclusive evidence, how does the government justify its purchase of an untested drug?

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, I wish to thank the member opposite for the compliment he has bestowed on me. I have risen almost to the status of a god in his eyes; I thank him.

I can assure the House that when we have drugs available to respond to emergencies, they will be safe for ingestion and will present no threat to the health of Canadians.

* * *

● (1145)

[*English*]

ANTI-TERRORISM LEGISLATION

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the anti-terrorism legislation has big holes in it when it comes to extraditing and deporting people who pose a threat to Canadian society.

Oral Questions

Why is the government more concerned about the civil rights of terrorists, criminals and dangerous people than the civil rights of law-abiding Canadian citizens?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the premise of the member's question is not only wrong, it is ridiculous. It is absolutely silly.

The government is absolutely committed to ensuring that the protection of Canadians is the absolute number one priority. We brought forward changes in the proposed immigration and refugee protection act that will make it easier for us to streamline our procedures both for refugee determination as well as for deportation and removal.

One of the important provisions is the new security certificate procedure which will also allow us to identify and remove with evidence those people who—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Prince Albert.

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Talk about bluster, Mr. Speaker. The anti-terrorism bill proposes many changes that would restrict the civil liberties of law-abiding Canadian citizens.

Why is the government focusing more on policing law-abiding citizens within Canada than stopping terrorists and dangerous people from getting into the country in the first place?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is simply not true. Whenever we have evidence that someone poses a risk to Canada, be that a security risk or a criminality risk, we arrest them, we detain them and we keep them there as long as we have to until we are able to remove them and deport them from this country. To suggest otherwise is just wrong and it sends the wrong message to Canadians.

I would ask the member to be sure that what he is saying is accurate and factual because so far he is not.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, former minister Lloyd Axworthy and the present Minister of Foreign Affairs have denied allegations that CSIS was conducting secret operations outside Canada.

Yesterday, CSIS director, Ward Elcock, said the opposite.

Will the solicitor general confirm whether or not CSIS is involved in espionage activities outside Canada?

[English]

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said a number of times in this House, CSIS has the authority to investigate any activity that threatens security inside or outside of Canada. It has that authority and it fulfills that mandate.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in light of what the Minister of Foreign Affairs has said, is

the solicitor general saying that CSIS is involved in espionage activities outside Canada without the government's approval?

[English]

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I am telling my hon. colleague, and I have said this many times in the House, is that CSIS has the authority to investigate, inside of this country and outside of this country, any activity that threatens Canada. That is the mandate of CSIS.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Premier of Quebec joined with his counterpart in British Columbia to call for the creation of a North American security perimeter.

The two leaders pointed out that such a perimeter would facilitate the movement of goods between Canada and the U.S.

Why is the government still stubbornly ignoring this suggestion, which makes perfect sense and which will provide protection as well as being good for trade and employment?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has already demonstrated a great deal of leadership and vision in this area.

As for the perimeter, what does the hon. member mean by this? If reference to a perimeter refers essentially to the definition of customs, which addresses the protection of ports and airports, then yes that is a perimeter.

The only thing to which reference is then being made is the basic principle of the customs system, which is a matter of proper risk assessment and management. In that context, there is no doubt whatsoever that there is a greater risk at international ports and airports. Customs is, however, already doing a good job in this area.

The reform we have put in place, which is in the process of being passed by the House of Commons, will also do an excellent job of creating an ultra-modern customs system.

• (1150)

[English]

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the problem is the government is talking, not doing. Premiers Landry, Campbell, Lord and Harris have all asked for this security perimeter. They represent the concerns of millions of Canadians who want to protect their jobs.

Why does this government not take the advice of these four premiers, as well as the advice of Canadians, and work with our counterparts in the United States to erect this security perimeter, which we need to protect our jobs and our trade?

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as far as the customs system is concerned, we cannot work in the abstract; concrete action must be taken. This means co-operative action as well.

Once again, if by perimeter, international ports and airports are being referred to, I would like to point out, in connection with concrete actions, that last June we in customs announced a particular initiative in Montreal, with more funds and more resources devoted to technology.

If the hon. member kept abreast of policy developments, he would know that last week we also announced the allocation of additional resources and more technology for ports, airports and postal centres, as well as more funding for technology. We are very much taking a lead role.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Mr. Charles Hubbard (Miramichi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been said that sometimes our greatest fear is fear itself. Recently we have heard members of the opposition and some members of the media talking about bioterrorism.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health give us a statement on behalf of Health Canada on what it is doing to make sure Canadians are ready for any possible attack on bioterrorists?

[Translation]

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I agree with the hon. member. We must look at the situation from a certain perspective. We must realize that there are threats, but we must remain calm and face the situation from a global perspective.

Yesterday, in order to improve the security and health of Canadians, the minister announced initiatives totalling close to \$12 million, including close to \$6 million to buy pharmaceutical products, close to \$2.25 million to buy equipment for possible radio nuclear incidents, \$2.12 million to improve a—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands.

* * *

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Canada's agriculture and food supply are easy targets for bioterrorism. So far the government's response to protect our food supply has been nothing. This is not good enough.

Last April, Dr. André Gravel, executive vice president of the CFIA stated that the threat of bioterrorism to our food supply is "a real threat and clearly a real possibility".

Why has the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food taken no action to protect our food supply?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the track record of the Canadian food safety in this country is second to none in the world. The Canadian Food Inspection Agency, along with the Solicitor General of Canada, the Minister of Health and other departments are being as diligent and vigilant as they possibly can in the food safety system. There is an emergency preparedness action plan in place if something takes place.

I can assure Canadian citizens that we will do all we can to make sure that our food continues to be safe.

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca pointed out, the government is talking and doing nothing. The lack of public response from the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food to the increased risk to our food supply is both appalling and dangerous.

Since September 11, the United States has announced an additional \$350 million to keep its food supply safe. We have heard nothing on this front from the Liberals.

Why has the minister of agriculture failed to implement any new measures to protect Canada's agricultural industry and food supply?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about it because the measures are already there. We are not scaremongering Canadians as the opposition is. We have the systems in place and we are prepared. We will continue to do all we can to make sure that Canadian food continues to be the safest in the world.

* * *

[Translation]

GUARANTEED INCOME SUPPLEMENT

Mr. Marcel Gagnon (Champlain, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development studied the problem of senior citizens who are excluded from the Canada pension plan.

According to the figures provided by one expert who appeared before the committee, more than 380,000 Canadians would not receive the guaranteed income supplement, even though they are eligible. We are talking about millions of dollars that Human Resources Development Canada is literally stealing from the neediest members of our society.

Does the Minister of Human Resources Development intend to eliminate the 11 month period—

● (1155)

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

Oral Questions

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the guaranteed income supplement is a very important part of the Canadian pension structure. Indeed, ensuring that Canadians who are eligible have access to that program is very important.

I believe there are better ways of communicating with Canadian seniors to ensure that those who have eligibility for the GIS have access to it. I recently wrote to my colleague, the Minister of National Revenue, to see if together we could come up with a more effective strategy.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Alan Tonks (York South—Weston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the parliament buildings are one of our most prized national treasures, are an essential part of the country's heritage and are in dire need of restoration.

Could the Minister of Public Works and Government Services inform the House on the government's plan for the parliamentary precinct?

Mr. Paul Szabo (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the parliament buildings are the centre of our history, our democracy and our identity. That is why the government has developed and approved a long term vision plan for the parliamentary precinct. We are now proceeding with its implementation.

Earlier this week, the Minister of Public Works and Government Services announced the creation of an advisory committee to provide oversight and advice on the renovations. I am also pleased to announce that the hon. John Fraser, former speaker of the House of Commons, has accepted to chair this committee.

* * *

CANADA CUSTOMS AND REVENUE AGENCY

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, what kind of message is the minister trying to give to our customs officers? They are being told to call the police if they are under physical threat. In many instances the nearest police are a lot further than a heartbeat away.

Will the minister start protecting Canadians, our borders and customs officers by giving them adequate tools to do their job?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the customs organization is a very good, effective and efficient organization. Since September 11, it has been working hard to protect our country and to fulfill its dual mandate. As I said, over the last few months we have started to implement what we call officer power.

One more time, customs officers are not a police force. We have been working jointly over the past decade with police forces, such as the RCMP, and we will keep working with them. As well, we have to take into consideration the safety and security of our employees, which we are doing.

[Translation]

HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, during the last election campaign, the Minister of Finance opened the door to a possible specific agreement with Quebec regarding the reconstruction of highway 175, for which Minister Chevrette has asked.

Yet, the Minister of Transport told the government of Quebec to include this work in the infrastructure program for highways.

What is the Minister of Transport waiting for to negotiate a specific agreement with Quebec on highway 175, and follow up on the comments made by his colleague, the Minister of Finance, during the election campaign?

Mr. André Harvey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since May, the federal Minister of Transport has been holding money under the infrastructure program, waiting for Quebec's minister of transport to define his priorities.

Unfortunately, during the last election campaign, the PQ and the BQ were nervous and Quebec's minister of transport came and bandied around a bunch of figures. We have a program. The money is there. All we need to know are the province's priorities.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Mrs. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, brand name drug companies should not be allowed to profit from terrorism. Nor should they be allowed to gouge Canadians. The need for anthrax medicine has the government realizing what it is like to be in the shoes of a senior citizen or the parent of a sick child as they try to pay for medicines that have increased 87% since 1990, increases directly related to drug patent changes.

Will the government finally admit that its support of the Tory initiated drug patent changes is jeopardizing the health of Canadians and our health care system?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised an important issue, but she should not try to mix this up with the basic issue that we have been talking about in question period today, which is what should we be doing and how should we be doing it to protect the health of Canadians against anthrax. That is the priority issue here.

What she is talking about deserves attention, but she should not mix up the two.

* * *

● (1200)

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, a short while ago in the House, the Prime Minister mentioned he was considering advancing infrastructure funding to give a kick-start to our sagging economy.

The provinces, cities and towns will solidly support this as they are crying out for infrastructure improvements. I mention especially St. John's where we have severe water and sewer needs, and have been devastated by flooding from the recent tropical storm.

When can we expect to see the suggestion by the Prime Minister become a full commitment by the government?

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have a \$6 billion infrastructure program in place now. This is entirely within the provincial determination of what projects the provinces want to set forward. I am sure the province of Newfoundland will be taking advantage of that program in due course.

* * *

HERITAGE CANADA

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, amidst the anxiety and the uncertainty there is a group of Canadians looking with optimism to the future, trying to secure a major international event in Canada.

Would the Minister of Canadian Heritage tell us if there has been any progress in recent days with the Vancouver-Whistler bid for the 2010 Winter Olympics?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is so great to have a question about the future and about living and working together because one of the messages that we have to send out to the terrorists is that life will go on and we will work very hard.

We had a very constructive series of meetings this week in Ottawa with the Vancouver-Whistler team, the premier and members of his cabinet and members of the association. We will be out in Vancouver next week to continue those discussions.

We believe Vancouver-Whistler is the best bid and we hope that we will all be there in the most beautiful part of Canada in 2010.

* * *

ANTI-TERRORISM LEGISLATION

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, on Monday when Bill C-36 was tabled in the House it was not the first time that the country heard about the legislation. Documents relating to Bill C-36 were leaked to the Toronto *Star* and the *National Post*.

Canada is at war. The Prime Minister says so. Parliament says so. President Bush says so. NATO says so. These are confidential, delicate matters and delicate information.

What is the justice minister doing to ensure that national security is preserved and these sorts of documents are never, ever leaked again?

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I responded to this issue on the floor of the House of Commons earlier this week and the hon. member knows that. The House unanimously passed a motion referring this issue to the parliamentary committee. Everyone is doing their absolute best in that regard to ensure that

Privilege

proper security is maintained, as well as proper respect for the rules of the House of Commons.

We have endeavoured to make officials available to the parliamentary committee, including the person in charge of security who also happens to be my deputy minister. He is willing to appear before the committee. The committee will do its work and we are looking forward to the report.

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair has received notice of a question of privilege from the right hon. member for Calgary Centre.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

PURCHASE OF MEDICATIONS BY HEALTH CANADA

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I raise a question of privilege relating to a matter that arose in question period relating to the purchase of medications that are covered by the Patent Act, a law that has been passed by the House and which sets forth regulations. Some of my colleagues do not agree with the content of the law, but they would agree that the law has been passed by parliament and must be respected by all Canadians, cabinet ministers among others.

During question period it was revealed that the Department of Health did not make an application to the commission under section 19(1) before purchasing from Apotex. That, Sir, is a breach of the law. An application made after the fact does not cover the requirement of the law to make an application before the fact. It is a breach of the law.

Also, the government did not have the commission inform Bayer, the company whose rights are established and protected under the law passed by this parliament. That was not done before the purchase from Apotex as is required by the law of this parliament. That is a breach of the law of this parliament.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. With the greatest of respect to the right hon. member, a parliamentarian of vast experience, he would know firsthand that the Chair would not rule on a point of law. I sense that in the debate of question period there might be a dispute of facts. I would ask the right hon. member to get to the privilege.

● (1205)

Right Hon. Joe Clark: Mr. Speaker, I shall, having established the facts.

There is a basic duty of ministers of the crown to act within the confines of the law. That is fundamental to this parliament. The failure to obey the law may be a matter for the courts, but it is also a matter of grave concern to members of the House because a failure to obey the law is a blatant and open contempt of the House. Why, Sir, are we here to pass laws if the laws we pass can be ignored by ministers of the crown?

Earlier the minister of—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I want to once again reiterate that the Chair at no time, under any circumstance, can make any ruling on a matter of law. If there are further words to the question of privilege, I would ask the right hon. member to get to the matter of privilege.

Privilege

Right Hon. Joe Clark: Mr. Speaker, the Chair can, as we both know and as the House knows, come to judgments on matters of contempt of parliament. A contempt of parliament is contained in an action by a minister of the crown of Canada to deliberately breach the law of Canada. I am not asking the House to adjudicate the law. The law is clear. I am asking the House to consider the question of contempt. It is without—

The Deputy Speaker: I again remind the right hon. member that first and foremost there has to be, and is, a presumption of innocence. Otherwise there is no contempt of parliament. I do not know what else I can do if there is another matter dealing with the question of privilege.

I would like to make it clear that the matter of contempt must be based on guilt. There is a presumption of innocence here so I am at a loss to go much further. However I will recognize the right hon. member.

Right Hon. Joe Clark: Mr. Speaker, it is precisely because of the presumption of innocence that I related to those matters which belong to the courts, which is whether or not there has been a breach of the law. The government knowingly departed from the law that this parliament wrote. That knowing departure by the government of the country in itself constitutes a—

The Deputy Speaker: I believe the Chair at this time has heard enough on the matter. I have listened attentively to the matter raised by the right hon. member. The Chair is satisfied at this time that there is no need for any further debate on the matter with regard to privilege. I will now move on.

I remind members in the House that I have another notice of a question of privilege. I will now go to the member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans.

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of privilege relating to an event that occurred during oral question period but, rather, a question of privilege that results from a briefing session on Bill C-36 given this morning by the Department of Justice.

I want to put this question of privilege in its proper context and to stress once again the indifference shown by this minister and her department toward the members of this House and their right to information, which is a priority. We saw the Minister of Justice's way of doing things with Bill C-15, which resulted in a question of privilege on the part of the hon. member for Provencher. That question was referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs and the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons amended the directives for members of the Privy Council Office.

As regards Bill C-36, the Anti-terrorism Act, a lot of information was released even before the bill was introduced in this House on Monday. One simply has to read the October 13 edition of the *National Post*, which included whole parts of the bill and which came out before the briefing session organized by the Minister of

Justice on Monday morning, the day that Bill C-36 was introduced in the House.

Our right to information as duly elected members of this House, which is a priority, was once again violated. This leak about Bill C-36 in the *National Post* was the subject of a—

• (1210)

The Deputy Speaker: Order please. I simply wish to remind the House that this question has already been referred to the committee. Therefore, I would ask the hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans to get on with his question of privilege.

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why the government House leader does not want us to raise our point. Is he hiding something? Does this bother him?

In short, the Minister of Justice and officials from her department did it again in a meeting this morning. Notwithstanding the complexity and the importance of this bill, it is, at the very least, peculiar that nobody at the Department of Justice requested simultaneous interpretation for their briefing session on Bill C-36 this morning. For more than one hour at the beginning of this briefing, the minister's officials provided information solely in English.

Assistants of members of the Bloc Québécois were present at that meeting and were unable to obtain the information in their native language, despite the complexity of the bill.

The right to service in the language of one's choice is guaranteed under section 133 of Canada's constitution as well as under the Official Languages Act.

In view of the complexity of this bill and taking into account the language barrier, it becomes very difficult for parliamentary assistants and for the members themselves to form an informed opinion about such a bill.

The reference book entitled *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* says on pages 66 and 67, and I quote:

Any disregard of or attack on the rights, powers and immunities of the House and its Members, either by an outside person or body, or by a Member of the House, is referred to as a "breach of privilege"—

I could also refer to Erskine May, who said the following, and I quote:

The privileges of Parliament are absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers. They are enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the services of its Members; and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity.

Let me now quote from Joseph Maingot's *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, second edition, chapter 2, page 13:

If someone improperly interferes with the parliamentary work of a member of parliament—i.e. any of the member's activities that have a connection with a proceeding in parliament—in such a case that is a matter involving parliamentary privilege.

In conclusion, my right to receive information in my native language, through my assistants, was violated this morning by the Minister of Justice.

Considering these facts, I submit that my privileges as a parliamentarian were also violated.

Should you rule that there is a prima facie case of privilege, I would be prepared to move the appropriate motion.

• (1215)

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree, it is a very serious matter. It is not, however, a question of privilege, as the member knows.

It is not a matter of a parliamentary committee or of the House. It is a matter of a briefing session provided—

An hon. member: Oh, oh.

Hon. Don Boudria: If the member listened, she might understand.

That said, I believe that the question raised by the member is serious. However, it is not a matter of negligence by the minister.

I have in hand and am prepared to table it, the document that the minister, through her office, used to request interpretation services in the House of Commons. I have received it and its reception has been confirmed by the House.

It is possible the interpreters reported late for work. Movement in parliament is restricted at the moment. It is possible.

In any case, I will not investigate the House staff or put them on trial.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Then the briefing should not have begun at that time.

Hon. Don Boudria: I am getting to that. If the member could listen—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I hope we will be courteous and respectful enough to listen to each other even, and I understand, though we do not always agree.

The hon. government House leader.

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am prepared to table the document I have in hand. However, I am prepared to go further, given that the briefing session was clearly inadequate since it was not given in the language of the member opposite, nor, for that matter, of other members.

Right Hon. Joe Clark: The act was not complied with.

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. It seems to me that the right hon. member for Calgary Centre could for once in his life listen to something serious.

I am prepared to offer the members opposite an additional briefing session for their benefit. This session would be held at a convenient time, in the language of their choice, with interpreters. I am prepared to offer an additional information session.

That having been said, I apologize for what happened and for the fact that interpretation services did not get there on time. If you were to ask me if the briefing session should have been cancelled at that

Routine Proceedings

point, I might agree. I do not know whether such a request was made.

To sum up, interpreters were requested. They arrived late. These two facts are true. I am prepared to offer a new briefing session at a convenient time, not just for the benefit of the member opposite, but for the benefit of all members. I am also prepared to meet with the member opposite to work out the details.

That having been said, I wish to table the document to which I referred, showing that the minister had asked for interpretation services to be present. It is entitled: *Chambre des communes-House of Commons*. Since I have quoted part of it, I may now table it.

The Deputy Speaker: I listened carefully to the comments of the hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans and to those of the government House Leader. During the latter's intervention, he made an offer which I hope will make it possible to resolve the matter amicably, without the intervention of the Chair. If not, we can always come back to the issue, and the Chair will deal with it at that time.

I hope that this disposes of the matter for now.

We will now revert to routine proceedings.

• (1220)

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Chair went very quickly and did not give me the time to complete my thought on this.

I wish to table a motion to the effect that the question of privilege raised by the member—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The motion by the hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans is premature. If the Chair is called upon to make a ruling, other measures will be available at that time, depending on the ruling in question. However right now, such a motion is premature.

[*English*]

Right Hon. Joe Clark: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I listened attentively to your remarks when I was speaking earlier. You indicated that you had not found at this time reason to find a question of privilege. I am rising to give notice to you and to the House that I want to reserve the right to pursue this question at the next sitting of the House.

The Deputy Speaker: To the right hon. member for Calgary Centre, with the proper motion in writing, certainly that privilege is his.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 34, I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the visit of the parliamentary delegation led by the Hon. Peter Milliken, Speaker of the House of Commons, to Northern Ireland and to the Republic of Ireland from June 23 to 30, 2001.

Government Orders

[Translation]

CANADIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

Mr. Claude Drouin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32 (2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the transition report of the Canadian Tourism Commission, for the nine month period ending December 31, 2000.

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in accordance with the order of reference of Tuesday, October 2, your committee has considered Bill C-32, an act to implement the free trade agreement between the Government of Canada and that of the Republic of Costa Rica and agreed on Thursday, October 18 to report it without amendment.

* * *

PETITIONS

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, it gives me pleasure today to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Olds, Alberta and district in regard to the decision of the supreme court recently.

The euthanasia prevention coalition and the Canadian citizens who signed the petition call upon the Government of Canada to respect section 15(1) of the charter of rights and freedoms and uphold the Latimer decision.

KIDNEY DISEASE

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition from citizens who are concerned about the huge and growing problem of kidney disease in Canada. The petition, like many others, was initiated by Ken Sharp of my riding.

These citizens are concerned that research into kidney disease in Canada is being restricted by the fact that the national institute concerned is called the Institute of Nutrition, Metabolism and Diabetes. They believe that kidney research would be much better served if the words kidney research were to appear in the title of that national institute.

Therefore they call upon parliament to encourage the Canadian institutes of health research to explicitly include kidney research as one of the institutes in its system, to be named the Institute of Kidney and Urinary Tract Diseases.

●(1225)

TRAFFICKING IN BABY PARTS

Mr. Carmen Provenzano (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition from members of my constituency of Sault Ste. Marie petitioning that parliament take all measures necessary to ensure that trafficking in baby parts becomes a criminal offence.

DETROIT RIVER

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am honoured to present a petition from my constituents and

other members of the city of Windsor and the county of Essex regarding the preservation of an ecologically important area along the Detroit River. It is the last area along the Detroit River that has not been affected by development and it is important in their opinion for this to be preserved. I am happy to table that petition today.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CUSTOMS ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill S-23, an act to amend the Customs Act and to make related amendments to other acts, as reported (without amendment) from the committee, and of Motions Nos. 1 and 2.

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Madam Speaker, as always when interrupted, my eloquence may be less than it was in the first several minutes. I will resume where I think I left off which was on the issue of the adequacy of the bill.

I have already made the points that we are concerned that the bill came from the Senate and was processed through there rather than through the House. It is well indicated that we are in support of the Bloc's amendments.

Beyond that we have some very serious concerns about the bill, particularly with regard to the tragedy of September 11. It is now totally inadequate to respond to the concerns of both Canada and the United States.

In that regard this was supposed to be about the free flow of goods and people across the border. Because it was our border we were looking at, it really was a question of the flow of people and goods from the United States into Canada.

It is important to my constituency and generally to constituencies in Canada that have large manufacturing centres. It is extremely important to those industries because of the nature of that trade that goods flow rapidly and equally so that the people involved in those manufacturing industries, including truckers and business people, are able to move easily across the border. Just on time manufacturing has been instituted in Canada and the United States now for over a decade. In order for that process to work, we must move across the border freely.

Government Orders

This bill was an attempt to deal with problems that existed long before September 11. Unfortunately it is wanting even with regard to the problems that we had at that time. What has happened since September 11 has dramatically increased the waiting periods on both sides of the border but particularly on the Canadian side going into the United States. That reflects the problems on the American side.

We do not do this a lot but I want to praise some of the work that national revenue has done with regard to the advancement of the use of technology and other systems to allow people and goods to move back and forth across the border. However that only works on the Canadian side, that is, it only works on allowing goods and people into Canada. The problem is it does nothing to allow goods to move from Canada into the United States.

It is important to note that 40% of all the trade in Canada moves across the five border crossings between Windsor and Sarnia. There are three tunnels, one for rail, two for vehicles, and two bridges for 40% of all the trade in this country. As a result of September 11 there have been tremendous backups.

I grew up in Essex county. The small town of Belle River is 20 miles, or 30 kilometres, from Windsor. On one day truck traffic was backed up from the Ambassador Bridge all the way to the Belle River Road which as I said is 30 kilometres from the border. Those are the kinds of problems we had. The bill is grossly inadequate to deal with those types of backups.

I want to come back to the praise I was trying to give to the department. It has moved further along both in human resources in the deployment of staff and in the use of technology on the Canadian side of the border. There has not been the same kind of response on the American side. That really is where the thrust has to be to get traffic moving again in an efficient and effective manner.

• (1230)

That is not to say there are no problems. We know that one of the systems, the Canpass system, allows priority to be given to people who hold the pass to move their goods across the border in a more rapid way than others. However one of the things that came out at the committee was that a full 15% of the addresses of people who hold Canpass passes are no longer accurate. The department itself gave that information to us.

Given the situation we have now and the screening that goes on around security, that is no longer acceptable. It should not be acceptable to Canadians and it clearly will not be acceptable to the U.S. government and its administration. We must improve these systems.

There is another system, Nexus, that assists individuals in moving across the border. These are people who move back and forth regularly. This system is similarly wanting in that it is not good enough. No one expects perfection but we are not close enough yet. We need to continue to work on that.

It is obvious that we need a system that both countries will accept and utilize to allow people and goods which move regularly back and forth across the border to have priority. It is the only effective and efficient way to move those goods and people.

We need the government to enter into intense negotiations with the U.S. government for these types of systems to be developed. It could also use the ones we have now and increase their effectiveness, or perhaps develop new systems that take into account the need to balance security and the efficient movement of goods and people.

Bill S-23, quite frankly, does not address these issues anywhere near adequately. It should go back for further review and be brought up to date.

I see that I am getting a signal from you, Madam Speaker, that my time has run out or is about to run out. I will finish with one other comment.

We have serious concerns, quite frankly, with regard to privacy and civil liberties in the bill.

• (1235)

Ms. Sophia Leung (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have listened carefully to my hon. colleague's comments on Bill S-23. I thank the member for his praise of the bill. I am pleased that some members of the opposition recognize the importance of the bill which would modernize and strengthen our customs system. They support the bill and even praise it.

The Canada Customs and Revenue Agency has a solid, professional and credible evaluation program. Evaluations are conducted by the corporate review directorate which is independent of the customs branch. According to CCRA policy all evaluation reports are made available to the public.

The Minister of National Revenue has already committed to having a review annually. We will have internal reviews by professional and independent groups. We will have external reviews by conducting public consultations to seek solutions and make the necessary adjustments.

Therefore the motions in amendment suggested by members of the third party are clearly unnecessary since the Minister of National Revenue has already made a commitment to do an evaluation annually.

I also stress the importance of Bill S-23 as part of the special measures to combat terrorism. We all know that trade and safety at our borders are vitally important to Canada. The new legislation would help us handle the increased volumes. It would move low risk goods and passengers to reduce delays at the border so we could focus on high risk travellers and shipments.

Following the events of September 11 it is important that we move forward quickly. Since fall 1998 the CCRA has consulted extensively to see how we might improve our customs mandate to protect Canadians and promote business and trade.

Our extensive consultations have shown that the business sector wants these positive changes to take place as soon as possible. The Canadian community would benefit from the bill's introduction of pre-approval programs such as customs self-assessment and CANPASS to clear low risk passengers and goods to expedite their movement at border crossings.

Private Members' Business

CCRA will apply technology to support our new programs to allow customs officers to focus their efforts on high risk people and goods. Recently the Minister of National Revenue announced the government's commitment to increase staff and technology applications for our proposed new programs.

The safety and protection of Canadians is vitally important to the government and the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency. In the wake of September 11 the government has committed more resources to tools, training and technology.

I heard my hon. colleagues all supporting our vision and action plan for customs. Without unnecessary delay it is obvious that Bill S-23 would provide the necessary action for Canada.

• (1240)

We need to unite together in the House to fight terrorism, for Canada and for the free world.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to Bill S-23, although I would have appreciated it if the revenue minister had been here to listen to the concerns of the opposition about this legislation.

The Bloc Québécois supports Bill S-23 and will be voting for it.

Unfortunately, in light of the events of September 11, the Bloc Québécois is seeking extra protection by putting forward amendments to ensure that the government will sit down again with the Standing Committee on Finance at the end of the year to review the scope and the enforcement of the legislation.

The Bloc Québécois wants the services being set up through this bill to be improved upon. It also wants businesses and travellers to respect the regulations that could be made under this bill.

However, we do have some concerns, since we know that all these new Customs measures to expedite the movements of persons and goods and to streamline the security procedures will be taken by regulations. We feel this leaves the minister with a lot of discretionary power.

I will not repeat the arguments raised by my hon. colleagues from Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, Verchères—Les Patriotes and Rosemont—Petite Patrie, who have so eloquently spoken to this bill. I simply want to thank all opposition parties who said they would support the Bloc amendments.

To conclude, I will say once again that the Bloc Québécois will support Bill S-23, but not without some major reservations.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The vote is on the first motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): A recorded division on Motion No. 1 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 2.

• (1245)

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the vote on the motion is automatically deferred until Monday but I believe you would find unanimous consent in the House to further defer the vote until the end of government orders on Tuesday next week.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I believe you would also find consent in the House to see the clock as 1.30 so that we may proceed to the consideration of private members' business.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

BROADCASTING ACT

Mr. John Harvard (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia, Lib.) moved that Bill S-7, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, it is an honour for me to initiate debate on the bill. The purpose of Bill S-7 is to amend the Broadcasting Act. The summary of the bill states:

This enactment amends the Broadcasting Act in order to enable the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission to make regulations establishing criteria for the awarding of costs, and to give the Commission the power to award and tax costs between the parties that appear before it.

Within the context of the bill, I bring the full attention of hon. members to one significant area that requires further elaboration and is the basis for the amendment that I am advancing.

Private Members' Business

Consider the following. We know that under sections 56 and 57 of the Telecommunications Act, the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, or CRTC, has the power to compensate the organizations or individuals appearing before it during proceedings on telecommunications. The act also authorizes the CRTC to establish the refund criteria and to determine to whom costs will be paid and by whom.

Conversely, the Broadcasting Act does not envision such provisions. Consequently, the CRTC has no power to either award costs or establish the criteria of awards under this act. This is an imbalance that causes concern and requires immediate rectification.

Why is it essential to amend the Broadcasting Act?

First, the amendment brings the Broadcasting Act into concordance with the Telecommunications Act, where the rights for cost recovery have existed for years.

Second, convergence and the information highway have created deep interplay between telecommunications and the broadcasting services used by the public, such as news media and the Internet. Often the CRTC has been faced with issues involving both the Telecommunications Act and the Broadcasting Act. Regardless of the validity of the arguments presented, the CRTC has been able to award only costs covered under the Telecommunications Act but not under the Broadcasting Act, even though the information provided under both acts has proven pertinent and value added.

Third, the vastness of the funding available to media companies is an outright contrast to the financial limitations faced by consumers and their representative groups. This condition therefore creates imbalances and inequalities that are inconsistent with our democratic system. Substantive and effective participation by consumer organizations representing the interests of citizens is often hampered by financial limitations owing to the fact that detailed research studies and expert assistance are very costly.

Fourth, this much needed amendment brings into symmetry and balances both acts. Thus, consumers will be fairly treated in all proceedings before the commission whether conducted under the Broadcasting Act or the Telecommunications Act.

Fifth, other regulatory agencies in Canada provide for the payment of intervenor costs. Many tribunals that regulate public utilities or important public services award costs of public interest intervenors to reimburse them for their intervention.

Sixth, this amendment will be extremely beneficial to the Canadian public. Cost awards would allow consumers and public interest groups as well as individuals to develop thorough research and substantial evidence to represent effectively the interest of citizens in broadcasting and cable television policy and regulatory proceedings at the local or national level. Locally, this amendment would permit our constituents to effectively challenge cable TV issues such as rate increases, channel packaging or licensing conditions of local broadcasters.

The issues examined by the commission could have wider repercussions on the population in general. For example, national issues such as television policy or cable television distribution

regulations or more specific issues, such as the rate consumers pay for cable television services, could be potentially at stake.

Seventh, consumer groups across Canada strongly support this initiative since they are aware of the importance of equal representation under the Broadcasting Act.

• (1250)

Among the organizations supporting the proposed amendments are: the British Columbia Public Interest Centre, the Public Interest Law Centre, the National Anti-Poverty Organization, the Canadian Labour Congress, the Canadian Library Association, the Manitoba chapter of the Consumers' Association of Canada, and the list goes on.

Again I must point out that the high level of citizen participation in telecommunications matters cannot be compared to the level of citizen participation in broadcasting proceedings, for one reason. Simply stated, they have not been able to secure their participation because of financial restraints.

The issue of effective citizen participation has become even more relevant since the bill was first introduced. Over the past several months the CRTC has instituted a number of proceedings relating to convergence, pricing, service and industry consolidation, which are of great interest and relevance to consumers.

For example, broadcasters and cable companies will be changing the technology they use for broadcasting television signals from analog to digital. This will cost at least several hundred million dollars and change how channels are packaged and sold to consumers. Consumers will also be required to purchase new televisions or rent digital decoders. Who will bear the companies' costs? How will this technological change affect the pricing and choice of programming and channels for consumers?

Another example is the community channel on cable television. Four years ago many community groups lost access or control of their channel through regulatory changes. This year the CRTC initiated a review of this policy as well as new rules for the creation of community based over the air television. Without good legal representation, research and other resources, consumer groups were hard pressed to put forward good evidence and a strong case to strengthen community television at the local level. How can we expect the system to truly change to benefit our constituents without sufficient resources?

Without the ability to recover costs related to the gathering of substantial evidence, consumer participation is limited. While consumers and consumer groups may be able to present short briefs expressing general principles and expectations, they are not able to afford indepth research and testimony. Their meagre efforts crumble under the weight of evidence put forward by the industry.

Private Members' Business

In our changing communications sector, Canadians deserve answers to these questions. We know how industry and consumer points of view differ and how issues of this magnitude need to be treated in a fair and balanced way for the benefit of all of us.

Who will be funded? Not everyone who appears before the CRTC in a proceeding will automatically qualify for a cost award. With the passage of this amendment, the CRTC will draw the rules of procedure that will be used to determine the criteria for awarding costs under the Broadcasting Act. As with the criteria that already exist in telecommunications rules of procedure for costs, applicants must demonstrate to the commission that they are representative of a group of citizens, that they have participated in the proceedings in a responsible way and that they have contributed substantially to a better understanding of the issues in question. These are rigorous tests.

Who pays for these cost awards? The costs are met by companies that come under the jurisdiction of the CRTC and that took part in the proceedings and will be affected by the outcome. One of the principles of reimbursement is to compensate deserving interveners for the costs incurred by an intervention based on the fair market value of the work performed. Like the costs for company representation, the funds come from the key industry interveners services budget. This procedure will be the same as that already in place under the Telecommunications Act.

In exercising its responsibility under the Broadcasting Act, the CRTC is given decision making powers that are important for and have a great impact on Canadians' association with the promotion of Canadian culture, the setting of rates, the introduction of competition and the resolution of stakeholder disputes.

Under paragraph 3(d)(i) of the Broadcasting Act, the commission is instructed to safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada. Therefore, for the process of decision making to be congruent with our Canadian principles of fairness and equity, it is vital that the process be conducted on the basis of openness, impartiality and transparency.

• (1255)

The amendment therefore affords us the opportunity to translate these principles into functional ones so that the results of wise governance may be delivered effectively in these important regulatory hearings.

I would like to remind colleagues that the spirit and intent of the bill rests with the concept that every democratic society should foster active citizen participation in public issues. Modern democratic life requires an active role from the population and needs participation from members of the community. It should no longer be the case that those who are governed act only to elect. They are then governed without any opportunity to interact with the governing institutions.

By increasing the participation of public advocacy groups in CRTC proceedings through Bill S-7 we would render a service to our own institutions, allowing them to make use of valuable information. We would also be making way for more reasoned decisions and a better understanding of the concerns and aspirations of our society, as well as allowing all parties to work in a co-operative fashion toward possible solutions.

In closing I would like to stress that Bill S-7 would allow each and every one of us to empower our constituents to be fairly and equally represented in all matters related to broadcasting and cable TV, both locally and nationally.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in the House again to debate Bill S-7, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act.

The bill was introduced in the Senate and passed in June. Essentially the intent of the bill is to permit the CRTC to establish criteria that would allow the awarding of costs to interveners in broadcasting proceedings. Currently it has the power to award costs in telecommunications cases. The wording of the bill states:

The Commission may award interim or final costs of and incidental to proceedings before it and may fix the amount of the costs or direct that the amount be taxed.

The Commission may order by whom and to whom any costs are to be paid and by whom they are to be taxed...establishing the criteria for the awarding of costs—

The intent of the bill seems reasonable and it is something that can be studied further in committee. However, the concern on this side of the House is that the timing of the legislation is perhaps a little inappropriate.

The Canadian heritage committee is currently reviewing the Broadcasting Act and will, without a doubt, focus on the CRTC's mandate.

Bill S-7 proposes that the awarding of costs would allow individuals or groups to come together with the opportunity to develop well researched evidence to present to the CRTC hearings. The opportunity to provide the awarding of costs to interveners would, according to the sponsors of the legislation, allow expert advice and testimony at hearings.

For those who sit on a committee and who are involved in parliament, as it is for witnesses who go before a committee, such as witnesses who go before the CRTC, it is imperative to come to conclusions on legislation and on their ideals. We applaud the essence of what the legislation is trying to do.

In May 2001, the government announced the long awaited review of the 1991 Broadcasting Act. The Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage requested submissions by Internet during the summer. We were hopeful for an early fall commencement of hearings. The Canadian Alliance agrees with the necessity of a review and it is anxious to participate in hearings that will host a wide range of differing opinions. However, at its present rate of speed, the review will not be completed by May 2002.

It must be recognized that technological changes are rushing opportunities of choices for consumers at the speed of light. The committee must be mindful that by the time the recommendations are put to paper, everything may have changed.

This brings me back to the reasons that it is not possible to support Bill S-7 at this time.

Legislation respecting the Broadcasting Act, whether it is the CRTC or otherwise, must not be dealt with prior to the completion of the Canadian heritage committee's study of the Broadcasting Act. To put forward legislation on a matter that is still in the process of being reviewed by the committee would be pre-emptive of the process.

I have a copy of a letter from the CRTC deputy commissioner of competition. It was written to the clerk of the committee on September 14, 2001. The letter states:

In general, the Commissioner is interested in examining and reporting upon the extent to which competition and market mechanisms have historically and may, going forward, be relied upon to realize the core objectives of the Broadcasting Act. For this purpose, the Commissioner will examine and make recommendations regarding the broadcasting policy objectives, the current regulatory model and its environment, and proposals for legislative and regulatory change.

• (1300)

The Canadian Alliance believes there cannot be any legislation put forward at this time which would pre-empt the recommendations of the study due to be released next year.

Furthermore, the committee has requested that the chair of the CRTC, David Colville, attend the committee to discuss his understanding of the proper constitutional relationship between parliament, its committees, federal commissions and their respective roles.

There is concern at this time that decisions made by the CRTC during the course of the heritage committee study may require the CRTC to impose regulatory changes on broadcasters and consumers long before the study is completed. Stated clearly, current CRTC decisions must not allow any unfair advantage while the committee is conducting the study.

Throughout the course of the hearings we must ask ourselves if the CRTC continues to be relevant or whether its purpose would be better served in an alternative regulatory body rather than under the arm of the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Department of Industry.

No one is questioning the relevancy of these regulatory bodies. We know there needs to be a regulatory body but as we discuss and study the CRTC and its mandate there are many things that will be brought out regarding its responsibilities.

We know the CRTC has a mandate to license and regulate broadcasters. We also know the CRTC is in charge of telecommunications. Part of telecommunications, especially phone companies and the use of telecommunications in rural Canada, will possibly be discussed at the hearings.

One of the concerns of Canadians is what is happening to rural Canada and agriculture. What the government, the CRTC and different bodies can do is look at what may be viewed as insensitivity toward some of our rural areas in regard to telecommunications.

When we look at some of our large metropolitan cities, all the business of the residents of those communities is carried out in the metropolitan area. One of my frustrations in rural Alberta is that every time we call the neighbouring town down the road where we do much of our business we are calling long distance. Towns in other parts have come together and the local call is broadening out a bit.

Private Members' Business

One of the things we need to look at is where people are doing business, where children are going to school and where people are carrying out their normal activities. In rural Canada local telephone calls are made not just to the closest small rural town but to many places. They are made to many small locales and little communities.

Bill S-7 does not and is not intended to answer all the questions of the CRTC. I fully understand that. However it sets the criteria for awarding costs in broadcasting proceedings. It is therefore not possible for the Canadian Alliance to support any legislative changes that would affect either the CRTC or the Broadcasting Act until the committee hearings are complete and recommendations are put forward.

As we have said, the content of the bill is good. The timing of the bill is bad.

• (1305)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Madam Speaker, Bill S-7, which I am speaking to today, aims to amend the Broadcasting Act to enable the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission to make regulations establishing criteria to determine how the CRTC may authorize the reimbursement of the costs incurred by a party appearing before it.

According to the CRTC, an official designated by the commission would examine the costs and determine their eligibility. The parties covered by Bill S-7 are primarily members of the public and consumer groups. At the moment, the CRTC is empowered to compensate individuals appearing before it regarding any matter under the Telecommunications Act, but it cannot intervene in the same way for matters arising under the Broadcasting Act.

If passed, this bill, introduced by my colleague Sheila Finestone, the former member for Mount Royal, and I recognize the member who has replaced her, now a senator and for whom I have considerable esteem, would harmonize these two laws and broaden the capacity of consumers or consumer groups to better assert their rights in the matter of broadcasting.

As we know, the big broadcasters and telecommunications companies have phenomenal sums available to them. According to the senator, the radio-telecommunications industry has annual revenues of some \$20 billion.

Clearly, the situation is very different for consumers, given the cost of collecting data, and paying honoraria for experts to do quality research and the time required for drafting briefs.

The gap between the public and the major industries is measured in light years. Individuals whose rights have been infringed should be able to demonstrate the injustice they have suffered. Obstacles of a technical nature cannot be allowed to prevent them. The right to fair and equitable treatment is a basic principle of our democracy.

Private Members' Business

Bill S-7 would give consumer groups the right to properly defend their interests with the CRTC when there problems involve the Broadcasting Act. This bill would enable the CRTC to make decisions based on properly documented briefs, since the means for their production would be assured. In addition, the means involved to permit costs should not be excessive, because the regulations must provide criteria for awarding costs.

In other words, the CRTC must ensure that the amount spent on preparing a brief is reasonable, before reimbursing the individual or consumer group appearing before it.

According to Action réseau consommateur, a group which has met with the Bloc Québécois, the situation is as follows:

The principle for appearance costs is to reimburse qualified interveners for the work associated with an intervention based on market value. The CRTC has always followed this practice, which was confirmed and approved by the Supreme Court in 1986. This means that clearly identified cases and detailed invoices must be prepared by the lawyer, expert witness or analyst working for a group of interveners, for submission to the charges assessor. This estimate is set in accordance with a fee scale which generally reflects the maximum market charge for similar services. It is important to note that the payment is for services rendered by recognized professionals and does not go into the coffers of the organization. Frequently, the intermediary organizations hire experts and consultants who are in private practice. Under these circumstances, the reimbursement is for invoices from these individuals for appearance fees, and the involvement of the intermediary organization is merely administration of that reimbursement. These fees do not constitute income for the public interest organizations; they are merely a reimbursement of the costs incurred in making an intervention in the public interest.

● (1310)

We have seen that this amendment to the Broadcasting Act is supported by citizens and by organizations that represent them.

In May Action réseau consommateur and the Fédération des associations d'économie familiale du Québec appeared before the Senate Standing Committee on Transport and Communications in their examination of Bill S-7.

In their brief, these organizations brought up another important point. Beyond re-establishing a balance between corporations and citizens, these two organizations amply highlighted one of the reasons why citizens, or the organizations that represent them, must be able to voice their concerns to the CRTC at a time when the television industry is undergoing a complete makeover.

For several years now, the cost of accessing television has climbed steadily. Since the advent of digital television, cable operators have been selling specialty channels separately.

Despite the fact that consumers do not appear eager to pay more for these channels, the CRTC recently approved operating licenses for 283 new specialty digital channels.

Action réseau consommateur and the Fédération des associations d'économie familiale du Québec asked themselves the following question. Conventional television, which was free of charge, was mandated to serve the public interest. How is the public interest better served today?

With the complex issue of analog television channels migrating towards digital, and the resulting rate increases that may ensue, the constant increase in the number of American channels on the Canadian market and all of the questions closely linked to these

changes, it seems more than clear to me that the bill currently before the House will allow us, to some extent, to better cope with these challenges, thereby ensuring that consumers' rights are respected.

The Bloc Québécois will therefore support Bill S-7, since it contributes to encouraging consumer groups in their efforts with the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission.

● (1315)

[English]

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of Bill S-7, both on behalf of our party and more specifically with the full support of the member for Dartmouth who is responsible for the bill and our position on it, and who is wholeheartedly in support of it.

Other than the argument we have heard that perhaps it is not the best time to be doing this, it seems to me that there is universal support in the House for the need for this type of amendment to the Broadcasting Act.

As a lawyer in private practice and a litigation lawyer, one who has worked on various occasions for groups who needed this type of support to provide themselves with the resources to act as interveners, it is obvious to me that this bill should be approved by all members of the House.

It is particularly important if one looks at what is happening to our media, to our regulation of it and to the overhaul which I think all parties agree is going on at this time and will continue for some time in the future. From a democracy standpoint, we simply and absolutely require the assistance that consumers and other interest groups will bring to the debate around the overhaul of the industry.

There are some changes being suggested that are quite frankly scary. There are some changes that have already occurred. One cannot help but think that, if we had had greater intervention from these groups, we would have had a better system for both public and private broadcasting.

If one is serious about democracy, one must support the bill.

I will raise a couple of issues that already have been addressed. The whole debate continues around the convergence of the print media with the electronic media, and the mergers of those systems, so that in many respects we now are faced with public opinion being formulated through the media by a smaller and smaller group of editors and producers. That cannot be healthy for democracy. It limits debate and the issues raised. As democrats, we must be concerned about that.

The other issue that caused a great deal of anger was the issue of negative billing. One cannot help but think that if the issue had been addressed at an earlier stage by interveners, it never would have got to the point that it did and it would not have caused so many people grief, including the providers of the service. This type of a bill and the resulting support it would provide to the interveners would really help head off that kind of a problem at a much earlier stage.

Private Members' Business

There are any number of other areas in the processing and enforcing of legislation and regulations. One cannot help but think that the government would be serving the Canadian public much better if it followed the example in the bill.

Again, I reiterate the need for the bill. Senator Finestone is to be commended for her work in the Senate with regard to it. I also want to acknowledge the speech by the member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia. His words were particularly forceful and eloquent at times on the need to have this type of legislation in place and to provide that type of support for the intervening groups who want to provide assistance to the democratic process.

● (1320)

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, PC/DR): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to join the debate this afternoon on behalf of members of the opposition coalition. I will pick up where my colleague left off in congratulating Senator Finestone, one of our former colleagues in this House, for her good work on the bill. I would like to also congratulate our colleague from Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia for his hard work on this initiative as well.

I would also agree somewhat with my colleague from Crowfoot on the point that perhaps, given the fact that there is an upcoming review of the Broadcasting Act that will be undertaken by the heritage committee, this may be the framework that this amendment is placed into, seeing as there will be a review of the entire legislation. Nevertheless, members of the coalition are generally supportive of the amendment.

I would like to focus my comments on some of the points that were made earlier by some of my colleagues.

Sections 56 and 57 of the Telecommunications Act give the CRTC the power to order intervenor costs that compensate individuals and organizations for their participation, research and testimony during telecommunications procedures that appear in front of the commission. There are rules that guide the CRTC on this.

This is not the same case for the Broadcasting Act. The CRTC has no power to award intervenor costs. I would agree with the points made by my colleagues that we have a discrepancy between the two bills. The amendment would seek to fix that point by harmonizing these two pieces of legislation.

I would like to focus my comments at this point on the purpose and the meaning of intervenor funding.

The purpose of intervenor costs is to ensure that individuals or groups of individuals who are or may be directly affected by a project under review by the CRTC have a reasonable opportunity to review information submitted by the applicant and other parties, that they have a reasonable opportunity to provide evidence relevant to the application and when appropriate an opportunity to cross-examine persons submitting information relevant to the application and that they have an opportunity to make arguments before the CRTC regarding the project.

It is important that the CRTC hear different points of view on an important decision it will make. Often the voice of individuals without the access to funds or the ability to be involved in the hearing is not heard. The amendment seeks to remedy that.

Why might we put this amendment in place? As I said earlier, it would harmonize the language between the Telecommunications Act and the Broadcasting Act, and that is an important thing to do. It would give the CRTC the power to award costs and to establish the rules to award these costs in the broadcasting field as they are presently in existence under the Telecommunications Act.

The details of these rules already exists in the rules of procedure for the Telecommunications Act and will remain the same should they be applied to this act as well. The procedure for cost award is already in existence in the Telecommunications Act and this would also be contained in this act if we went ahead with this amendment.

It is important to note also that this would result in asymmetry of legislation of both rules and procedures and would be fair to consumers. It would allow the full participation of consumers or consumer organizations in CRTC hearings. These people would be able to provide informed opinions which could be beneficial to both the consumer and the CRTC.

The amendment would be extremely beneficial to the Canadian public. Cost awards would allow consumers and public interest groups, as well as individuals, to develop thorough research and substantial evidence to represent effectively the interests of citizens in broadcasting and cable television policy and regulatory proceedings.

● (1325)

There are many other reasons why we should be supportive of this amendment. Many of those points have been brought up by my colleagues throughout this debate. Perhaps the most important one, which has been echoed in this place, is that it opens up a fairness opportunity for Canadians. Canada is a big country in which it is often hard to get from one place to another, but it is important that voices be heard in important decisions and that people have the access to those opportunities to have their voices heard so that good decisions can be made that are reflective of both sides of an issue or of many sides of an issue.

The amendment would allow a greater opportunity for that to happen. Of course individuals would still have to take the initiative to be involved in the process and we would encourage individuals and groups to do that. The amendment would encourage more individuals to get involved in that process and would bring together the two bills, the Telecommunications Act and the Broadcasting Act, in terms of harmonizing the procedures for both. It seems a bit unfair that there is one procedure that allows for intervenor costs in the Telecommunications Act but not in the Broadcasting Act. We have heard in debate today that most members would agree with that.

Again, we commend our former colleague from this place, now Senator Finestone, and our colleague from Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia for his good work on this issue and for bringing it forward for us to consider.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to this bill.

Private Members' Business

[English]

Indeed, we would like to compliment Senator Sheila Finestone, who has done an excellent job on this matter, as well as the member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia.

I also want to mention another colleague, Senator Jean-Robert Gauthier, who has also done a lot of work on the bill.

Bill S-7, which would provide compensation for witnesses to plead their cases in front of the CRTC, is a good bill and we certainly support it given the current situation in the country. I emphasize that phrase, given the current situation, for a particular reason. I think we ought to ask ourselves why we even have a CRTC in its current form.

In this era of the Internet, of greater freedom of speech and of greater freedom in movement of information, why do we have a CRTC that is, in my view, overblown? It is an organization that has influenced and put forth numerous rules and regulations that restrict the ability of the broadcast media to be the best that they can be.

I remember a group of people in my riding that tried to set up an ethnic broadcasting station and the incredible hoops those people had to jump through in order to do that. Why did they have to go through all those hoops and regulations in order to broadcast messages to ethnic communities in western Canada?

If ours is a country that is supposedly a democracy, that promotes freedom of speech and that believes in the ability to communicate between peoples, a right that enables us to live in a secure, peaceful country, then why do we have a CRTC that is putting out more and more rules and regulations every year? Does this not impede the right of Canadians to access information? Does it not impede the freedoms of writers, broadcasters, reporters and editorial boards across the country, their freedom to pursue and write stories and have them heard? Does it not impede artisans, actors and actresses in their ability to use their craft and broadcast their voices across the country? I think it does.

I think the CRTC has become overblown. Limited rules and regulations are required, to be sure, but what is happening now is beyond the pale. If we take a closer look at what the CRTC has become we see a small group of individuals controlling the rules and regulations through which we receive information. They decide what we can hear. They decide what we can listen to. They decide what information we get and what programs we watch.

What right do these individuals have to tell Canadians what we should be watching? They do not. Certainly the original purpose of the CRTC was and remains a good one, but over the years the CRTC has become overblown, like many pseudo-government organizations. It has widened its grip and influence and in so doing is actually violating one of the basic tenets and principles upon which the country was built, the right of freedom of speech.

In this examination of the CRTC that is taking place today, I think we, the CRTC and the public need to take a very close look at how much of a CRTC we need. Of the many rules and regulations the CRTC currently supports or requires, how many should we keep and how many should we remove? That is the larger question.

While Bill S-7 is a good bill given our current context, and we will support it, we certainly believe that on the larger issue we need to take a very close, cold, hard look at the CRTC and what powers it currently has. I would submit that on close examination we would see that the CRTC's powers, rules and regulations that it has manufactured for itself need to be removed. Canadians, broadcasters, artisans and the public do not need a small group of individuals telling us what we should be hearing.

• (1330)

Clearly that violates the basic principles of democracy in the country. Efforts have been made by good people to have broadcasting rights in Canada that would educate and inform Canadians and make Canada a better and safer place. It is bizarre that they have to go through all these rules and regulations and jump through hoops, at great length and expense, to accomplish this goal.

Let us also not forget that this organization uses the taxpayer money. In effect, the CRTC uses this money toward having a small group of individuals restrict the right that Canadians have to information. Does that not seem passing strange? Does it not seem odd that we even established this organization and allowed it to balloon to what it is today, with these expansive powers?

We have been asleep at the wheel. I do not think we have taken a very close look at this organization, which acts not as a facilitator, but as a barrier to the dissemination of information which could benefit Canadians.

Let us look at the CBC. It has a number of very superb programs, be it *Ideas* on CBC radio or some of the documentaries which it has produced. It also has some programs that are terrible. However, what it clearly needs to have is the right and the power to sell and export those great programs so it can make money and by doing so, it would rejuvenate its editorial boards, its writers and broadcasters. It would also create jobs and perhaps expand and put itself on a firm fiscal footing.

When I travel abroad, I find it heartwarming to see Canadian programs being shown half a world away because of bilateral arrangements.

I think everyone in this House has listened to *Ideas* on CBC Radio and have been riveted by the extraordinary programming on CBC Radio. Imagine if those programs could be sold to other parts of the world, such as south of the border, Europe and other far away places. Imagine how that could educate people about Canada.

When I travel to other parts of the world, I find the quality of some of the programming quite sad. If some of our Canadian programs were exported and sold, what a benefit it would be to these countries. That would be extraordinary.

The CRTC acts as a bulwark to prevent that from happening. That organization prevents the CBC from exporting this information. It prevents broadcasters and people of extraordinary broadcasting abilities to get their programs out there for us to see. The CRTC prevents that because broadcasters have to go through it.

As I said in my earlier remarks, in this era of the Internet, of open borders and of supposedly greater freedoms, which in fact we have, we have an organization that does the opposite. It retards and compromises our freedoms as Canadians.

I can only stress to the minister responsible, the minister of heritage, that this could be an extraordinary legacy for her if she informed the CRTC that her department would be doing an in-depth examination of the rules, regulations which govern the role of the CRTC. If she does that and limits the powers of the CRTC, then Canadian broadcasters, editors, reporters, writers and all Canadians would be better off and we would have a freer country.

• (1335)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Marcell (Beauharnois—Salaberry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, as was explained earlier, the House is considering Bill S-7, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act, which would enable the CRTC to make regulations concerning the awarding of costs. It would in fact allow the commission to award and tax costs between the parties that appear before it.

It is important to remind the House that there is support for the principles of fairness and balance behind Bill S-7. It is also important to harmonize the rules governing the participation of witnesses to the CRTC hearings dealing with either broadcasting or telecommunications. We also need to harmonize the rules for stakeholders and broadcasters who appear before the CRTC. For all these reasons, we think Bill S-7 should be passed at second reading and referred to the appropriate committee for a more in-depth review.

If passed, Bill S-7 will guarantee equal opportunity for all Canadians who wish to take part in the decision-making process concerning the future of our broadcasting system, as is currently done for our telecommunications system.

The transition to a new and innovative economy, from an industrial economy to a knowledge economy, does have an impact on what Canadians expect from the government and on the role of the government.

Therefore, in a democratic society, it is perfectly logical to encourage citizens to act in accordance with the decisions by CRTC advisers and businesses that appear before the CRTC to participate in the process and react to it. After all, the broadcasting system uses a public resource and, through its programming, it helps Canadians establish links with one another and get to know their history and country better.

Convergence is an ever-present reality within the communications industry. The convergence of technologies is a key element. The regulatory issues and concerns that the CRTC must face are increasingly connected to the Broadcasting Act and the Telecommunications Act, and they affect a broader segment of Canadians.

In an increasingly more complex communications sector, the rational approach would be to invite citizens to take part in the decisions that affect them. While the commission is dealing with these issues, one way to promote informed decisions regarding the protection of the public's interest would be to help pay the costs incurred by stakeholders who appear before broadcasting authorities.

Private Members' Business

If Bill S-7 were passed, the CRTC would have to take into consideration the different nature and character of radio-broadcasting and telecommunications hearings. The former are held frequently: they deal with a wide variety of issues and attract a variety of stakeholders, who are interested in making their points of view known.

Allow me to clarify.

Telecommunications hearings are generally official in nature and take place less frequently. Stakeholders who appear before the commission are usually specialists presenting technical details and economic analyses regarding rates and their impact on consumers. There is normally a cross-examination and no licence hearing takes place. Accordingly, the number of interested stakeholders is relatively limited.

Radio-broadcasting hearings, on the other hand, are frequent, almost regular. Numerous participants, who hold licences, reflect the many facets of the radio-broadcasting system: radio, television, cable, traditional and digital services, pay-per-view television, satellite and direct distribution services, and multichannel/multipoint distribution services.

• (1340)

These hearings tend to be unofficial. More particularly, the number of stakeholders interested in attending radio-broadcasting hearings is not surprising, given that the cultural media have a close impact on the daily lives of Canadians, shaping their identities and how they see the world.

Accordingly, it is easier for an informed and well-spoken citizen to present his observations without necessarily backing them up with economic or technical analyses.

In addition, radio-broadcasting hearings do not include cross-examination, and the hearings deal with matters of policy and whether or not to grant, renew or amend licences.

As for radio-broadcasting hearings, the commission must make its rulings after taking into account competing and varied issues having to do with society, culture, language, ethnic origin and the economy. As a result, the number of stakeholders and areas of interest is much broader.

Convergence has resulted in differences between telecommunications and radio-broadcasting, formerly separate industries. The time has come to standardize the rules for awarding costs.

In the past, when the CRTC held proceedings under the Telecommunications Act and the Broadcasting Act, including hearings on the new media, it awarded costs only for representations dealing with one of the telecommunications aspects. With increasing technological integration that will blur the differences between the various communications industries, it will become more and more difficult to assess the contribution of representations made in relation to their impact on telecommunications or broadcasting.

Private Members' Business

As I said earlier, the objectives of Bill S-7 are laudable in principle, but they will be difficult to achieve. In view of the large number of broadcasting licence renewal proceedings, the CRTC should probably tailor its criteria for awarding costs related to broadcasting to the circumstances and even set a limit in that regard.

The CRTC said it was in favour of harmonizing the rules with regard to the awarding of costs to the parties that appear before it and that it was ready to set things in motion to bring about the necessary changes through a public hearing. In fact, the CRTC wants the public and the industry to be involved in determining what the criteria for the new system would be. Bill S-7 provides for the harmonization of these rules.

The challenge facing the CRTC is to determine what will entitle the parties making representations to an award of costs. According to the rules of procedure in telecommunications, the parties must have an interest in the outcome of the proceedings, take part in the

proceedings in a reasonable manner and help the CRTC to better understand the issues.

● (1345)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): I would like to inform the member that he will have two minutes left out of the ten minutes normally allotted to him when debate on this bill is resumed in the House.

The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the order paper.

[*English*]

It being 1.45 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 1.45 p.m.)

APPENDIX

**ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS WITH THEIR
CONSTITUENCIES, PROVINCE OF CONSTITUENCY
AND POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS;
COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE,
THE MINISTRY AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY**

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. DON BOUDRIA

HON. ANDY MITCHELL

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

MR. JACQUES SAADA

MR. JOHN REYNOLDS

MR. PIERRE BRIEN

MR. RICHARD HARRIS

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay—Columbia	British Columbia	CA
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	Alberta	CA
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Allard, Carole-Marie	Laval East	Quebec	Lib.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	CA
Anderson, David	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	Saskatchewan	CA
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Assad, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Gatineau	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	Quebec	PC/DR
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Bagnell, Larry	Yukon	Yukon	Lib.
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	CA
Baker, Hon. George	Gander—Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni	Ahuntsic	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga	Ontario	Lib.
Bélaïr, Réginald	Timmins—James Bay	Ontario	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier—Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eugène	Ottawa—Orléans	Ontario	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon	Lakeland	Alberta	CA
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères—Les-Patriotes	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Ontario	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—Petite-Patrie	Quebec	BQ
Binet, Gérard	Frontenac—Mégantic	Quebec	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon—Souris	Manitoba	PC/DR
Boudria, Hon. Don, Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	Quebec	BQ
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	New Brunswick	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Saskatchewan	CA
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	Quebec	BQ
Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	Nova Scotia	PC/DR
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bryden, John	Ancaster—Dundas— Flamborough—Aldershot	Ontario	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Parkdale—High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Burton, Andy	Skeena	British Columbia	CA
Byrne, Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Newfoundland	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	British Columbia	CA
Calder, Murray	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Caplan, Hon. Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Thornhill	Ontario	Lib.
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	Quebec	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy	Québec East	Quebec	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford	Ontario	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	Nova Scotia	PC/DR
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Alberta	CA
Castonguay, Jeannot, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Madawaska—Restigouche	New Brunswick	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West—Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph—Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Quebec	Lib.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Alberta	CA
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister of Canada	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	Lib.
Clark, Right Hon. Joe	Calgary Centre	Alberta	PC/DR
Coderre, Hon. Denis, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)	Bourassa	Quebec	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—St. Clair	Ontario	NDP
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Ontario	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Quebec	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques	Quebec	BQ
Cullen, Roy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Markham	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta—South Richmond	British Columbia	CA
Cuzner, Rodger	Bras d'Or—Cape Breton	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
Day, Stockwell, Leader of the Opposition	Okanagan—Coquihalla	British Columbia	CA
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière—L'Érable	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Hon. Herb, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver South—Burnaby	British Columbia	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland	PC/DR
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Drouin, Claude, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	Quebec	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Francophonie)	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	CA
Duplain, Claude	Portneuf	Quebec	Lib.
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Art, Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo—Cowichan	British Columbia	CA
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	CA
Eyking, Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	CA
Folco, Raymonde, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby	British Columbia	CA
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Ontario	CA
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton Centre-East	Alberta	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan	British Columbia	CA
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	British Columbia	CA
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Alberta	PC/DR
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency— Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CA
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Harris, Richard	Prince George—Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	CA
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James— Assiniboia	Manitoba	Lib.
Harvey, André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Quebec	Lib.
Hearn, Loyola	St. John's West	Newfoundland	PC/DR
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	New Brunswick	PC/DR
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	CA
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	British Columbia	PC/DR
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	Manitoba	CA
Hinton, Betty	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	British Columbia	CA
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	Alberta	CA
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Cooperation	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce— Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CA
Jordan, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister	Leeds—Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Nunavut	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	Nova Scotia	PC/DR
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	CA
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont—Dundas— Charlottenburgh	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Ontario	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau— Mirabel	Quebec	BQ
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Lanctôt, Robert	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint- Paul—Pointe Saint-Charles	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
LeBlanc, Dominic	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	New Brunswick	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Leung, Sophia, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	Lib.
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	NDP
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Ontario	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	British Columbia	PC/DR
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	British Columbia	CA
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC/DR
Macklin, Paul Harold	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour	Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie—Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	CA
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier	Quebec	BQ
Marcil, Serge	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Quebec	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	Manitoba	PC/DR
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	CA
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle—Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Matthews, Bill, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Burin—St. George's	Newfoundland	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	British Columbia	CA
McCallum, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Markham	Ontario	Lib.
McCormick, Larry, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	British Columbia	PC/DR
McTeague, Dan	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Ontario	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	British Columbia	PC/DR
Merrifield, Rob	Yellowhead	Alberta	CA
Milliken, Hon. Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	CA
Mills, Dennis	Toronto—Danforth	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation	Beaches—East York	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Moore, James	Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam	British Columbia	CA
Murphy, Shawn	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Myers, Lynn, Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada	Waterloo—Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Kenora—Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Neville, Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Bellechasse—Etchemins— Montmagny—L'Islet	Quebec	Lib.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina—Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
O'Brien, Lawrence	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	London—Fanshawe	Ontario	Lib.
O'Reilly, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Haliburton—Victoria—Brock	Ontario	Lib.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Alberta	CA
Owen, Stephen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Hon. Rey, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Manitoba	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	Manitoba	CA
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Saskatchewan	PC/DR
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Paradis, Denis	Brome—Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	CA
Peric, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	Quebec	BQ
Peschisolido, Joe	Richmond	British Columbia	CA
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre, Minister for International Trade	Papineau—Saint-Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry	Chatham—Kent Essex	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet— Bécancour	Quebec	BQ
Pratt, David	Nepean—Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Price, David	Compton—Stanstead	Quebec	Lib.
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	Saskatchewan	NDP
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Rajotte, James	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	CA
Redman, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton	Ontario	Lib.
Regan, Geoff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Carleton	Ontario	CA
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	British Columbia	CA
Richardson, John	Perth—Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	CA
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend	Burnaby—Douglas	British Columbia	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Roy, Jean-Yves	Matapédia—Matane	Quebec	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Quebec	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	Quebec	BQ
Savoy, Andy	Tobique—Mactaquac	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scherrer, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	Lib.
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	British Columbia	CA
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Serré, Benoît, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Ontario	Lib.
Sgro, Judy	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Skelton, Carol	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	Saskatchewan	CA
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	CA
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	Alberta	CA
Speller, Bob	Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Spencer, Larry	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	CA
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Quebec	Lib.
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik	Quebec	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin	Ontario	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	British Columbia	CA
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	British Columbia	PC/DR
Szabo, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Kitchener—Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Thibault, Hon. Robert, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	West Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande	Saint-Lambert	Quebec	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	PC/DR
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	CA
Tirabassi, Tony	Niagara Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Tobin, Hon. Brian, Minister of Industry	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Toews, Vic	Provencher	Manitoba	CA
Tonks, Alan	York South—Weston	Ontario	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Stoney Creek	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward—Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	CA
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton—Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Ontario	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick	PC/DR
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	British Columbia	CA
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	CA
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Ontario	Lib.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	CA
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
Yelich, Lynne	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	CA

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: Lib. - Liberal; CA - Canadian Alliance; BQ - Bloc Quebecois; NDP - New Democratic Party; PC/DR - Progressive Conservative Party / Democratic Representative Caucus Coalition; Ind. - Independent

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

First Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	CA
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	CA
Benoit, Leon	Lakeland	CA
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	CA
Chatters, David	Athabasca	CA
Clark, Right Hon. Joe	Calgary Centre	PC/DR
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	CA
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton Centre-East	CA
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	PC/DR
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	CA
Hill, Grant	Macleod	CA
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	CA
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	CA
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	CA
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	CA
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Lib.
Merrifield, Rob	Yellowhead	CA
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	CA
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	CA
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	CA
Rajotte, James	Edmonton Southwest	CA
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	CA
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	CA
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	CA
Williams, John	St. Albert	CA
BRITISH COLUMBIA (34)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay—Columbia	CA
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	Lib.
Burton, Andy	Skeena	CA
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	CA
Cummins, John	Delta—South Richmond	CA
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Day, Stockwell, Leader of the Opposition	Okanagan—Coquihalla	CA
Dhaliwal, Hon. Herb, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver South—Burnaby	Lib.
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	CA
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo—Cowichan	CA
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby	CA
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan	CA
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	CA
Harris, Richard	Prince George—Bulkley Valley	CA
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	PC/DR

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hinton, Betty	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	CA
Leung, Sophia, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	PC/DR
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CA
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	CA
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	CA
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	PC/DR
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	PC/DR
Moore, James	Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam	CA
Owen, Stephen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Peschisolido, Joe	Richmond	CA
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	CA
Robinson, Svend	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	CA
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	CA
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	PC/DR
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	CA
White, Ted	North Vancouver	CA
MANITOBA (14)		
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon—Souris	PC/DR
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Francophonie)	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	CA
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	PC/DR
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Neville, Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Hon. Rey, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	CA
Toews, Vic	Provencher	CA
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP
NEW BRUNSWICK (10)		
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	Lib.
Castonguay, Jeannot, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Madawaska—Restigouche	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	PC/DR
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
LeBlanc, Dominic	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	Lib.
Savoy, Andy	Tobique—Mactaquac	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	PC/DR
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC/DR

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEWFOUNDLAND (7)		
Baker, Hon. George	Gander—Grand Falls	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC/DR
Hearn, Loyola.....	St. John's West	PC/DR
Matthews, Bill, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.....	Burin—St. George's.....	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence	Labrador	Lib.
Tobin, Hon. Brian, Minister of Industry	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)		
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC/DR
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC/DR
Cuzner, Rodger	Bras d'Or—Cape Breton.....	Lib.
Eyking, Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald.....	South Shore	PC/DR
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC/DR
McDonough, Alexa.....	Halifax	NDP
Regan, Geoff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Halifax West.....	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley— Eastern Shore.....	NDP
Thibault, Hon. Robert, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency) ..	West Nova	Lib.
NUNAVUT (1)		
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut.....	Lib.
ONTARIO (103)		
Adams, Peter.....	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis.....	Brampton Centre.....	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke—Lakeshore.....	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga.....	Lib.
Bélaïr, Réginald.....	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène.....	Ottawa—Orléans	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's.....	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan—King—Aurora.....	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond.....	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey.....	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons.....	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.....	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie.....	Oakville.....	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bryden, John	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Hon. Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West—Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph—Wellington	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—St. Clair	NDP
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Cullen, Roy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Markham	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Art, Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Lib.
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	CA
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Lib.
Jordan, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister	Leeds—Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Lib.
Macklin, Paul Harold	Northumberland	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour	Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie—Lincoln	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Lib.
McCallum, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Markham	Lib.
McCormick, Larry, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
McTeague, Dan	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Lib.
Milliken, Hon. Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis	Toronto—Danforth	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation	Beaches—East York	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Lib.
Myers, Lynn, Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada	Waterloo—Wellington	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Kenora—Rainy River	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	London—Fanshawe	Lib.
O'Reilly, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Haliburton—Victoria—Brock	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Lib.
Peric, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry	Chatham—Kent Essex	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Pratt, David	Nepean—Carleton	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Redman, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Kitchener Centre	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Carleton	CA
Richardson, John	Perth—Middlesex	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
Serré, Benoît, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Lib.
Sgro, Judy	York West	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Kitchener—Waterloo	Lib.
Tirabassi, Tony	Niagara Centre	Lib.
Tonks, Alan	York South—Weston	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Stoney Creek	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward—Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton—Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Lib.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)		
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Murphy, Shawn	Hillsborough	Lib.
QUEBEC (75)		
Allard, Carole-Marie	Laval East	Lib.
Assad, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC/DR
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères—Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—Petite-Patrie	BQ
Binet, Gérard	Frontenac—Mégantic	Lib.
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy	Québec East	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister of Canada	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup— Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphondu-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière—L'Érable	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Claude, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Duplain, Claude	Portneuf	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Cooperation	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Lanctôt, Robert	Châteauguay	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint-Paul— Pointe Saint-Charles	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier	BQ
Marcil, Serge	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Lib.
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonnette	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)...	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny— L'Islet	Lib.
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	BQ
Paradis, Denis	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre, Minister for International Trade	Papineau—Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Price, David	Compton—Stanstead	Lib.
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Roy, Jean-Yves	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
Scherrer, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Lib.
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	BQ

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Anderson, David	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CA
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	CA
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	CA
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Lib.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina—Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	PC/DR

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	CA
Skelton, Carol	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	CA
Spencer, Larry	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	CA
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	CA
Yelich, Lynne	Blackstrap	CA
YUKON (1)		
Bagnell, Larry	Yukon	Lib.

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of October 19, 2001 — 1st Session, 37th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair:	Raymond Bonin	Vice-Chairs:	Nancy Karetak-Lindell Maurice Vellacott	
Larry Bagnell	David Chatters	John Godfrey	Pat Martin	(16)
G�rard Binet	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	Beno�t Serr�	
Serge Cardin	John Finlay	Richard Marceau	Guy St-Julien	
Jean-Guy Carignan				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	Gilles-A. Perron
Diane Ablonczy	John Duncan	Robert Lanct�t	Joe Peschisolido
Rob Anders	Ken Epp	Gary Lunn	James Rajotte
David Anderson	Brian Fitzpatrick	James Lunney	Scott Reid
G�rard Asselin	Paul Forseth	Peter MacKay	John Reynolds
Andr� Bachand	Ghislain Fournier	Preston Manning	Gerry Ritz
Claude Bachand	Cheryl Gallant	Inky Mark	Jean-Yves Roy
Roy Bailey	Yvon Godin	Keith Martin	Werner Schmidt
Leon Benoit	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Carol Skelton
St�phane Bergeron	Jim Gouk	Joe McGuire	Monte Solberg
Bernard Bigras	Gurmant Grewal	Grant McNally	Kevin Sorenson
Rick Borotsik	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Larry Spencer
Garry Breitkreuz	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Darrel Stinson
Scott Brison	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Chuck Strahl
Andy Burton	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Greg Thompson
Chuck Cadman	John Herron	Anita Neville	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Grant Hill	Lorne Nystrom	Vic Toews
Rick Casson	Jay Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Howard Hilstrom	Brian Pallister	Randy White
Joe Comartin	Betty Hinton	Jim Pankiw	Ted White
John Cummins	Rahim Jaffer	Pierre Paquette	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Dale Johnston	Charlie Penson	Lynne Yelich
Bev Desjarlais			

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:

Charles Hubbard

Vice-Chairs:
Murray Calder
Howard HilstromDavid Anderson
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Claude DuplainMark Eyking
Marcel Gagnon
Rick LaliberteLarry McCormick
Dick Proctor
Bob SpellerPaul Steckle
Suzanne Tremblay
Rose-Marie Ur

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
Paul Crête
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed ElleyKen Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Mario Laframboise
Robert LanctôtGary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Pierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Gilles-A. Perron
Joe PeschisolidoJames Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Jean-Yves Roy
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairs:

Jim Abbott
Dennis Mills

Paul Bonwick
Sarmite Bulte
Rodger Cuzner
Claude Duplain

Christiane Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Roger Gallaway

John Harvard
Betty Hinton
Wendy Lill

Grant McNally
Caroline St-Hilaire
Tony Tirabassi

(16)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Bill Blaikie
Rick Borotsik
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
John Cummins
Libby Davies

Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy

Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Pierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
Dick Proctor
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Joe Fontana

Vice-Chairs:

Paul Forseth
Steve Mahoney

Mark Assad
Yvon Charbonneau
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
John Godfrey

Art Hanger
Inky Mark
Anita Neville

Jerry Pickard
David Price
Stéphan Tremblay

Tony Valeri
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Lynne Yelich

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day

Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy

Jason Kenney
Francine Lalonde
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Charles Caccia	Vice-Chairs:	Karen Kraft Sloan Bob Mills
Roy Bailey	Marcel Gagnon	Rick Laliberte	Andy Savoy
Bernard Bigras	John Herron	Karen Redman	Hélène Scherrer
Joe Comartin	Gar Knutson	Julian Reed	Alan Tonks
Paul Forseth			

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Robert Lanctôt	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	John Duncan	Clifford Lincoln	John Reynolds
Peter Adams	Reed Elley	Gary Lunn	Gerry Ritz
Rob Anders	Ken Epp	James Lunn	Svend Robinson
David Anderson	Brian Fitzpatrick	Peter MacKay	Werner Schmidt
André Bachand	Cheryl Gallant	Preston Manning	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Peter Goldring	Richard Marceau	Monte Solberg
Stéphane Bergeron	Jim Gouk	Inky Mark	Kevin Sorenson
Rick Borotsik	Gurmant Grewal	Keith Martin	Larry Spencer
Garry Breitzkreuz	Deborah Grey	Pat Martin	Darrel Stinson
Scott Brison	Art Hanger	Philip Mayfield	Peter Stoffer
Andy Burton	Richard Harris	Grant McNally	Chuck Strahl
Chuck Cadman	Loyola Hearn	Val Meredith	Greg Thompson
Serge Cardin	Grant Hill	Rob Merrifield	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Jay Hill	James Moore	Vic Toews
Rick Casson	Howard Hilstrom	Deepak Obhrai	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Betty Hinton	Brian Pallister	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Rahim Jaffer	Jim Pankiw	Randy White
John Cummins	Dale Johnston	Charlie Penson	Ted White
Stockwell Day	Gerald Keddy	Joe Peschisolido	John Williams
Bev Desjarlais	Jason Kenney	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich

FINANCE**Chair:**

Maurizio Bevilacqua

Vice-Chairs:Nick Discepola
Ken EppSue Barnes
Carolyn Bennett
Scott Brison
Roy CullenAlbina Guarnieri
Rahim Jaffer
Jason Kenney
Sophia LeungYvan Loubier
John McCallum
Shawn Murphy
Lorne NystromPauline Picard
Gary Pillitteri
Monte Solberg

(18)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé
John DuncanReed Elley
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Christiane Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Dale JohnstonGerald Keddy
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Alexa McDonough
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Pierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Gilles-A. PerronJoe Peschisolido
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Stéphan Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair:

Wayne Easter

Vice-Chairs:

John Cummins

Paul Steckle

Sarkis Assadourian
 Andy Burton
 Rodger Cuzner
 Georges Farrah

Loyola Hearn
 Dominic LeBlanc
 James Lunney

Bill Matthews
 Lawrence O'Brien
 Jean-Yves Roy

Peter Stoffer
 Suzanne Tremblay
 Tom Wappel

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
 Diane Ablonczy
 Rob Anders
 David Anderson
 Gérard Asselin
 André Bachand
 Roy Bailey
 Leon Benoit
 Rick Borotsik
 Garry Breitzkreuz
 Scott Brison
 Chuck Cadman
 Bill Casey
 Rick Casson
 David Chatters
 Joe Clark
 Stockwell Day
 Norman Doyle
 John Duncan
 Reed Elley

Ken Epp
 Brian Fitzpatrick
 Paul Forseth
 Ghislain Fournier
 Marcel Gagnon
 Cheryl Gallant
 Yvon Godin
 Peter Goldring
 Jim Gouk
 Gurmant Grewal
 Deborah Grey
 Art Hanger
 Richard Harris
 John Herron
 Grant Hill
 Jay Hill
 Howard Hilstrom
 Betty Hinton
 Rahim Jaffer
 Dale Johnston

Gerald Keddy
 Jason Kenney
 Gary Lunn
 Peter MacKay
 Preston Manning
 Inky Mark
 Keith Martin
 Philip Mayfield
 Grant McNally
 Val Meredith
 Rob Merrifield
 Bob Mills
 James Moore
 Deepak Obhrai
 Brian Pallister
 Jim Pankiw
 Charlie Penson
 Joe Peschisolido
 James Rajotte
 Scott Reid

John Reynolds
 Gerry Ritz
 Svend Robinson
 Yves Rocheleau
 Werner Schmidt
 Carol Skelton
 Monte Solberg
 Kevin Sorenson
 Larry Spencer
 Darrel Stinson
 Chuck Strahl
 Greg Thompson
 Myron Thompson
 Vic Toews
 Maurice Vellacott
 Elsie Wayne
 Randy White
 Ted White
 John Williams
 Lynne Yelich

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair:	Bill Graham	Vice-Chairs:	Jean Augustine Brian Pallister	
George Baker	John Duncan	Francine Lalonde	Pierre Paquette	(18)
Aileen Carroll	John Harvard	Diane Marleau	Bernard Patry	
Bill Casey	Marlene Jennings	Keith Martin	Svend Robinson	
Rick Casson	Stan Keyes	Pat O'Brien		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Stan Dromisky	Gary Lunn	John Reynolds
Rob Anders	Antoine Dubé	James Lunney	Gerry Ritz
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Peter MacKay	Yves Rocheleau
Sarkis Assadourian	Ken Epp	John Maloney	Benoît Sauvageau
André Bachand	Mark Eyking	Preston Manning	Werner Schmidt
Claude Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Richard Marceau	Carol Skelton
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Inky Mark	Monte Solberg
Colleen Beaumier	Cheryl Gallant	Pat Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Leon Benoit	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Bob Speller
Stéphane Bergeron	Jim Gouk	Grant McNally	Larry Spencer
Bernard Bigras	Gurmant Grewal	Val Meredith	Darrel Stinson
Bill Blaikie	Deborah Grey	Rob Merrifield	Chuck Strahl
Rick Borotsik	Art Hanger	Bob Mills	Greg Thompson
Garry Breitkreuz	Mac Harb	James Moore	Myron Thompson
Scott Brison	Richard Harris	Anita Neville	Vic Toews
Andy Burton	Loyola Hearn	Lorne Nystrom	Stéphane Tremblay
Chuck Cadman	John Herron	Deepak Obhrai	Tony Valeri
Serge Cardin	Grant Hill	Jim Pankiw	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Jay Hill	Charlie Penson	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Howard Hilstrom	Joe Peschisolido	Randy White
Irwin Cotler	Betty Hinton	Beth Phinney	Ted White
Paul Crête	Rahim Jaffer	David Price	John Williams
John Cummins	Dale Johnston	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Stockwell Day	Gerald Keddy		

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chair:	Mac Harb	Vice-Chair:		
Rick Casson	Gary Lunn	Pierre Paquette	Bob Speller	(9)
Mark Eyking	Pat O'Brien	Svend Robinson	Tony Valeri	

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Beth Phinney	Vice-Chair:		
Sarkis Assadourian	Bill Casey	Antoine Dubé	Deepak Obhrai	(9)
Colleen Beaumier	Irwin Cotler	Marlene Jennings	Svend Robinson	

HEALTH**Chair:** Bonnie Brown**Vice-Chairs:**Reg Alcock
Rob MerrifieldDiane Ablonczy
André Bachand
Colleen Beaumier
Diane BourgeoisJeannot Castonguay
Brenda Chamberlain
Stan DromiskyJames Lunney
Réal Ménard
Hélène ScherrerJudy Sgro
Yolande Thibeault
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis

(16)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Libby Davies
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John DuncanReed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale JohnstonGerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
Pauline PicardJames Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair: Judi Longfield

Vice-Chairs:

Joe Peschisolido
Diane St-Jacques

Eugène Bellemare
Paul Crête
Libby Davies
Raymonde Folco

Monique Guay
Tony Ianno
Dale Johnston
Gurbax Malhi

Serge Marcil
Joe McGuire
Anita Neville
Carol Skelton

Larry Spencer
Greg Thompson
Alan Tonks

(18)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Carolyn Bennett
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé

John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Christiane Gagnon
Marcel Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
John Godfrey
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer

Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Wendy Lill
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Larry McCormick
Grant McNally
Réal Ménard
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister

Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Jean-Yves Roy
Werner Schmidt
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Tony Tirabassi
Vic Toews
Stéphan Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Judy Wasylycia-Leis
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:	Andy Scott	Vice-Chairs:	Chuck Cadman Denis Paradis	
Carole-Marie Allard	Paul DeVillers	John McKay	Myron Thompson	(18)
Michel Bellehumeur	Ivan Grose	Lynn Myers	Vic Toews	
Bill Blaikie	Peter MacKay	Stephen Owen	Pierrette Venne	
Irwin Cotler	John Maloney	Kevin Sorenson		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Duncan	Dominic LeBlanc	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Reed Elley	Derek Lee	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Ken Epp	Gary Lunn	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Brian Fitzpatrick	James Lunney	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Paul Forseth	Preston Manning	Svend Robinson
Roy Bailey	Cheryl Gallant	Richard Marceau	Werner Schmidt
Leon Benoit	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Carol Skelton
Bernard Bigras	Jim Gouk	Keith Martin	Monte Solberg
Rick Borotsik	Gurmant Grewal	Philip Mayfield	Larry Spencer
Diane Bourgeois	Deborah Grey	Grant McNally	Darrel Stinson
Garry Breitkreuz	Art Hanger	Réal Ménard	Chuck Strahl
Scott Brison	Richard Harris	Val Meredith	Greg Thompson
Andy Burton	Loyola Hearn	Rob Merrifield	Suzanne Tremblay
Bill Casey	John Herron	Bob Mills	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Grant Hill	James Moore	Tom Wappel
David Chatters	Jay Hill	Anita Neville	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Joe Clark	Howard Hilstrom	Deepak Obhrai	Elsie Wayne
Joe Comartin	Betty Hinton	Brian Pallister	Randy White
John Cummins	Rahim Jaffer	Jim Pankiw	Ted White
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Marlene Jennings	Pierre Paquette	Bryon Wilfert
Stockwell Day	Dale Johnston	Charlie Penson	John Williams
Bev Desjarlais	Gerald Keddy	Joe Peschisolido	Lynne Yelich
Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	David Pratt	

LIAISON

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Peter Adams	Charles Caccia	Charles Hubbard	David Pratt	(17)
Mauril Bélanger	Wayne Easter	Ovid Jackson	Andy Scott	
Maurizio Bevilacqua	Joe Fontana	Clifford Lincoln	Susan Whelan	
Raymond Bonin	Bill Graham	Judi Longfield	John Williams	
Bonnie Brown				

BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE

Chair:	Bill Graham	Vice-Chair:		
Bonnie Brown	Clifford Lincoln	Susan Whelan	John Williams	(7)
Wayne Easter	Judi Longfield			

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:

David Pratt

Vice-Chairs:
Leon Benoit
David Price

Rob Anders
Claude Bachand
Roy Bailey
Colleen Beaumier

Stan Dromisky
John O'Reilly
Janko Peric

Louis Plamondon
Carmen Provenzano
Peter Stoffer

Elsie Wayne
Bryon Wilfert
Bob Wood

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
David Anderson
André Bachand
Stéphane Bergeron
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick

Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Francine Lalonde

Wendy Lill
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Svend Robinson
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Peter Adams	Vice-Chairs:	Richard Harris Jacques Saada	
Pierre Brien	Michel Guimond	Paul Harold Macklin	John Reynolds	(16)
Marlene Catterall	Jay Hill	Carolyn Parrish	John Richardson	
Cheryl Gallant	Joe Jordan	Geoff Regan	Tony Tirabassi	
Yvon Godin				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Stockwell Day	Gary Lunn	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Norman Doyle	James Lunney	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Peter MacKay	Gerry Ritz
David Anderson	Reed Elley	John Maloney	Werner Schmidt
André Bachand	Ken Epp	Preston Manning	Carol Skelton
Roy Bailey	Brian Fitzpatrick	Inky Mark	Monte Solberg
Sue Barnes	Paul Forseth	Keith Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Michel Bellehumeur	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Larry Spencer
Leon Benoit	Jim Gouk	Grant McNally	Caroline St-Hilaire
Stéphane Bergeron	Gurmant Grewal	Réal Ménard	Darrel Stinson
Bill Blaikie	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Chuck Strahl
Rick Borotsik	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Paul Szabo
Garry Breitkreuz	John Harvard	Bob Mills	Greg Thompson
Scott Brison	Loyola Hearn	Dennis Mills	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	John Herron	James Moore	Vic Toews
Chuck Cadman	Grant Hill	Lorne Nystrom	Maurice Vellacott
Bill Casey	Howard Hilstrom	Deepak Obhrai	Elsie Wayne
Rick Casson	Betty Hinton	Brian Pallister	Randy White
David Chatters	Rahim Jaffer	Jim Pankiw	Ted White
Joe Clark	Dale Johnston	Charlie Penson	Bryon Wilfert
John Cummins	Gerald Keddy	Joe Peschisolido	John Williams
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Jason Kenney	Marcel Proulx	Lynne Yelich

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Carolyn Parrish	Vice-Chair:		
Bill Blaikie	Michel Guimond	Jay Hill	Marcel Proulx	(6)
Garry Breitkreuz				

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY CALENDAR

Chair:	Marlene Catterall	Vice-Chair:		
Pierre Brien	Yvon Godin	Richard Harris	Jay Hill	(5)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chair:	John Williams	Vice-Chairs:	Mac Harb Beth Phinney	
Robert Bertrand	John Finlay	Philip Mayfield	Alex Shepherd	(17)
John Bryden	Rahim Jaffer	Shawn Murphy	Greg Thompson	
Gerry Byrne	Sophia Leung	Gilles-A. Perron	Myron Thompson	
Odina Desrochers	Pat Martin			

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Gerald Keddy	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	John Duncan	Jason Kenney	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Reed Elley	Gary Lunn	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Ken Epp	James Lunney	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Peter MacKay	Benoît Sauvageau
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Preston Manning	Werner Schmidt
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Inky Mark	Carol Skelton
Rick Borotsik	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Monte Solberg
Garry Breitzkreuz	Jim Gouk	Grant McNally	Kevin Sorenson
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Val Meredith	Larry Spencer
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Rob Merrifield	Darrel Stinson
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Bob Mills	Peter Stoffer
Serge Cardin	Richard Harris	James Moore	Chuck Strahl
Bill Casey	Loyola Hearn	Deepak Obhrai	Vic Toews
Rick Casson	John Herron	Brian Pallister	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Grant Hill	Jim Pankiw	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Jay Hill	Denis Paradis	Randy White
John Cummins	Howard Hilstrom	Charlie Penson	Ted White
Stockwell Day	Betty Hinton	Joe Peschisolido	Lynne Yelich
Bev Desjarlais	Dale Johnston		

SUB-COMMITTEE ON COMBATING CORRUPTION

Chair:	John Williams	Vice-Chair:		
John Bryden	Pat Martin	Shawn Murphy	Alex Shepherd	(10)
Odina Desrochers	Philip Mayfield	Beth Phinney	Greg Thompson	
Mac Harb				

TRANSPORT AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chair:	Ovid Jackson	Vice-Chairs:	James Moore Marcel Proulx	
Reg Alcock	Bev Desjarlais	André Harvey	Val Meredith	(16)
Gerry Byrne	Brian Fitzpatrick	Mario Laframboise	Alex Shepherd	
John Cannis	Peter Goldring	Ghislain Lebel	Paul Szabo	
Joe Comuzzi				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Dale Johnston	Dick Proctor
Diane Ablonczy	John Duncan	Gerald Keddy	James Rajotte
Rob Anders	Reed Elley	Jason Kenney	Scott Reid
David Anderson	Ken Epp	Dominic LeBlanc	John Reynolds
G�rard Asselin	Paul Forseth	Gary Lunn	Gerry Ritz
Andr� Bachand	Ghislain Fournier	James Lunney	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Christiane Gagnon	Peter MacKay	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Preston Manning	Monte Solberg
Bernard Bigras	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Richard Marceau	Kevin Sorenson
Rick Borotsik	Jim Gouk	Serge Marcil	Larry Spencer
Garry Breitzkreuz	Gurmant Grewal	Inky Mark	Darrel Stinson
Scott Brison	Deborah Grey	Keith Martin	Peter Stoffer
Andy Burton	Monique Guay	Philip Mayfield	Chuck Strahl
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Grant McNally	Greg Thompson
Serge Cardin	Richard Harris	R�al M�nard	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Loyola Hearn	Rob Merrifield	Vic Toews
Rick Casson	John Herron	Bob Mills	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	Randy White
Paul Cr�te	Howard Hilstrom	Jim Pankiw	Ted White
John Cummins	Betty Hinton	Charlie Penson	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Charles Hubbard	Joe Peschisolido	Lynne Yelich
Odina Desrochers	Rahim Jaffer		

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

Chair:	Paddy Torsney	Vice-Chairs:	Carole-Marie Allard Randy White	
Andr� Bachand	Mac Harb	R�al M�nard	Jacques Saada	(13)
Bernard Bigras	Dominic LeBlanc	Stephen Owen	Carol Skelton	
Libby Davies	Derek Lee			

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chair:

Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald Beaudoin
John Bryden
Jane Marie Cordy

Donald Oliver
Vivienne Poy

Mauril Bélanger
Carolyn Bennett
Robert Bertrand
Marlene Catterall
Marcel Gagnon
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton

Jim Karygiannis
Raymond Lavigne
Wendy Lill
Jerry Pickard
Louis Plamondon
Jacques Saada
Darrel Stinson
Andrew Telegdi

(21)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Libby Davies
Stockwell Day

Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Howard Hilstrom
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy

Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairs: Mauril Bélanger
Shirley Maheu

Joint Vice-Chairs: Scott Reid
Yolande Thibeault

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald Beaudoin
Joan Fraser
Jean-Robert Gauthier

Laurier LaPierre
Jean-Claude Rivest
Raymond Setlakwe

Mauril Bélanger
Eugène Bellemare
Gérard Binet
Sarmite Bulte
Claude Drouin
Christiane Gagnon
John Godfrey
Yvon Godin

Peter Goldring
Richard Harris
John Herron
Raymond Lavigne
Dan McTeague
Scott Reid
Benoît Sauvageau

(25)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
John Cummins
Stockwell Day

Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Loyola Hearn
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney

Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
Louis Plamondon

James Rajotte
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chair: Céline Hervieux-Payette

Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

John Bryden
Sheila Finestone
Noël Kinsella

Wilfred Moore
Pierre Claude Nolin

Sue Barnes
Paul Bonwick
Jean-Guy Carignan
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Michel Guimond
Gar Knutson

Robert Lanctôt
Derek Lee
Paul Harold Macklin
Lynn Myers
Lorne Nystrom
Jim Pankiw
Tom Wappel
Ted White

(23)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Michel Bellehumeur
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle

John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy

Jason Kenney
Ghislain Lebel
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Pierrette Venne
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

Panels of Chairman of Legislative Committees

The The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister of Canada
Hon. Herb Gray	Deputy Prime Minister
Hon. David Collenette	Minister of Transport
Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
Hon. Ralph Goodale	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board
Hon. Brian Tobin	Minister of Industry
Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
Hon. John Manley	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
Hon. Art Eggleton	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Health
Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Solicitor General of Canada
Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister for International Trade
Hon. Don Boudria	Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Hon. Herb Dhaliwal	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Ronald Duhamel	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Francophonie)
Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
Hon. Robert Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Maria Minna	Minister for International Cooperation
Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	Leader of the Government in the Senate
Hon. Robert Thibault	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
Hon. Jim Peterson	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
Hon. Andy Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
Hon. Gilbert Normand	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
Hon. Denis Coderre	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)
Hon. Rey Pagtakhan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr. Joe Jordan	to the Prime Minister
Mr. André Harvey	to the Minister of Transport
Mrs. Karen Redman	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Benoît Serré	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Claude Drouin	to the Minister of Industry
Ms. Sarmite Bulte	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Ms. Aileen Carroll	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. John McCallum	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. John O'Reilly	to the Minister of National Defence
Mr. Stephen Owen	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Mr. Jeannot Castonguay	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Lynn Myers	to the Solicitor General of Canada
Mr. Paul Szabo	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Mr. Alex Shepherd	to the President of the Treasury Board
Ms. Sophia Leung	to the Minister of National Revenue
Ms. Raymonde Folco	to the Minister of Human Resources Development
Mr. Pat O'Brien	to the Minister of International Trade
Mr. Geoff Regan	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Larry McCormick	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Mr. Georges Farrah	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Carmen Provenzano	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Mr. Gurbax Malhi	to the Minister of Labour
Mr. John Finlay	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Ms. Marlene Jennings	to the Minister for International Cooperation
Mr. Mark Assad	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration

CONTENTS

Friday, October 19, 2001

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Customs Act

Bill S-23. Report stage..... 6359

Speaker's Ruling

Motions in Amendment

Mr. Bergeron 6359

Motions Nos. 1 and 2..... 6359

Mr. Mark 6360

Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)..... 6361

Mr. Ménard..... 6362

Mr. Stinson..... 6363

Mr. Comartin..... 6365

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Bernard Mascarenhas

Mrs. Kraft Sloan 6365

Marine Conservation Areas

Mr. Burton..... 6365

Organ Donations

Mr. Adams 6365

Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Month

Mr. Harb..... 6365

Amnesty International

Mrs. Redman..... 6366

Canada Winter Games

Mrs. Skelton..... 6366

Order of Canada

Mr. Marcil..... 6366

Canadian Museum of Civilization

Ms. Dalphond-Guiral..... 6366

Diamond Industry

Mr. Pratt..... 6366

Air Canada

Mr. Moore..... 6367

Peacekeeping

Mr. Easter..... 6367

Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion

Mrs. Desjarlais 6367

Tax Havens

Ms. Guay..... 6367

National Security

Mr. Lee..... 6368

The Environment

Mr. Herron 6368

National Security

Ms. Thibeault..... 6368

Airline Industry

Mr. Hill (MacLeod)..... 6368

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Immigration

Mr. Day..... 6368

Ms. Caplan 6368

Mr. Day..... 6368

Ms. Caplan 6369

Mr. Day..... 6369

Ms. Caplan 6369

Mr. Hill (MacLeod)..... 6369

Ms. McLellan 6369

Mr. Hill (MacLeod)..... 6369

Ms. McLellan 6369

Anti-terrorism Legislation

Ms. St-Hilaire 6369

Ms. McLellan 6369

Ms. St-Hilaire 6369

Ms. McLellan 6369

Mr. Bellehumeur 6369

Ms. McLellan 6370

Mr. Bellehumeur 6370

Ms. McLellan 6370

National Defence

Ms. Wasylcia-Leis 6370

Mr. Eggleton 6370

Ms. Wasylcia-Leis 6370

Mr. Eggleton 6370

Health

Mr. Strahl..... 6370

Mr. Gray..... 6370

Mr. Strahl..... 6370

Mr. Gray..... 6371

Mrs. Ablonczy..... 6371

Mr. Gray..... 6371

Mrs. Ablonczy..... 6371

Mr. Gray..... 6371

Anti-terrorism legislation

Mr. Guimond..... 6371

Ms. McLellan 6371

Mr. Guimond..... 6371

Ms. McLellan 6371

Justice

Mr. Sorenson 6371

Ms. McLellan 6371

Mr. Sorenson 6372

Ms. McLellan 6372

Health

Mr. Ménard..... 6372

Mr. Gray	6372	Mr. Cauchon	6376
Mr. Ménard	6372		
Mr. Gray	6372	Highway Infrastructure	
Immigration		Ms. Girard-Bujold	6376
Mrs. Gallant	6372	Mr. Harvey	6376
Ms. Caplan	6372	Health	
Mrs. Gallant	6372	Mrs. Desjarlais	6376
Ms. Caplan	6372	Mr. Gray	6376
National Security		Infrastructure	
Mr. Murphy	6372	Mr. Heam	6376
Mr. Cauchon	6373	Mr. Shepherd	6377
Employment Insurance		Heritage Canada	
Mr. Comartin	6373	Mr. Bélanger	6377
Mrs. Stewart	6373	Ms. Copps	6377
Mr. Comartin	6373	Anti-terrorism Legislation	
Mrs. Stewart	6373	Mr. Moore	6377
Health		Mr. Boudria	6377
Mr. Clark	6373	Privilege	
Mr. Gray	6373	Purchase of Medications by Health Canada	
Mr. Clark	6373	Mr. Clark	6377
Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	6373	Official languages	
Mr. Castonguay	6373	Mr. Guimond	6378
Anti-Terrorism Legislation		Mr. Boudria	6379
Mr. Fitzpatrick	6373		
Ms. Caplan	6374	ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
Mr. Fitzpatrick	6374	Interparliamentary Delegations	
Ms. Caplan	6374	The Deputy Speaker	6379
Canadian Security Intelligence Service		Canadian Tourism Commission	
Mr. Bergeron	6374	Mr. Drouin	6380
Mr. MacAulay	6374	Foreign Affairs and International Trade	
Mr. Bergeron	6374	Mr. Harb	6380
Mr. MacAulay	6374	Petitions	
National Security		Assisted Suicide	
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	6374	Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	6380
Mr. Cauchon	6374	Kidney Disease	
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	6374	Mr. Adams	6380
Mr. Cauchon	6375	Trafficking in Baby Parts	
Health		Mr. Provenzano	6380
Mr. Hubbard	6375	Detroit River	
Mr. Castonguay	6375	Mr. Comartin	6380
Agriculture		Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)	6375	Ms. Carroll	6380
Mr. Vanclief	6375		
Mr. Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)	6375	GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
Mr. Vanclief	6375	Customs Act	
Guaranteed Income Supplement		Bill S-23. Report Stage	6380
Mr. Gagnon (Champlain)	6375	Mr. Comartin	6380
Mrs. Stewart	6376	Ms. Leung	6381
Public Works		Mr. Perron	6382
Mr. Tonks	6376	Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	6382
Mr. Szabo	6376	Ms. Catterall	6382
Canada Customs and Revenue Agency		Ms. Catterall	6382
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	6376		

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Broadcasting Act

Mr. Harvard	6382
Bill S-7. Second reading	6382
Mr. Sorenson	6384
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral	6385

Mr. Comartin	6386
Mr. McNally	6387
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	6387
Mr. Marciel	6389

APPENDIX

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Communication Canada - Publishing
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :

Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) 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 Communication Canada - Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9**